

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**January 24, 2017**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, January 24, 2017 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  
Carl Leonard  
Jerry Alexie  
Frank Eckenrode  
David Joseph  
James Moran

Absent: Ray Saelens, *excused*

Others: Patrick Meagher, Community Planning & Management  
Jonathon Palin, Planning & Zoning Administrator

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

**5      PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. PUD #2016-25: (APPLICATION PHASE) JPB Car Wash 29939 S. River Road, Harrison Twp. MI 48045 Proposed 10,216 square foot addition to Dockside Auto Wash for a detailing facility located on the one half mile north of Cotton Road at 47391 Jefferson.**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to open the Public Hearing

**Supported** by Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. LaBelle asked applicant if they had received the reports from Community Planning Management and AEW?

Dennis Dewulf, Dewulf Assoc., architect, 27938 Worthington, St. Clair Shores, MI 48081 addressed the board.

Applicant replied yes. He stated that since the last time they met they had a brief meeting with the neighbors and they expressed some of their concerns. He mentioned that he tried to address some of their concerns and they tried to do what they could within reason and present a picture of the property with the plans that should be acceptable to the Planning Commission and to the community.

**Public Comments:**

Marty Niester, 29213 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Ms. Niester stated that she and the neighbors do not approve of this car wash. She mentioned that one of their concerns was that their neighbor Carolyn Natzke has a pesticide certification so she cannot be within 100' from any kind of toxins or particles that are in the air. So, she would like to know if the EPA is going to be looking into this to make sure this is under regulations. She stated that the drawings have shutters and with the severity of her neighbor's condition, which is verified with the State of Michigan, how is she supposed to deal with the toxins and particles in the air when she is 90' away from the car wash across the street. She stated that it does not make sense to allow this 6,200 square foot which has now been changed to a 10,000 square foot

facility in an area that she understood was supposed to be developed in the future into a kind of downtown area. She remarked that this project belongs on 94 and 21 Mile Road. She asked where Mr. Bowen was because this has been in front of the Commission before and he has not shown up. This guy just wants to dump money into this facility and expand it up to 10,000 square feet and he is not even here. She thinks allowing this expansion is a big mistake. She asked how many people received the notice on this project? Is there some kind of protocol?

Mr. Meagher explained that the notices are sent to everyone within 300' of the property lines.

Ms. Niester stated that originally the notice went out for 6,200 square feet and now it is 10,000 feet and she asked for an explanation.

Mr. Palin replied that the first submittal had 6,200' on the plan and at the first meeting they requested to be tabled because they were making some changes to the plans. He stated then they came back in two weeks for the Public Hearing and that was when the site plan was changed to 10,000'.

Sandy Gendreau, 29217 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Ms. Gendreau stated that she runs in that area and notices everything. She has counted cars that use that car wash and it is never busy. One Saturday she opened all of her blinds and counted 11 cars that went to that car wash in a 2 ½ hour period. She remarked that the maximum that is spent per car is \$8 which would make a total of \$88 and she saw three workers that probably make \$6 an hour and with water, soap and electricity to pay, she did not understand what why a successful, wealthy business man would want to expand this car wash and dump all of this money into it when the business is not lucrative. She speculated on a few reasons that a successful business man would want to dump money into this business.

Carolyn Natzke, 47353 Forton St., New Baltimore, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Ms. Natzke stated that she lives across the street from the car wash and explained that she has Multiple Chemical Sensitivity and she is registered with the Department of Agriculture with the State of Michigan. She mentioned that the Commission has been given a copy of that certification. Her doctor was very concerned because the particulates are spread anywhere from 2 to 20 miles and even though the shutters are closed most of the time, when they are opened the particles are still there. She is not in favor of this expansion and she is concerned about her health.

Steve Spangler, 29180 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Mr. Spangler has lived in the community for about six months and has some environmental concerns. He mentioned that now this would be a detail shop, not a car wash. He explained that with a detail shop there would be airborne products that are being sprayed like engine cleaners, sealers, polishes, etc. He then mentioned the lake being close to the facility and was concerned about the run off into the lake. He remarked that this would be a toxic environment that the owner is trying to create. He knows that from experience because he used to work in the automotive industry. He was a painter by trade and a paint rep for PPGM. He requested that the Council at least looks at the MSD sheets of all products that are going to be used at this facility in this environment. He asked if he is using anything airborne, would the place have a ventilation system? He asked if the Council has addressed this matter? He stated that this is a serious concern for all the neighbors. He does not think this detail shop is good for the community. He then speculated what this guy is doing with this property because he just does not have the business. He asked that the Commission become aware of what chemicals the owner plans to use in this environment. He asked if this would be EPA approved or approved within the Federal guidelines as far as the run off.

Laurie Gaborik, 29201 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Ms. Gaborik stated that she does not allow her children out in her back yard due to the profanity that comes from this car wash. She cannot have anybody come over and visit in her back yard because of the profanity and vulgarness of the people that hang around that facility. She stated that the cigarette smoke comes in her back yard when the wind blows and she cannot imagine what she will be breathing in if it becomes a detail shop. She is concerned for her children and remarked that this is not a good location for this detail shop.

Applicant stated that there was a question about the shutters. He explained that the shutters are not functioning; they are decorative Caribbean Bahama shutters and are strictly aesthetic. He mentioned that to answer where Mr. Bowen is; he is currently in Florida recovering from surgery, otherwise he would have been at the meeting. He stated that he was Mr. Bowen's representative and he would do the best he could to answer any questions.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Meagher if they could request data sheets and get the information about the chemicals that would be used?

Mr. Meagher answered that they could certainly request any information that they would like. He explained that typically that information would be handled through the Department of Environmental Quality at the State level and not as part of the site plan. However, it is a PUD and if there are any concerns certainly it would be possible to get a list of the types of chemicals that are going to be used with all of the details on those.

Mr. Joseph stated that a few of the comments that have to do with the vibrancy of the business he does not believe is within the scope of this board's consideration. He explained that as the Township Trustee representative and the liaison to the full Township Board. He stated that he did not know if he could go back to the full board and talk about a property owner who has an entrepreneurial right to make the go of a business and say to him they do not think it is a vibrant business. He explained that he is not in the car wash business and does not think they can say no because they do not believe it will be a successful business. He did look over the pesticide application and because of the close proximity to Ms. Natske, they should probably insure that they know whatever the solvents or chemicals would be used at the facility. He does not believe that the notification registry encumbers this project unless they make a real strong connection to the chemicals being pesticides. He explained that the fact of the matter is that this is a commercial district and with a PUD request he looks at what are some of the areas where they would request relief from the ordinance requirements. He remarked as he understands it when they grant the PUD status they are in essence stating the property is now a special district, not required to follow every single variance. So in his review of what some of the proposed variance requests would be, his understanding from the Planning Director is that the ordinances are actually in place to accommodate the people in the neighborhood. He stated so the gates on the property is something being done extra by the business owner to try to alleviate concerns regarding traffic and access to the property. He finds that there is some effort by the owner taking into consideration the surrounding community. Lastly, he does not know if the Board would be well served to start doing an assessment on neighboring car washes and how many cars came in and it is not in this board's wheel house and it is not something that they can do. He commented that the only argument he thought had some merit was the point that they make sure they protect their most vulnerable citizens. There is a notification and Ms. Natske has surely documented her concern about her exposure. He would think whatever is in the air now is not going to be greatly enhanced by this business. He noted that every one of those marinas in that area does some type of work as far as rubbing compounds and detailing of boats, such as PGA Collision right up the road. He reiterated in essence they are in a commercial area where they would come into contact with cleaners, solvents and rubbing compounds. He would expect that Ms. Natske would not see anything here that would add to

her condition. However, he would like to see an investigation done on what is going to be used before they move this forward.

Mr. Eckenrode stated that he agreed with Mr. Joseph's comments and the other main concern would be falling within the Master Plan.

Mr. Leonard agreed with Mr. Joseph and Mr. Eckenrode about the chemicals and how this would really blend in with the Master Plan which runs all the way down Jefferson.

Mr. Alexie asked if the applicant knew if there would be any airborne particles and would there be a dust collection system in that facility?

Applicant replied that there should be no dust generated at this site. This is going to be a hand car wash with an associated detailing process. He stated it would involve hand held bottles of cleaning products not barrels much like the things that are underneath their kitchen sinks, like Formula 409 or Fantastic but they are products made for auto detailing industry.

Mr. Alexie asked about dust or mineral spirits?

Applicant stated that he is not exactly sure, but they would be happy to provide an MSD sheet on everything used.

Mr. Alexie asked what about the paint?

Applicant replied that they would not be painting any vehicles on the premises. It would be strictly hand washing of cars and vehicles.

Mr. Alexie asked if the owner would be storing any of his cars on the premises?

Applicant replied no, only as long as it would take to detail them. He commented that these are not antiques. Mr. Bowen owns exotic cars like Aston Martins and Ferraris. He belongs to numerous car clubs and has been assured of enough business to make this a lucrative operation.

Mr. Alexie asked if he knew when the car wash was built?

Applicant replied no. He guessed about 30 years ago. He stated that the problem is that the records are gone because of a flood or something.

Mr. Miller stated that normal procedure is to wait two weeks to render their decision.

Mr. Moran did not have any comments at that time.

Mr. Stabile stated that at the previous meeting people and brought up screening. He went out to look at it and there is a cement fence and pretty dense arborvitaes across the whole back of the property. He mentioned that within 2 or 3 years those arborvitaes should be up another three feet, so the view will be less and less as time goes by.

Applicant failed to mention that they have extended that cement wall and the property owner plans to put in an irrigation system in so the arborvitaes get enough water and they will grow more quickly. He mentioned that the owner has not been watering them and that probably was the reason they have not grown very much so far.

Mr. Miller informed them that their decision would only be a recommendation to the Township Board to approve or deny the PUD and ultimately the decision is up to the Township Board.

**Motion by Mr. Miller to Close the Public Meeting and Table PUD #2016-25 to the February 14, 2017 meeting.**

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

There were some additional remarks from the Public that were inaudible.

There was a discussion among the board concerning the decision making process.

Mr. Stabile commented that the Township Board usually accepts the recommendation from the Planning Commission and votes accordingly. He did not want to give the residents the idea that if they do not get what they want here, they can go over there and start all over again. He stated that there are very few things that get reversed because they are the ones who have the knowledge of the very complicated Township ordinances.

Mr. Joseph stated that decisions are made by the Township Board after a vetting process where the Planning Commission listens to the neighbor's concerns and on February 14<sup>th</sup> the Commission will make their recommendation to the full Township Board and there will be an opportunity for a Public Hearing there as well.

Mr. Meagher explained that the PUD is a two phase project. He stated that the first one is a concept and it is informal and the idea is to take comments from the public and the applicant addresses those and then they come back under a formal application. He explained at that time they needed the lighting, parking and the details they spoke of tonight like the chemical sheets they mentioned. The commissioners will look at all aspects of the plan take a look at the Master Plan and what the ordinances say for the community and give their recommendation for approval or denial to the Township Board. He stated at this point he hopes everybody is going to study the issues and get the additional information before they form their opinion because that is what due process is all about. He stated that they owe it to the applicant to give him due process and to the residents to give them due process and without that the board would not be acting in a legal fashion. He continued that once the Township Board gets that recommendation, reads the minutes, gets the information from their Planning liaison and possibly the Planning Director at that time they will make their own decision as to whether they agree or disagree with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

Mr. Miller recommended that they take a two minute break.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to reopen the meeting.

**Supported** by Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

6. **REVIEWS:**

- A. **SLU #2016-17: Double Vision Holdings, 35207 Cricklewood Blvd., New Baltimore, MI 48047. Proposed office with outdoor automobile sales located at 55800 New Haven Road. Public Hearing closed, tabled on 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant has gone in front of the ZBA and were approved for the zoning changes.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve SLU #2016-17 subject to the applicant providing the engineers with a lighting distribution plan and he also made the statement that at this point there is no signage being approved.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. SITE PLAN #2017-02: J&M Maxi Mini Storage Facility, 27470 21 Mile Road, Chesterfield, MI 48051. Proposed 9,900 square foot indoor storage facility located south side of 21 Mile, east of I-94 at the above address.**

Mr. LaBelle asked the applicant if he had received the paperwork from AEW and Community Planning Management.

Applicant replied yes they had received that information.

Tom Lubinski, 35441 Edmunds Grove, New Baltimore, MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that their proposal is for a 9,900 square foot Maxi Storage facility which states 21 Mile Road, but they are proposing to vacate the existing approach on 21 Mile and have the entrance to the site off of Luckino Drive. He stated that it would be a one-story facility unoccupied with the exception of a small business office to undertake the daily operations of renting the units. He explained that none of the units would be occupied; they would be strictly storage units. It would be mostly a decorative masonry structure to seven feet and one of the units off of Luckino would be full height masonry. He mentioned that they did go over most of the comments, one of them which stated that 21 Mile would be considered frontage as well, so they are recommending full masonry on that side as well and that would be something they could do.

Mr. LaBelle asked if the address would actually be on 21 Mile Road.

Applicant replied that he believed the address would be on Luckino.

Mr. Palin explained that he spoke with the Fire Department and it is currently on 21 Mile Road because of the previous resident, but that parcel and the lot next door will be changed to a Luckino address. He already reassigned them and he will call Tom with the new address.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the reason he asked was the detention pond is on 21 Mile Road.

Applicant replied correct.

1-24-2017

Mr. LaBelle asked if there was anything else they could do with the dumpster location being they now have a Luckino Drive address and the dumpster would be at the front of a building.

Applicant stated that he thought they found another alternative location if it is open to the board. They would probably shift the gate access to the detention pond and move it closer to the building and potentially put the dumpster location where the gates are in that corner.

Mr. Miller stated that it looks like the building would be constructed with mostly cinder block.

Applicant replied that it would be a split face block.

Mr. LaBelle explained that their Township ordinance requires 90% brick or better.

Applicant stated that he thought it was a masonry requirement including split-face block.

Mr. LaBelle replied no; it is brick or better.

Herb Blackstock, 70 Macomb Place, Suite 220, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043 addressed the board.

Mr. Blackstock the owner of the property stated that there are other buildings in that area that are constructed with block.

Mr. LaBelle stated that, in his opinion, they have this beautiful Cabela's coming in off 21 Mile Road and they want the Township to be pristine. He stated they want someone maybe to come into Cabela's and think maybe the he would like to move to Chesterfield Township. He stated that the Township ordinance is 90% brick or better.

Applicant asked if that is just the frontage? Would that be off Luckino and 21 Mile or would that be on all sides?

Mr. LaBelle replied that there are 3 frontages, 21 Mile, Luckino and Continental.

Applicant asked even though there is another lot on the one side?

There was a discussion among some of the board members about the frontages.

Mr. Meagher stated that during the consent that was reserved as a landscape easement.

Mr. Miller stated so they would need brick on all three sides.

Mr. Meagher stated that would be a determination from the Commission. He read that the ordinance indicates that building frontages shall be constructed with a minimum of 90 % brick or similarly durable material as determined by the Commission. The remaining 10% can be color integrated block E.I.F.S, factory finish seam metal or similar materials as determined by the Planning Commission. E.I.F.S, block, or similar materials that are susceptible to staining shall not be utilized where signs may be installed, as determined by the Planning Commission. E.I.F.S and similar materials that are susceptible to contact damage shall not be utilized in areas below eight feet from the established grade. He explained that basically it indicates that the exterior surfaces of all buildings fronting upon a street, public waterways as described in section 76-73, a corner lot having frontage on a side street, or any portions of a building visible from a street or public waterway shall be face brick or other comparable durable decorative building materials approved by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Palin asked if he ever got those pictures he sent him and did he get a chance to show them around?

Mr. Palin answered that he showed them to a few of the staff over here. He has not printed them, but he could certainly have those available for the next meeting and he can send them out with an email as well.

Applicant asked if a comparative durable material would be split face block?

Mr. Meagher stated that it is typically not accepted by the Township as similar durable. He does not feel this would be a horribly expensive application in this case compared to the blocks.

Applicant stated that is would just be a different construction type. He asked if a decision had been made as to which frontages they have to address.

Mr. Miller stated that they would require the brick surfaces on Continental, Luckino and 21 Mile Road because they would all be considered frontages.

Applicant verified that up to 90% of the façade would have to be brick?

Mr. Meagher replied that is correct.

Mr. Miller asked if they would just table it for two weeks?

Mr. Meagher stated that they could Table it to the next meeting or they could approve it subject to the applicants addressing the comments; unless they want further consideration.

Mr. LaBelle stated that he would make a motion to approve if the applicant is willing to comply with the brick or better on the frontages.

Mr. Blackstock stated that he did not see it as a huge problem and asked if there was anything else they needed to address?

Mr. LaBelle stated that they would still also have to comply with the requirements from AEW and CPM.

Applicant asked that if they comply with all the requirements, do they come back and resubmit?

Mr. Meagher stated that could be handled by the staff internally.

Mr. Alexie commented that signage is not included.

Applicant stated that he understood that and signage will be worked on separately.

Applicant asked if they would like the dumpster relocated in the new place?

Mr. Meagher answered that it was up to the Commission, he finds the location actually better further off of 21 Mile.

Mr. LaBelle stated that it is a difficult site and he was hoping they would come up with some great plan to hide the dumpster.

Mr. Meagher stated that there are very limited opportunities for a location on that property. There will either be visibility from 21 Mile Road or Luckino.

Mr. LaBelle verified that doesn't the ordinance not allow dumpsters at the front of the building because it will be at the Luckino address.

Mr. Meagher stated that they have to allow it on one side or the other.

Mr. Joseph remarked that he was having a very difficult time following this meeting. He does not know if there is a motion on the table.

Mr. Miller replied that there is no motion on the table and they were just having a discussion.

Mr. Joseph stated that he cannot get closure from one point to the next. They have discussed the dumpster, Luckino, brick or better, etc. He stated that maybe he could just get together with them after the meeting and go through how these go. He reiterated that it is very difficult for him to follow if they resolved one concern and are now on to the next concern because there are conversations among the board and conversations with the petitioner. He does not know who is talking to whom and it is very confusing.

Mr. Stabile explained that the one before was a PUD and this is just a regular application and it is more informal where they can discuss the matter among themselves and the applicant. He expressed that after a while Mr. Joseph will realize what they are looking at.

Mr. Joseph commented that when he received the Planning paperwork the minutes do not capture all of this. As Mr. Stabile mentioned before, as a Township Trustee, he relies on the Planning Commission for their expertise. He thought that maybe he would wait to hear the end product and possibly get together after the meeting to go through it.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Site Plan #2017-02 for the J&M Maxi Mini Storage Facility, 27470 21 Mile Road, Chesterfield, MI 48051. The applicant has agreed to comply with the 90% brick or better for the outside surface of the building. He added that the applicant has received the comments from the Fire Department, the engineer, as well as Community Planning Management and has agreed to adhere to all of their stipulations. The approval is subject to the applicant getting together with engineering to make sure that everything is squared away with them.

**Supported** by Mr. Leonard with the addition to the motion that the applicants would have to come back for signage.

Mr. LaBelle agreed to the addition to his motion

Mr. Leonard continued support.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**C. SIGN REVIEW #2016-121: Signs & Engraving, Inc. 100 West 13 Mile Road, Madison Heights, MI 48071. Proposed new wall sign located at 46558 Gratiot for J. Moore Salon tabled on 12-13-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant made the adjustments to the sign and now the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2016-121

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**D. SIGN REVIEW #2016-122: Johnson Sign Company, 2240 Lansing Ave., Jackson, MI 49202. Proposed new ground sign located at 34875 23 Mile Road for the Med-Express Medical Building tabled 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that there was some kind of confusion as to what side of the building certain signs go on. Mr. LaBelle stated that this is the pylon sign at the front of the building and the applicant has agreed to put the address on the pylon sign. He added that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2016-122

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**E. SIGN REVIEW #2016-123: Johnson Sign Company, 2240 Lansing Ave., Jackson, MI 49202. Proposed new wall sign located at 34875 23 Mile Road for the Med-Express Medical Building tabled 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that Med-Express requested a number of signs all around the building. He explained that on the front of the building, which is the south elevation, there is a logo as well as the Med-Express sign. The applicant has requested that they allow them to combine those two signs and keep it under the 50 square feet according to the Township ordinance and allow the two signs at the front of the building which typically the ordinance does not allow. He explained therefore, on Sign Review #2016-23-123 which is the Med-

Express sign and on Sign Review #2016-126 the logo, they would like to combine the signs and keep the amount of signage at 50 square feet.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2016-123 and Sign#2016-26

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

Mr. Leonard asked so they would just be dealing with Sign #2016-123 and Sign#2016-126 with this motion?

Mr. LaBelle replied yes.

Mr. Joseph asked if this was typically something handled here instead of going to ZBA for a review?

Mr. LaBelle replied that the Planning Commission may give the variances for signage.

Mr. Joseph asked so in this instance this would violate in essence the ordinance by allowing two signs instead of one but the overall square footage allows them to combine the signs and it stays within the spirit of the ordinance.

Mr. Miller stated that they are allowed 50 square feet and the applicant is putting both of the signs in the 50 square feet.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**F. SIGN REVIEW #2016-124: Johnson Sign Company, 2240 Lansing Ave., Jackson, MI 49202. Proposed new wall sign located at 34875 23 Mile Road for the Med-Express Medical Building tabled 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle has agreed to remove this sign from the agenda

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to deny Sign #2016-124

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- G. SIGN REVIEW #2016-125: Johnson Sign Company, 2240 Lansing Ave., Jackson, MI 49202. Proposed new wall sign located at 34875 23 Mile Road for the Med-Express Medical Building tabled 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that this is on the west elevation of the building according to the Township ordinance a business is allowed a sign at the back or side of the building at 50% of the overall square footage at the front of the building. He is asking the board for approval of a sign at the west elevation at 25 square feet. He added that again they will be combining signage in order to achieve the 25'.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2016-125 at 25 square feet.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- H. SIGN REVIEW #2016-126: Johnson Sign Company, 2240 Lansing Ave., Jackson, MI 49202. Proposed new wall sign located at 34875 23 Mile Road for the Med-Express Medical Building tabled 11-22-16.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign was combined with Sign Review #2016-123.

- I. SIGN REVIEW #2017-08: Intercity Neon, P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed new wall sign located at 50740 Gratiot for Weight Watchers.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign exceeds the ordinance, however, because of the location of the sign and the business is 250' back from Gratiot; they usually allow a larger sign. Also he explained that, when looking at the application, to the right of the Weight Watchers sign there is a wall coming out toward Gratiot and it is very difficult to see the sign and for people to find the business.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-08

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the minutes from the meeting on 1/10/2017.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

8. **COMMUNICATIONS:**

There were no communications.

9. **OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business.

10. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**Approval of 2017 Meeting Dates**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to adopt a resolution establishing their Meeting Dates for 2017

**Supported** by Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

11. **PLANNERS REPORT: None**

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

The Commissioners all welcomed Mr. David Joseph to the Planning Board as the new liaison to the Township Board.

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the next pre-planning meeting.

Mr. Alexie and Mr. Leonard both agreed to attend that meeting on 2/14/2017.

Mr. Leonard brought up the fact that there really should be sidewalks around the Township and he showed pictures that were about 60 years old of Jefferson and the street looks the same. He has seen people on bikes and even in wheelchairs that have to go into the street because there are no sidewalks and it is dangerous and is a safety issue. He thinks they should not kick the can down the road anymore and do something. He stated that any time that they can get sidewalks put in that they do it to make Chesterfield a better place for them, their children and grandchildren.

**13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA.**

There were no proposals for the next agenda.

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 8:46 PM

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes:** All

**Nays:** None

**Motion Carried**

---

*Rick LaBelle, Secretary*

---

*Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary*