

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**June 27, 2017**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 27, 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  
David Joseph  
Jerry Alexie  
Frank Eckenrode  
Ray Saelens

Absent: James Moran, *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. 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 #2017-11: Dan Nicevski, 37450 Clubhouse Dr. Sterling Heights, MI 48312 Proposed 432' garage on a 60' x 23' canal lot located across from 48246 Harbor Drive.**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to open to close the Public Hearing for SLU #2017-11

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Dan Nicevski, 37450 Clubhouse Dr., Sterling Heights, MI 48312

Applicant stated that he wanted to put a 432' garage on his canal lot. He elaborated that the garage would meet the criteria of the Township, would look nice and would be similar with all the other houses around them.

Mr. Saelens asked if he was correct that there would be no living quarters or businesses run out of the garage?

Applicant replied yes, it was just extra storage for their jet skis mostly.

There were no Public Comments.

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

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Miller asked the Recording Secretary to poll the board to see if they wanted to make their decision that evening.

All the Planning Commission board members voted to make their decision that evening.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Special Land Use #2017-11 for a proposed 432 square foot garage on a 65' x 23' canal lot located across from 48246 Harbor Drive.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed amendment to Township Ordinance Sec. #76-331, for Accessory Structures.**

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

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Palin stated that this amendment is for accessory structures in residential districts. He explained that the main reason this is in front of the Commission is to update an older ordinance that Mr. Leonard and Mr. Joseph can attest to regarding quite a few variances in front of the ZBA for larger structures. He mentioned that a lot of them were being approved already, but this amendment creates a sliding scale for larger parcels permitting larger accessory structures. He stated that this would be more consistent with what they are seeing in surrounding communities. He explained that this is really fairer to the residents. He mentioned another reason for the amendment is to provide some mechanism to allow a gazebo or some similar structure. He stated that gazebos have become very popular and there has been no mechanism in the past for approval or denial of them. He explained that the ordinance would permit gazebos at 200 square feet because that is the maximum size sold in stores as well as 200' and below would not require a building permit. He mentioned that they did the same thing with sheds allowing up to 200 square feet which was previously 120'. He remarked other than that it would be the same as before, this would just make it a little fairer. He stated that a staff member brought something up to him concerning A-3. Pole barns would only be permitted on non-platted residential parcels of one acre or more. He stated that the idea behind that was that they did not want pole barns in platted subdivisions. However, it was brought to his attention that there are some properties that are over one acre or two acres in platted subdivisions and some of them have been recently approved for pole barns and that would create some non-conformities. Therefore, that may be something to consider possibly taking out the platted part if they like the rest of the ordinance.

Public Comments:

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

Mr. Gendernalik commented that in the first part 76-331 about accessory structures. It is his understanding this refers to just residential districts, so maybe in the draft it should be modified to state "in the residential districts only". He also referred to A-3 because he knew that there were some places that were platted with parcels over one acre, so that language should be modified. He stated that his other question was about the bottom section of the first page where it has garage 920 square feet and the height the same as the principle and he thought that was 28', but he was wondering if that was authorizing a detached garage or an attached garage. He stated that if that was for an attached garage, he is not sure it would be needed because it is part of the building code that a person can have a garage of that size attached to the house. He then mentioned to the second page in paragraph E. there are a couple of typos that he pointed out to Mr. Palin. He continued that on the last page J. it stated that accessory buildings under 24 square feet, there is no height restriction and he believes under the code there are no foundation requirements and he thought that should be added so that people know about that permitted use without a rat wall or foundation.

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

**Supported** by Mr. Stabile

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Miller asked the Recording Secretary to poll the board to see if they wanted to make their decision that evening.

All the Planning Commission board members voted to make their decision that evening.

**Motion** by Mr. Joseph to recommend approval to the Township Board of proposed Amendment Sec. #76-331 for Accessory Structures.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Palin asked for clarification was it the pleasure of the board to remove the platted portion or leave that in there?

Mr. Stabile asked if this was just a draft that they approved?

Mr. Palin replied that it was a recommendation to the Township Board

Mr. Stabile thought this was just a draft and they would be taking consideration of the comments.

Mr. Joseph either way the document will arrive at the Township Board and he has noted the proposed amendments to the draft and they can include those in the first publication from the Planning Department. He thought that the draft was pretty solid with those recommendations on the Amendment.

**C. PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed amendment to Township Ordinance Sec. #76-253 for an Administrative Approval Committee.**

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

**Supported** by Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Palin stated that he would just read this one in full because it is rather short. Administrative Approval Ordinance draft: The Township Supervisor may delegate authority to a committee comprised of at least three (3) of the following, depending on the nature of the project: The Supervisor, Building Administrator, Township Engineer, Planning and Zoning Administrator, DPW Superintendent, Fire Inspector and Planning Commission member. The committee may waive the site plan submission requirements and approve a proposal when the proposed building or site change is minimal. A majority shall be required to receive administrative approval. He stated that the reason behind this amendment is that a lot of changes are so minor that there are delays caused by sending them to the Planning Commission. He explained that they have ordinances, building codes and fire codes in place that prevent anything illegal or crazy from happening. He stated that this would be a mechanism to form a committee where they can approve things without delaying the process.

Mr. LaBelle asked what kind of threshold would there be?

Mr. Palin stated that the way this is written it would give the Supervisor the authority for something minor to call a committee of whoever he deems is necessary and they would vote on whether it should be approved or not. He stated that if it did not receive a majority, it would then be referred to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Stabile asked who would be making up the committee?

Mr. Palin replied that would depend on the project. Some of the issues may not require Planning and some of the issues may not require Building or the Fire Department. Every issue would not require input from every Department; it would all depend on the project.

Mr. Saelens asked if it would require every department, wouldn't the project require going through a full site plan as opposed to this administrative approval?

Mr. Palin stated that there may be times where the project would require circulation so they would call Planning and if it involves fire hydrants they would have to call the Fire Department and DPW. He stated that if something is very minor they would still want every department involved to have input. There are cases when three departments are fine with a project and one department would be against it because it does not meet fire code or whatever the case may be.

Mr. Saelens asked wouldn't there need to be a threshold maybe because of the size or scope of a project?

Mr. Palin stated as currently written there is none.

Mr. Saelens stated that he was worried that maybe the Supervisor may want a certain building and may just want to bypass the Planning Commission. He would like to see some type of threshold.

Mr. Palin stated that there are zoning ordinances and building requirements which will prevent anything too crazy from happening. He mentioned that the Commissioners have seen some things like a 100' addition that really does not need to go through the process. He stated that they have one coming up which is just a peak coming out of a building and at this point it may take a month or more to get it approved, where a few department heads can look at it administratively and avoid all the delays.

Mr. Stabile asked who would decide if something would be approved administratively, would it be Mr. Palin.

Mr. Saelens replied the according to this it would be the Supervisor.

Mr. Meagher stated that the way the ordinance is structured, the Supervisor would delegate authority to the committee. He might be one member of the committee, but that does not mean the department heads or Commission members placed on the committee will agree that this is a minor change. He explained that there would be some type of check and balance. He stated that if there was a comfort level he guessed they could look at the size of an addition...

Mr. LaBelle asked would a compromise be that there would always be a Planning Commission member on that board? He stated that it could be Mr. Joseph who may be involved anyway or one of them could be the conduit back to the Commission to let them know what happened.

Mr. Leonard stated that the second to last sentence is kind of a threshold. He read: The committee may waive the site plan submission requirements and approve a proposal when the proposed building or site change is minimal.

Mr. LaBelle asked what is minimal?

Mr. Stabile stated that this could open up an avenue for a whole lot of rubber stamping. He mentioned that without some type of threshold he is kind of uncomfortable with it.

Mr. Meagher stated that thresholds are always difficult to deal with because in some cases 1,000 square foot addition for a warehouse would be insignificant. However, a 1,000 square foot addition to a gas station would be very significant. Maybe an alternative would be to indicate that the Supervisor and the Planning Commission Chairman or an appointee by the Chairman must unanimously agree that the change is minor. He mentioned that obviously they would want to pick someone who could meet during the day so the project would not be held up for a person to get a day off of work.

Mr. Miller remarked that he told Jonathon that he would be willing to sit on that board with no problem.

Mr. Joseph stated that currently the Township Engineer is a vendor and not a Township employee. As an elected official and he would ask that the Engineer be removed from the deliberations where he has authority to either be thumbs up or thumbs down. He stated if it is a minimal project, the need for an engineer strikes a chord with him because if there is an engineering problem, it is probably not a minor project. He stated that he does not like the engineer who is a paid consultant to be on that panel. He does like the idea of the Planning Commission Chairman, especially because he is willing to do that

to be part of the review process as a mandatory member. He explained that it is a case of check and balance and if they are talking about removing something from the Planning Commission then the Commission must have somebody on that committee to view and determine what is minimal.

Mr. Meagher stated that many times there are major delays because of the meeting schedules, publishing in the newspaper, minor changes to the plan because of something they find at the site. He explained that it is a benefit to have something like this so they don't have something like a whole development construction crew on a site sitting there with nothing to do until there is a Planning Commission meeting to fix the issue.

**Public Comments:**

Mr. Gendernalik state that on the draft it did not reference the ordinance section number and he thought they should include that. He stated that now when they go through an administrative review there is a \$400 fee. He asked if there would be a fee for this process?

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

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Miller asked the Recording Secretary to poll the board to see if they wanted to make their decision that evening.

All the Planning Commission board members voted to make their decision that evening.

Miller, Leonard, Joseph, Alexie, and Eckenrode voted to make the decision that evening.

LaBelle, Stabile and Saelens voted to wait on a decision.

Mr. Saelens stated that he thought they needed to refine the document.

Mr. Meagher stated that all they have done is to clear the way for a motion to be made. They can still make a motion to Table it if they cannot iron out the language.

Mr. Miller stated that this is just a recommendation to the board and the changes could be on that for the first publication.

Mr. Saelens stated so in the motion they would include that someone from the Planning Commission would be on the committee.

Mr. Miller asked if there would still be a fee?

Mr. Meagher thought the fee would be decided by staff and the Township Board because the Planning Commission does not decide if a fee is charged. He thought there would be a fee because they certainly do not want to subsidize the development.

Mr. Stabile stated that it sounded that there is still a lot to do on this.

**Motion** by Mr. Joseph to approve the amendment to the Township Board on Section 76-253 for an administrative approval committee. Furthermore, he would ask that the draft be used as written and include the recommendations that have been made today for board deliberation as to what is to be included in the first publication.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

6. **REVIEWS:**

- A. **CONDITIONAL REZONING #343: Morelli Custom Homes, LLC, 22756 Macomb Industrial Dr., Clinton Twp., MI 48036. Requesting to rezone vacant property from R-1-B (Single Family Residential) to RM2 (Multi-Family Residential) located on the north side of Cotton Road between Sugarbush Road and Jefferson. Public Hearing closed. Tabled on 6/13/17.**

Bob Kirk, 19500 Hall Road, Suite 100, Clinton Twp., MI 48038 addressed the board.

Mr. Kirk stated that following the last meeting and tonight they have discussed some possible tweaks to the plan and they are requesting that the matter be tabled to the next meeting. At this point, they need to meet with the Planner on a couple of items.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Conditional Rezoning #343 to the next meeting.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. SIGN REVIEW #2017-56: Phillips Sign & Lighting, Inc. 40920 Executive Drive Harrison Twp., MI 48045. Proposed new ground sign located at 34845 23 Mile for CSI Financial.**

Rebecca Godin, 9601 Dolar, Columbus, MI addressed the board.

Ms. Godin stated that she is representing Phillips Sign and Lighting and their client CSI Financial. Her client's sign was damaged during a storm and they wanted them to fix the sign and put a new one in. The sign ordinance states that the sign has to be 70' back from the center line. Originally, they were told 25' back from the curb and that was how they progressed and then after submitting the paperwork, they find out it is 70'. They were requesting to get the 25' setback if possible. She mentioned that Mr. LaBelle stated they could compromise and go with a 60' set back, but they would like to discuss the matter.

Mr. Saelens stated that for the record he would be in favor of the 60' setback.

Ms. Godin mentioned that the building is 70' back from the center line and it is an 8' sign so in essence the sign would be two feet in front of the building.

Applicant stated that there are a lot of trees on the sides that are blocking the sign from view. They just want customers to enter the driveway without having to turn around and miss the business. There is no side walk in front of the business, it that may play into the matter. She stated that all the other signs along the road have the sidewalk in front of it.

Mr. Saelens remarked that they need a sidewalk.

Mr. Miller asked if they could resurface the existing sign?

Ms. Godin stated that they wanted to do that and were told they would need a new sign and would have to move it back further. She gave the board pictures of the business and the road coming up both ways showing the tree line.

Mr. Saelens stated that those are pine trees and they could be trimmed up.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Palin if he had any comments?

Mr. Palin stated that it was understanding that this was beyond the scope of a normal resurface.

Mr. Joseph commented that it seems like the resurfacing is just an attempt to stay away from Planning. He stated that these are the types of things about Planning that he does not understand. He stated that they have a family business that have been there for quite a while and through no fault of their own the wind takes their sign and they can't just put up the same type of sign, because in the meantime, the Township has changed the ordinance. At this point, by looking at the picture, they have to tuck their sign into a space that is no longer useful to their business. So, unless you are a repeat customer of CSI and know the location, they can forget about someone driving down the road, seeing the sign and making a note that they should check them out for their business needs. He doesn't like this situation that the people try to get their business back together after a storm and they come to us and our response is to trim trees and tuck the sign in the back where no one can see it. He thought they should let the gentleman put the sign right back where it was. It will be newer brighter and fresher than the old one and lets move along.

Mr. Stabile asked Ms. Godin when they stated he could not put the sign back,, did it have anything to do with the height?

Ms. Godin replied no it was just the setback rule that they were enforcing from 2006.

Mr. Miller asked if the sign is still there?

Ms. Godin replied yes, they had their son just screwed the face back on, but the sign is very old and is in disarray.

Mr. Alexie asked if they could use the same base?

Ms. Godin answered yes. However, that was not how they sold it. The new one would be a new base and sign.

Mr. Leonard asked if they were going to take out the footing?

Ms. Godin replied yes, they were going to pull it out and go back where they had to be.

Mr. Joseph thought the question was, but for the setback requirements would they be able to utilize the existing base?

Ms. Godin replied yes if they were able to put the sign in the same place they could utilize the same base and save them some money.

Mr. Leonard stated that if it could be refaced, it would not be moved anyway. He asked at 25' back, would that push the sign toward the building from where it is ?

Ms. Godin replied yes.

Mr. Stabile stated that he thought the problem here is the trees.

Mr. Joseph stated that in their packet there is an existing sign picture with the proposed new sign. He stated that the existing sign indicates 48' from the center of the road and compliance with the existing ordinance would take it back to 70'.

Mr. Leonard stated that it looked as though the new sign would be lower than the existing sign.

Ms. Godin replied yes.

Mr. LaBelle asked to compromise would they consider using the existing base and foundation, resurfacing the sign at the current location.

Ms. Godin replied that they would do a new monument sign on top of the old base and they would include the address on the sign.

Mr. Leonard stated so they would take it down to ground level which is the footing, re-brick it and put the signage on top of the brick.

Mr. Joseph asked if it was illuminated?

Ms. Godin replied yes and there is electric at the sign at the current location. She explained that another reason they do not want to put the sign further back is because they would have to bring the electrical further back and that would incur more cost for her client.

Larry D. Stones, 34845 23 Mile, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that the best position for visibility on that road with the traffic speed is where the sign is currently. If they move it back 25' from the curb the sign would be right at the edge of the building. He also mentioned that the trees that are blocking the view of his sign are not his trees. They belong to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Stabile stated so the applicant wants to put the sign back where it is now.

Applicant stated that was what they wanted to do in the beginning.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-56 using the existing foundation and resurfacing and rebuilding the sign in the same place due to the storm damage.

Mr. Alexie stated that the applicant must put the business address on the sign.

**Supported** by Mr. Joseph

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Ms. Godin verified that they are approved to locate the sign in the same place and they just would use the existing base.

Mr. LaBelle replied that is correct.

]Mr. Leonard stated that Ms. Godin mentioned that she was going to make sure that the address is on the sign.

Ms. Godin replied that the address is currently on the sign and we will make sure the address is also on the new sign.

**C. SIGN REVIEW #2017-57: Allied Signs, Inc. 33650 Giftos Dr. Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Proposed new wall sign located at 50912 Gratiot for Athletico Physical Therapy.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the proposed sign exceeds the allowable square footage. The applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the sign down to 39.21' which would comply with the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-57 for the reduced sized sign

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- D. SIGN REVIEW #2017-58: Allied Signs, Inc. 33650 Giftos Dr. Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Proposed new wall sign located at 51315 Gratiot for Home Depot.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that they are just taking the sign down and fixing it.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-58

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- E. SIGN REVIEW #2017-59: Allied Signs, Inc. 33650 Giftos Dr. Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Proposed new projecting blade sign located at 50523 Waterside for Ulta Beauty.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that in the packet they received a picture of what the sign would look like. He explained that all those stores in that mall are underneath a canopy and they are proposing to put a blade sign out from the wall showing the Ulta location. He stated that the sign is just over four square feet and the ordinance allows two square feet.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2017-59 and allow the variance for the blade sign.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- F. SIGN REVIEW #2017-60: Allied Signs, Inc. 33650 Giftos Dr. Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Proposed repairs & new illumination for existing wall sign located at 50523 Waterside Dr. for Ulta Beauty.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that they are just taking the sign down and fixing it.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-60

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- G. SIGN REVIEW #2017-61: Ron Kahle for Art Van Pure Sleep 6500 14 Mile Road, Warren, MI 48092. Proposed new front elevation wall sign located at 50900 Gratiot for Art Van PureSleep.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign greatly exceeds the Township ordinance and the part of the application where they have to fill out the size of the frontage of the building and it was grossly understated. He does not know how big the building is and the applicant asked them to table it for one meeting.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Sign Review #2017-61 to the next meeting.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- H. SIGN REVIEW #2017-62: Ron Kahle for Art Van Pure Sleep 6500 14 Mile Road Warren, MI 48092. Proposed new rear elevation wall sign located at 50900 Gratiot for Art Van PureSleep.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign would be on the back of the building and as they all know the Township ordinance allows a sign at the back of the building at 50% the size of the front sign and since they do not know what that is at this time he would table it.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Sign Review #2017-62 to the next meeting

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

I. **SIGN REVIEW #2017-63: Delta Industrial 51825 Gratiot, Chesterfield, MI 48051. Proposed new ground sign located at the above address for Delta Industrial.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that they are just relocating an existing sign.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-63

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

J. **SIGN REVIEW #2017-64: Classic Building Co. P.O. Box 530565, Livonia, MI 48153. Proposed pylon sign resurface located at 50189 Gratiot for Cheeba Hut Vape Smoke Shop.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does comply with the Township ordinance and the applicant is aware of the pending sign height reduction that will go into effect on August 16, 2017

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-64

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

Mr. Miller requested that the Recording Secretary to do a roll call on the vote twice with the same result both times.

**Ayes: Miller, LaBelle, Leonard and Eckenrode**

**Nays: Stabile, Joseph, Alexie and Saelens**

**Motion Denied**

Mr. Stabile asked why would they approve the sign for a few months when it has to be changed in August?

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant signed an affidavit that he knew he had to change the sign in August. He mentioned that the sign is already up and all they are asking is to put a new face on it.

Mr. Miller stated that the sign is on a single pole and they could probably just lower it in August.

**K. SIGN REVIEW #2017-65: Joe Dakhi 3731 Ravenswood, Marysville, MI 48040. Proposed new wall sign located at 50918 Gratiot for Jamba Juice.**

The sign does not meet the Township ordinance the linear footage at the front of the building is incorrect on the application and he would like to make a motion to table.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Sign #2017-65 for one meeting

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**L. SIGN REVIEW #2017-66: Joe Dakhi 3731 Ravenswood, Marysville, MI 48040. Proposed new directional signs located at 50918 Gratiot for Jamba Juice.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that they never received anything in their packets reflecting what the sign is all about

Mr. Palin stated that the applicant submitted drawings that were incorrect and he was supposed to come in with the corrected drawings prior to the meeting and he never turned in the paperwork.

Joe Dakhi 3731 Ravenswood, Marysville, MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that he heard something about the linear feet of the building being wrong.

Mr. Saelens stated that they just tabled the request to the next meeting

Applicant asked how they correct it for the next meeting?

Mr. Miller stated that they had no paperwork for the directional signs and dimensions for the building were wrong on the first one. He suggested that the applicant get together with Mr. Palin in the Planning Department and he will be able to tell the applicant exactly what he needs.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the paperwork on the first one stated 59 1/4' lineal feet for the front of the building and on the diagram it shows 20' lineal feet for the building. He asked which one is correct?

Applicant stated that the building is 59 ¼' and the 20' is the portion where the sign is.

Mr. Miller reiterated that the applicant should meet with Mr. Palin and he will find out what he needs.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Sign #2017-66 for one meeting

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- M. SIGN REVIEW #2017-67: Sign Fabricators, 43984 Groesbeck Hwy., Clinton Twp., MI 48036. Proposed new wall sign located at 31185 23 Mile Road for "Rocco's Barber Shop".**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign exceeds the allowable square footage. However, the applicant has agreed to reduce the sign to 20 square feet.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-67 at 20 square feet

**Supported** by Mr. Joseph

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the meeting minutes from 6/13/2017.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- 8. COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

9. **OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business.

10. **NEW BUSINESS:**

Appointment of officers

Mr. Miller asked if any of the other Commissioners would like to run for any of the positions? He stated otherwise he would just make a Motion to keep the officers the same.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to keep the Planning Commission officers in their current positions

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

11. **PLANNERS REPORT:**

- A. **ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #182:** Nancy Long for Waterside Marketplace the Ulta Cosmetics store located at 50523 Marketplace Blvd. Chesterfield, MI. Requesting to update their branding and seek approval for fabric awnings for their 3 storefront windows located at the above address.

Mr. Meagher stated that Alta is requesting fabric awnings. He stated that the paperwork indicated that they were going to be using a design or lettering on the awnings. He would recommend the fabric awnings for approval. He stated that if they have a design that could be worked out with the Planning Department. However, any signage on those would constitute a sign and they would have to come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant agreed during Pre-Planning that they would just be using plain red awnings and there would be no signage on the canopies.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Administrative Request #182 for the plain red canopies.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- B. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #183: Michael J. Johnson / Paradigm Design 550 3 Mile Road N.W., Grand Rapids, MI 49544. Requesting to remodel the existing Meijer Store, full exterior & interior with a proposed pharmacy drive-thru addition located at 27255 23 Mile Road.**

Mr. Meagher stated that this is a façade change to basically modernize the store to match many of the existing Meijer's. He explained that right now the store does not meet their brick requirement, so what they are doing is a dramatic improvement to what they have in terms of brick now. He stated that he would recommend approval at this time.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve Administrative Request #183

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- C. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #184: John Bowen, 29939 S. River Road, Harrison Twp., MI 48045 Requesting to continue with 102' of decorative wall from rear property line to the front of the property, all materials will match the existing wall at the rear of the property.**

Mr. Meagher stated that this request was to complete the decorative screening wall at the rear of their property and continue it on Jefferson along the property line. He mentioned that the ordinance allows for the wall between residential and commercial. They have no objection to the request based on the ordinance requirement.

Mr. LaBelle asked if the materials would match the existing wall?

Mr. Meagher stated that was what they have indicated.

Mr. LaBelle verified so they are just going to finish the wall?

Mr. Meagher replied that is their request.

**Motion** by Mr. Joseph to approve Administrative Request #184

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

Mary Niester, 29213 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Ms. Niester made a comment from the audience that was inaudible.

Mr. Meagher stated that this was not a public hearing it was an administrative request because it is a minor amendment to the plan which meets the ordinance requirement. Therefore there is really not much that can be done to deny the request.

Ms. Niester asked so is he going to rip out all of those trees?

Mr. Meagher replied that the proposal is not to remove any trees

Mr. Miller stated that he is going to put the fence behind the trees.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

Ms. Niester asked the motive to put in the wall at this point?

Mr. Miller stated all that they know is that he is requesting to put up a wall. It will run parallel to the wall and up to Jefferson 75"

Ms. Niester claimed that when he put in the fence, he disturbed her electrical fence for her dog. She never brought it up because the dog passed away. She was wondering if the wall would end up on their property.

Mr. Meagher stated that to put up the wall they would have to survey the property and stake it. He assumes that it will be built on the property line as shown on the plans.

Mr. Saelens commented that he thought she would be happy with this

Ms. Niester remarked that was not a fair statement. She asked if he wanted to trade houses with her, then he might have the right to make a comment like that. She exclaimed that she has the right to speak.

Mr. LaBelle stated that they would have to hire a professional surveyor and they will lay out exactly where the wall would be and they will mark the property line from the steels at each corner of the property. He stated then typically the wall would go inside his property.

Ms. Niester then stated that she wanted that in the meeting minutes that the wall would be inside or on his property line. She also noted that this construction would disrupt the bunnies that are hopping around everywhere.

Mr. Stabile stated that this is not a public hearing.

Ms. Niester told him that the Mr. Miller gave her the opportunity to speak and she just wanted to state her concerns.

William Robertson, 29208 Rachid, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Mr. Robertson stated that he understood the owner had the right to continue his wall, but it will be a huge disruption to people around it. He just wants to make sure they do not disrupt the trees because when they put in the original portion of the wall he claimed that they cut down their easement trees in the process. He asked do they have an assurance that the trees will not be damaged.

Mr. Miller asked if the trees in the easement belong to their homeowner's association.

Mr. Robertson replied yes.

Mr. Meagher stated that if they damage any of the trees, document it because they need to respect their property during the development. He asked Mr. Palin to talk to the other departments to make sure they monitor what is going on the property.

Mr. Joseph stated with regard to the people who made the comments. He remarked that they do have the right to speak. However, when Mr. Saelens made the comment, he really felt the same way. He did not understand with all the hearings on this. He explained that originally the business owner had an intention to build a project and it was the Planning Commission's decision supported by the Township Board that the project impacted that area and was not consistent with the Master Plan. He explained that when he saw the administrative request and he whispered to the Township Planner what is the difference between an administrative request and an agenda item. He was told an administrative request was consistent with the language of the administrative approval that they were discussing earlier. He stated that these are things that are routine and do not have a massive impact. He remarked this is one property owner's ability to do something on his own property, yet people still think they can dictate what he can and cannot do on his own property. There is an obligation to be a good neighbor and the

presentation about being mindful of surrounding trees was something a good neighbor would do. He stated that people need to respect other people's property rights. He could not imagine going in his neighbor's yard and telling him what he could or should put in his yard providing it was in compliance with the law.

Mr. Joseph continued that it just seems to him that talking about bunny migration, well that is a rough one. He remarked that there has to be a balance here. He reiterated that when Mr. Saelens made his comment, he felt the same way. He stated at some point it becomes very unreasonable trying to dictate to other people what they can do on their property.

Mr. Leonard stated that he would be unable to attend the next meeting.

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the next Pre-Planning Meeting and wished everyone a Happy Holiday.

Mr. Saelens and Mr. Alexie volunteered to attend that meeting on 7/11/2017.

Mr. Alexie wished everyone a safe and Happy Holiday.

**13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA.**

There were no proposals for the next agenda.

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 8:16 PM

**Supported** by Mr. Joseph

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

---

***Rick LaBelle, Secretary***

---

***Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary***