CITY OF WARREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on Monday, October 10, 2016

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, October 10, 2016, at 7:00 p.m., in the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Commissioners Present:
Jocelyn Howard, Chair
Edna Karpinski
John Kupiec, Vice Chair
Charles J. Pryor
Syed Rob
Claudette Robinson
Warren Smith, Assistant Secretary

Also present:
Ronald Wuerth - Planning Director
Michelle Katopodes - Planner I
Judy Hanna - Senior Administrative Secretary
Elizabeth Saavedra - Planner Aide
Caitlin Murphy - Assistant City Attorney
Megan O'Brien - Communications Department

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Howard called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL
Chair Howard - We did receive notification that Mr. Vinson is in the hospital, so I do need a motion to excuse him from tonight's meeting.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to excuse Commissioner Vinson, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Howard - Also I received notification from Secretary McClanahan that his mother is gravely ill. We do want to keep him in our prayers and thoughts. So I do need a motion to excuse Secretary McClanahan from tonight's meeting.

APPROVED

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to excuse Secretary McClanahan, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA
Chair Howard: Moving forward to the approval of the agenda for tonight, I do want to make one modification. On item number 9. A., we want to make that a minor amendment, as well as item number 9. C., we also want to recognize that as a minor amendment. From that, I would need a motion to approve tonight's agenda.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Pryor to adopt the agenda, supported by Commissioner Robinson. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - September 26, 2016

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to approve, supported by Commissioner Robinson. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Howard - Judy, is it possible that we can send cards to both Secretary McClanahan and also Commissioner Vinson during their time of illness, and also to Secretary McClanahan on behalf of his mother? Thank you so much, Judy.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING RELIGIOUS FACILITY: Located on the southwest corner of Schoenherr Road and Masonic Boulevard; 31731 Schoenherr Road; Section 2; Andre Cast, Life Application Ministries (Tiffany J. Lenman, Neikirk Engineering). **SECOND TIME TABLED**.

APPROVED

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to remove this item from the table, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec. A voice vote was taken and the motion was carried unanimously.

Chair Howard - As I indicated at the last meeting, I am a member of this assembly; I do hold a position there. With that being said, I'm going to recuse myself from this portion of the agenda, and I'm going to allow our Vice Chair, Mr. Kupiec, to take over, and then I'll return promptly.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Thank you, Madam Chair. We'll call you when we're finished. We're going to have a vote to remove this item from the table, so roll call by the Secretary.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Karpinski… …….. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Pryor…….. Yes
Commissioner Rob…… Yes
Commissioner Robinson…….. Yes
Commissioner Smith……. Yes

Vice Chair Kupiec - All right, it has been removed. It is now open for discussion. Is the petitioner here this evening?

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Pastor Adolphus Cast - Good evening; Pastor Adolphus Cast. On the advisement of the Commission to meet with the neighbors, I'd like to just say that, on October 1st, three of my board members met with Leonard and Charmion Mathison, Jason Harvey, Jeff Curle, and Richard and Carole Wiseman. And also I hear that they met today right before this meeting. I would just like to say that, if this Board approved the site plan, that we will prove to be the kind of church and community that is willing to work ongoing with the community. I'd like also to go on record, so they'll know, that in three years I'll be a part of this community for 50 years, 19 years old coming to the Tech Center, going to Macomb Community College, served and worked with

APPROVED

the former mayor, before Mayor Fouts, and pretty much have my hand on the pulse of this community. And we're certainly willing to work with them on an ongoing basis, love for them to come and worship with us and see that we're going to be an asset to this community.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No Delinquent Taxes.
DTE: Approved.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comment:

1. The City has adopted a new Storm Water Ordinance since the last site plan approval. Pretreatment of storm water, along with a storm water management plan, may be required.

FIRE: Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comments:

1. Must meet the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code for an A-3 use group.

2. If required by the Building Code, the building must be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13. Fire Department connection threads shall be a national standard type and a fire hydrant shall be provided within 150 feet of the Fire Department connection.

3. Maintain existing Fire Department access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 feet and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.

4. Provide fire alarm system if required by code.

5. Provide Fire Department lock box (Knox box) as required by local ordinance.

Assistant Secretary Smith - I also have some correspondence from Commissioner McClanahan. It states: "I apologize for not being able to attend this meeting. I have a family emergency. Yesterday I was invited to be an observer for the meeting between LAM staff and the local residents with concerns. Unfortunately, the residents never showed up. I was given a tour of the facilities. Community service and a plan for addition and

APPROVED

expansion were discussed. Thanks, Jason McClanahan, Planning Commission Secretary."

I also have another correspondence that Ms. Carole Wiseman brought to the Planning Department yesterday dealing with the concerns of the neighbors regarding the new construction at 31731 Schoenherr.

1. **No parking on Masonic side (north side) of building**.
   Parking there would have issues of air pollution from exhaust, light pollution from the commercial parking lot lights and headlights facing the homes. Additional foot traffic to the cars. Cars might be parked on Masonic in front of the neighbors' homes. We need trees and shrubbery in this area between building and sidewalk.

2. **Re Parking lot behind houses on Eiffel (west side parking)**
   Remove entire row of cars against lot line as cars' headlights would be facing neighbors' back yards; leave one row of parking against or closer to the building. Landscape area between rows of cars and back of neighbors' property line with trees and shrubbery. Neighbors don't want a fence. A berm was suggested but that might cause water runoff into the neighbors' lots. More parking can be added south of the existing building because LAM church now owns all of that property.

II. GENERAL CONCERNS

1. **What will the hours of operation be?**
   Concern regarding traffic and additional noise. After 3 p.m., northbound Schoenherr becomes a parking lot on weekdays.

2. **How many people will be in the building at any time?**
   Parking is rated at a 1-3 ratio - a parking spot for every 3 people. You have 228 proposed parking spaces. That is equivalent to 684 people.

3. **Why are the plan of the Planning Department and the plans displayed at Saturday's October 1st meeting different?**
   What is the correct plan?

4. **What is the time line for completion of this Phase I?**

APPROVED

5. **What is Phase II and its time line?**
   Has the Planning Commission been informed of Phase II?

6. **Is LAM church asking the Planning Commission to approve Phase I and Phase II at the same time?**

   SUGGESTIONS FROM THE NEIGHBORS:
   Build the new building on the south side of the existing building, leaving land to the north side as grass, as it was before.

III. **Concerns regarding the former Parsonage at 13446 Masonic which LAM is using as a Guest House. For the safety of the property and so it appears lived in, neighbors have suggested:**

1. Outside lights on timers for the front door, garage door, back or side door, mercury vapor light mounted on house for backyard. (You are welcome to check out the light on the back of 32800 Cambridge Drive.)

2. Timer lights in the living room and family room downstairs and one upstairs.

3. Perennial (flowers or plants which come up every year) and do not require much maintenance.

4. Snow plow and shovel driveway, sidewalk and walkway to the front porch.

5. Park a car in the driveway periodically, especially to pull up in and out when snow is light, to make tracks.

6. Trim back shrubbery on sides of the house and remove dying bushes in the front yard.

7. Put black plastic yard edging piled on west side of the house out on trash day, along with broken downspouts.

8. Remove wood from the west and south sides of the house to deter vermin.

9. Put mulch around landscape in front and sides of the house.

APPROVED

10. Check house each week for mailers and flyers in front door and remove them.

11. Sump pump? Discharging outside of the house.

LAM member present indicated, even though they withdrew the site application December 8, 2014, they have resubmitted due to increased membership estimated to be 600-800 members.

LAM has admitted they have done a poor job of communicating with the neighbors and hope these meetings will restore their credibility with the community.

In attendance October 1st, 2016 at noon meeting at 32800 Cambridge Drive:

James Bailey, from LAM; Roy Walters from LAM; John Randle from LAM; Leonard and Charmion Mathison, at 31734 Eiffel; Jason Harvey at 32143 Dover; Jeff Curle at 13445 Masonic, and Richard and Carole Wiseman at 32880 Cambridge Drive.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Before we move to the Planning Directors' Report, I'd like to acknowledge the presence of Councilwoman, Kelly Colegio. She's in the audience tonight; welcome.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

Vice Chair Kupiec - The next portion of our meeting is the audience presentation. And I am going to ask the Commission to invoke Article No. 710 of our Bylaws, which encourages the people to come up in an orderly, timely, basis, submit their suggestions and their recommendations, but limit it to 5 minutes per person. And we'd appreciate if everybody would, if you have something of a similar nature, do not come up and speak about the same thing, because it is just redundant and taking up time. So each person coming up here will be limited to 5 minutes per discussion. So, with that, I'd like to open up the request for Bylaw No. 710 to be imposed tonight to this audience meeting. So we need a motion and a motion from the Commission.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to limit speakers to five minutes, per item per no. 710, supported by Commissioner Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - Therefore, we have adopted the 5 minute rule. So, with that, we'll proceed to the audience portion.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ms. Carole Wiseman - My name is Carole Wiseman and I live at 32800 Cambridge, in Warren, 48093. I just have a question for Mr. Wuerth. You mentioned 8 feet between the property lines, so I had a question about that 8 feet. And I also want to say here, thank you, Mr. Smith, for reading my notes, so I don't have to read them. But I want to say we had really two very good meetings with Life Application Ministry people, first at my house, and then over here in the Historical Commission Meeting. And we also apologize for not being at the meeting yesterday with Mr. McClanahan. I think it was just people not knowing how to use their computer for e-mails. But, anyway, we did have a good meeting today and we had a very good meeting on the 1st at my home. So I think we're on the way to some really good understanding here. But we just do want to make sure that the houses facing the building from Masonic, and the ones on Eiffel, are not impacted as in numbers 1 and 2 that you already read, Mr. Smith. So I guess that was my question about 8 feet. I'm a little worried; I thought it would be more than that. Thank you.

Ms. Lisa Olow - Hi, my name is Lisa Olow. I live at 31705 Nelson Drive, 48088. And my mother lives directly behind the church at 13442 Chippewa, 48088. We've lived in this house for over 54 years. And what you're proposing and what's on site now is a disgrace to our neighborhood. You approved whatever they originally had and it fell through. What makes you think any of these new arrangements are going to comply with the neighborhood? Second of all, if they need it for a gymnasium, Wilkerson and Carter is available for rent any time during the week. You can sign up when school's in session. Afterwards from 6:00 to 8:00, 9:00 to 10:00, you can go and register if you need a gymnasium. I'd also like to know why they don't end up putting a gym on Saint Sharbel's. There's plenty of property there to build something on. And you also have K-Mart's that is empty, that has ample amount of parking for everybody to go into. And that is an empty building that should suffice for a gymnasium and whatever else. But I please ask, don't allow this. We live behind, our house, and you want to put parking space in there. We had the carnival in there. There was so much noise and distraction and we didn't sleep for 3 nights, with the lights, and the parking, and the noise that was going on. Now I realize that was a carnival, but I don't think it's right to have all that parking behind our house. We have to endure

APPROVED

with the church going on and their functions, and you're just going to increase more noise, and that's it, so thank you.

Mr. Jeffrey Curle - Hello; my name is Jeffrey Curle. I reside at 13445 Masonic Boulevard, directly across the street from this property. I spent 3 years looking at this mess that you guys initially approved. Before I even get to that, I want to make something very clear. We have been trying to reach out to the church on several occasions and had a very difficult time getting hold of them. And they finally agreed to a meeting that we had, which was helpful. They come up here and claim that they tried to reach out to us, as well as one of your members, and that no one showed up. I live directly across the street from that church. First of all, I do not have Internet. They can come and knock on my door. They have my phone number. When they had a problem with their business and asked me to keep an eye on it, they had no problem doing it then. So I want to make it very clear that nobody here, as far as the homeowners, did not want to be at that meeting. We would have died to have been at that meeting, because we are very concerned about what's going on in our community.

My house has become undesirable for 3 years. I've been thinking of moving and I haven't been able to because of this monstrosity. You know, and if any of you guys think that it's been desirable, then buy my home, because it's horrible to sit there and look at this for 3 years. Now we finally agreed with the church, hoping that they'll stick to what they say and move the parking from the north to the south and from the west to the south. Hopefully that will happen. But I would like to have this tabled until they can come up with an exact blueprint of that and what they plan to do with the property afterwards. Because, if you agree to it now and you let it go through, they can put anything there, I mean really, except parking. It's not just the parking; it's industrial lighting, it's noise. You know we're going to have a big issue with traffic flow on Schoenherr. At first, when it was just a church, yes, we had no problem with traffic flow because it was on Sunday and late Thursday night. Now you're talking over 600 or 700 people at one event possibly, or more, in this building that's going to exist and enter off Schoenherr. So no one has even considered the traffic flow on Schoenherr. It's going to be an absurdity to sit there and try and get out of my house and down the street on any particular day. No one's discussing the hours that these people are planning to use their building, which is you know fine, but I don't expect it to be there like 10:00 or 11:00 at night. The only other businesses that you'd consider that are close to this are schools which are closed by 4:00 or 5:00. And they have very little lighting, just enough to keep the parking lot safe. I ask that

APPROVED

you'd consider tabling this until they can give you an exact plan of what they plan to do now that they've agreed to move the parking from the north and from the west, away from the residents' home. And never once did we hear the ministry ever apologize for the way they've treated the homeowners. So I find it very difficult, although I'm willing to turn the other cheek, when it comes to them being honest and doing exactly what they say they're going to do. So, please, do me a favor, don't just count on it and pass this through without a thorough look at the plan that they're going to use. Thank you.

Mr. Jason Harvey - My name is Jason Harvey; I live at 32143 Dover. I want to thank everybody that did attend the meeting. We had a constructive meeting. There's a lot of things that we spoke about that I believe the church is going to go through with. One of the biggest concerns that I have also is how long this construction's going to take, if we move forward with this, Phase I, II, III, like they were saying. We've seen this property for over 3 years. We have a constructive dialogue now which is great. But we would like to know how long this construction's going to take. If this is going to take upwards of 4 or 5 years to complete construction, I mean, we're looking at, you know, 8 years of an unfinished building and then construction. So, if I were to do construction on my home, that wouldn't be allowed and I'd be cited by the City multiple times as violations. So we shouldn't be giving special treatment to any facility; we should follow the rules that we have on the books.

Bringing that up, as well, a lot of complaints were made. However, it seems only a fraction of them have made it to the City. That just concerns me, not really about with the church, but just going forward with residents making concerns and calling in, if the complaints are actually being entered into the computers or not, or if we're shoving these complaints somewhere else. That can be proven through phone records and the 150 signatures that we did receive on the petition. I had multiple people say that they had called and made complaints. However, when I FOIA requested for the complaints made on this building, there was only a handful, dating back to, it looks like, 2015 only. And this building has been there for more than 3 years. That's a concern, not really just for this church, but that's for anything going forward, to make sure that complaints from citizens are actually being entered properly into the City complaint system. I don't understand how that, you know, if we're just kind of shooing complaints away, when residents are calling, that's a big concern. So I want that on the record.

Ms. Kelly Colegio - Good evening. My name is Kelly Colegio, counsel woman, ex-officio, Planning. I just thought I'd get up and do it under this

APPROVED

portion of the meeting. I just had what I thought was a very productive meeting with the petitioners, representatives for the petitioners, and some of the residents, that were able to meet in the Historic Room behind us back here. And, moving forward with this project, I think we all agree that we'd like to see this project move forward as quickly as possible and get something in motion, so we can see the end product that we see set out before us in the site plans. But, one of the concerns that was brought up, and it was addressed by one of the residents, this lady here and the gentleman as well, was the parking adjacent to the residential. Now that the church has purchased Saint Sharbel, and I know from working with this church in the past on some projects with the City, that they, if they tell you they're going to do something, I believe they'll stick to their word. But the residents are really concerned with the parking that is adjacent to Masonic and the street behind the church as well. And I know that sometimes that may not have been requested by the church, as I heard back in that meeting, but it may have been put in place by Planning at the time because they were trying to fit the crowd that would be inside of the church. If this Commission could, if you move forward with this project tonight, possibly discuss with the Planning Director, if you could move that parking abutting Masonic, as well as the street behind the church where the parking is there, and move it between the church and Saint Sharbel, I think that would take care of many of the concerns that the residents had in the meeting, as well as lighting, and parking, and how far from the residential property. So it was a good meeting. The residents had concerns. The petitioners were more, I believe, then willing to work with everybody. They want this, I think, to be something that looks good for the community and for their church as well. But the residents do have a concern with the parking there. And I'm not so sure if it was even requested by the petitioner to be there; it may have been put in place with the Planning Director at the time, trying to fit into that lot. If we could move it away from the residential area and put it over between Saint Sharbel and the church, I think that would alleviate some of the concerns with the residents. Thank you.

Vice Chair Kupiec - We're still open for comments; anybody else want to speak? Seeing and hearing none, we will close the audience portion and leave it to the Commission for a proposal and a vote.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Commissioner Pryor.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Assistant Secretary Smith - First of all, I'd like to thank everyone for coming out this evening. I know there's been a lot of issues with this project. I wasn't able to make the last meeting, but I did watch it on the Warren channel and I did hear a lot of your concerns at that point in time. There was a bump in the road as far as the first phase of the construction of this project, and it delayed it for 3 years, and it was an eyesore. I've been by there a few times; I noticed it myself. But the church has been in the neighborhood for a while, and the community has been there for a while. The church is willing to work with the residents, so it's going to be a work in progress. The residents are going to have to continue to work with the church, the church is going to have to continue to work with the residents, and try to get it to the point where everybody can be happy. You're not going to make everyone happy, but at least if you can get close enough to where everybody can be happy and still be able to enjoy their neighborhood, that's the concern that we have, or I have. Can I get the Pastor of the church up, please? Thank you.

Now I know you've heard some additional comments from some of the residents tonight, as far as the parking is concerned. I know you're trying to be amenable to everything that's going on. And I'm sure you would probably continue to work to try to resolve some of these issues.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yes, we will.

Assistant Secretary Smith - So I want to commend everyone for their support for this matter. But one of the concerns I had, which they also had, was about the hours of operation, as far as if they're going to have events in the gym, what days, what kind of hours are you looking at, or is it all week, or certain days, or what's going on there?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Because it's a religious facility, just like at Saint Sharbel's, we have youth night sometime where they actually spend the night in the building. And also that building was used, and will be used again in 2017 for MCREST. We house the homeless there. And of course we have staff, because you have to be up all night. That's a solid week of citizens sleeping, showering, and eating in that building. It's been that way for the last 10, 14, years we've been there.

Assistant Secretary Smith - Okay. So some of the resident concerns about noise and headlights and stuff like that, would the hours be late hours? I know during the week, if they're spending the night, there would be, but, as

APPROVED

far as the concerns, as far as the headlights and stuff like this, would that be an ongoing issue or just sometimes?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - I'm assuming that the greenbelt, the trees, and the arborvitaes, that I think that they have across that whole back, will block those headlights out. It's just a matter of parking, cutting your lights off, and then getting out of the car, but not sitting there with the lights in the residents' back window.

Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, I have a question for you. Going back to councilwoman's topic that she brought up about the parking lot, what is your insight on that? Is there any other alternative choices to not having those, I think 17 parking spots right on the residential side, on putting those on somewhere else? What is your insight?

Mr. Ron Weurth - There has been no alternative to the parking presented to us. It's the site plan as you see it presented here tonight, is what we were going to approve. If there is a change in parking, placement of the parking, then we'll have to look at that. But that clearly would require another meeting in order to do something like that, a new site plan. I don't have one.

Commissioner Rob - But the trees and shrubs should be enough to cover that light part; am I right?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Now we're talking about the 8 foot wide greenbelt that is supposed to go along the west property line, 8 feet out. And pine trees and arborvitae shrubs would be planted alternately all through there. And, as those grow, and usually the plants are about 5 feet tall to begin with, but as they grow, they get 6 foot and taller, and spread ideally enough to cut down any problems with lighting, visual type things, that would go on at the church. And this would be between the church and the neighbors to the west.

Commissioner Rob - A masonry wall is not an option in this case?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Of course it is.

Commissioner Rob - What is your insight on a masonry wall? Are we talking about a drainage problem?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, in this particular case where there aren't any masonry walls nearby, or to connect to, then we prefer to see a greenbelt. But I have

APPROVED

to say sometimes neighborhoods, neighbors, prefer the wall. But that's not been the case here; no one's mentioned a wall.

Commissioner Rob - But it will solve most of the problem. Even though with the greenbelt, it would be much better to have a masonry wall?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I guess it's all in the eye of the beholder. If you like vegetation as a natural screen, then our 8 foot wide required greenbelt will work. But, if there's a need for a masonry wall, a poured concrete 6 foot high brick embossed wall, then that has to be requested and approved by the Planning Commission.

Commission Rob - To the petitioner, the ultimate goal is to have mitigation of the gap that you guys have with the neighbors, so I really appreciate your sitting with them, and thanks to the neighbors at the same time for sitting together and find some common grounds. This is how we progress. It's not we just say, "No," to something, that we don't want it at all, or, "Yes," we want it at all. It's something we find some common ground and move forward from there. I'm sure the residents found that, and I would really appreciate it. As you said, you are here for a long time. You are a resident, you will be, so I'm sure you will respect their talks and ideas and move forward. And the maintenance and other issues that were brought up, I'm sure you'll go from there.

I wanted to ask you a little bit more about the operations. So, besides the programs you said you're going to have, what is your actual planning on this building? Gym, then educational things; can you elaborate on operations in that new building?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Well, basically it will be an extension of what we already do. Hopefully we'll be able to add some community things as far as education, and family issues, and things like that. But it's basically a building that will house our youth and senior citizens for activities. There is a workout gym, if you looked at the actual building plans, inside of there, classrooms, a library, and things like that. So my youth pastor probably would be the better person to ask, because they'll be running that facility.

Commissioner Rob - And how long the whole project will run, the construction or whatever, the remodeling, and how long you're expecting?

APPROVED

Pastor Adolphus Cast - You're saying how long would it take to complete the project?

Commissioner Rob - Yes, just a timeline.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - That would probably be a better question to the construction company.

Commissioner Rob - What is your anticipation, how long it could take?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Well, let me see if I can go back and remember their initial timeline before we purchased Saint Sharbel. I think, if I'm not mistaken, that timeline was - I'm just going to throw this out there, I'm not a construction person. I think they were planning on completing that thing within a year. I think it was 12 months, once they got rolling. And I don't think it would take very long at this point, because all of the foundational work is done, the retention system is in, all of the plumbing underground is in, so it's just a matter of going up now. There's nothing that has to go in the ground except I think they have to connect a sewer line from the old building to the new. But everything else is done.

Commissioner Rob - Thanks for answering that. I have a request to you, alternative recommendation, because Planning Director also suggest he thought greenbelt would be better. My thought was masonry wall. But, in this case, I may request, a lot of time the parking lots, if they have next to the neighbor, they do the reverse parking. It's not a hard thing to do. But that removes the light options. Light is really a problem if you live next to a commercial building, so reverse parking would be an option. At least we can mitigate that part. Sounds, I'm sure you, Pastor, can come up with something. There are so many things you can implement to make it much better. And I'm sure you're going to come in future, you'll anticipate more progress. And I'm sure that you'd love to have more neighbors on your side and very positive outlooks, and which it came a long way within one meeting. We saw that there's a good progress, and I'm positive that you'll be able to take that forward too.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yes, I'm very optimistic about it. A little bit about myself is, it's easier to work with people if you put yourself in their place. That's all I do. If I was living behind the church, across the street, I will view it from that aspect. And whatever we can do, we're willing to do that. I just don't want to overplay my hand when it comes to architectural renderings

APPROVED

and things like that. But I can assure this Commission and the neighbor, because we are a community church. And the last thing I would want to do, if I was going to do anything, I would have tried politically to get rid of that quarter of a million dollar retention system under the ground. If I didn't care about their basements being flooded, I would have worked on that legally. But I didn't do that because I wouldn't want my basement flooding just because there's a gym or a church being built behind me. So certainly I can't say it enough to this community and to this Commission that our goal is nothing less than to serve this community in the best way possible.

Commissioner Rob - Thank you so much. And, by saying that, I want to thank the neighbors also for coming along and moving forward in a positive direction. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Robinson - Well, I did have a question. It seems, from the neighbors, the big issue is moving the parking possibly to the south side instead of the north and west side. And I'm wondering, if that is done, would that accommodate the members of the church. It appears the church has been expanding and is it possible, if the parking is moved, to what expense and would it accommodate the members of this growing church? I guess there's something maybe from an engineering standpoint, or a planning standpoint? That's the concern that I would have. It seems like that's the biggest concern there.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Here, again, the retention system was designed and put there because of the parking on that side. So that would negate that whole design. But I'm willing to look at that with an architect. As Ron Wuerth said, it would take additional drawings and professional people to look at that. I wouldn't want to stand here and say, yeah, we'll just move it to the other side, and all of a sudden that thing starts economically, because we were short on parking. And, because of the amount of grass that was removed, that's why we had to put that quarter of a million dollar tank underground, to make sure that we did not flood the neighbors. So just to just say, okay, we'll put it on the other side, that needs to be looked at professionally.

Commissioner Robinson - I see; okay.

Vice Chair Kupiec - To the petitioner, I have a question or two for you. I wasn't quite clear on your hours of operation and days of the week. Are you a 24/7 operation, or what type?

APPROVED

Pastor Adolphus Cast - No. We have Tuesday night bible study, Thursday night, prayer, and then Sunday morning, new member, new converts, and Sunday morning worship. That's from 10:00 to about 11:30. So there's 3 days, 3 operations. And then periodically there are certain events that's not ongoing.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Because of a lot of discussion about the lights in the evening, and the parking lot, what goes on in the evening over there that would be of that concern?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yeah, I don't know what that's about.

Vice Chair Kupiec - You don't know if anything goes on?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - I'm saying to you, Tuesday from 6:30 to roughly 8:00 is bible class; Thursday, 6:00 to roughly 7:00-7:30; Sunday, 10:00 to about 12:00. Those are our traditional hours of operation. Other than that, it's a special event.

Vice Chair Kupiec - This special event is not an ongoing thing; it's something that comes up seasonal?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yeah, we have a harvest festival which is coming up, and I don't think that goes too late. We're outside there. That's 20 acres of property and we're trying to develop that property, see how we can use it most effectively. Right now we have to come outside of Saint Sharbel's, drive down Schoenherr. I'd like to see something where we can stay right on the site there. It's a work in progress. I don't think these hours are a problem, because I just gave you 3 days a week. And none of those services are like midnight services, unless there's a special event where they have an all-night prayer, or the kids sleep over, and then MCREST for a week. And that's all night for a solid week.

Vice Chair Kupiec - That was another issue I was going to ask you about. You mentioned about a homeless activity. Could you give us a little idea about that?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yeah; we don't run that. That's run by Macomb; it's a 501(c)(3). We just partner with them. What they do is for a week they solicit 52 churches, to keep the homeless off the streets for a solid year. And we've volunteered for probably the last 10-12 years. Our week is in January.

APPROVED

So these people move from our church to Church of the Masters. They go all the way around, and they rotate them, hopefully some of them out of the program. But that's to keep them in shelter for a solid year. So we just take one week.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Because of driving through the area, observing the site, I don't see a lot of homeless situations in that area, so I wondered where do the people come from.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - You would have to ask that question to MCREST, because we pick them up. There's a pickup spot, Macomb Mall, and then we feed them, clothe them, shower them, and then in the morning we take them back to the Macomb Mall. And they simulate a work day.

Vice Chair Kupiec - So you pick them up, and take them back where you picked them up from?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yeah, because they have to simulate a work day, a 8 hour work day.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Do you have a bus to do this with?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yes, 2 vans.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And that's one week a year in your facility?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yes.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I'm a little concerned about the length of the operation of this construction site. It's been ongoing for many years and we'd like to see it completed. But we do have to have a little bit more definitive answer on that length of time. And also the parking, if there's to be a big situation, with your bringing up the point about the retention area that was put in at quite a high cost. And, if we were to move the parking, I think you said it would put it right over the top of the retention area. Mr. Wuerth indicated that we might need some more additional time to think about it and do architectural reviews of this. This parking does seem to be a big issue. And obviously you said you're not qualified to speak to it. Your architect is not here with you tonight; he was with you last time. But, unfortunately, he's not here tonight.

APPROVED

Pastor Adolphus Cast - No, I'm saying, not that I'm not qualified isn't the issue. Like what we submitted, the Planning Commission approved. We'd like to take another look at it, but I don't want to say definitively what's going on with that site in the future, past what the professionals have put out there, from the architect to the construction people and all of those people that are a part of making that. Because we're not builders; we're a church. And now, looking forward at that, my heart is just to make sure that everybody understands that we are willing to work with this community. That's what I want you to hear. I don't want you to hear anything other than that, because if you hang up on that, we can't move forward.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Mr. Weurth, could we see you up here again for a minute? I don't think anybody is here tonight that is qualified to speak to the issue on this parking. It looks to me like it needs some further review.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, there needs to be communication with the Planning Department regarding any change to the plan we have before us. And there's been discussion other places, but not with Planning, and not with me. So, if there's going to be a change in where parking is going to go, I certainly need to know about it. We need a change in the plan, and then we come back here for an approval.

Vice Chair Kupiec - So that change would come from the petitioner? He'd have to go to the City, make a presentation, what he wants to do?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, it's a little vague at this point. I think they want approval, but then they want to look at it after that. And that requires amendments like we commonly go through. So you have a choice, I guess.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Would we be better off, in your opinion, at this point, because, again, we don't want to push something through and then have them constantly coming back here for amendments and revisions and just add to the length of time to get something accomplished? We'd like to get this accomplished as quickly as possible, within a reasonable time professionally.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - If everyone is satisfied that there is to be a change in parking and where it's going to be located, then I would suggest that there be a tabling and we'll continue to meet and have the group, or whomever, meet with the Planning Department to straighten this issue out.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - How much time would it require, off the top of your head, to do something like this, so we can table it to a date certain, if that happens to be the case?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, I can meet in 2 weeks. Sometimes a month is what people need. I don't know from what the Bishop's architect would offer in a change in plan regarding the parking lot and how our Engineering Division would look upon that. Because, as he said, he already has facilities in the ground, expensive facilities in the ground, and how those would now work with the change. That's got to be reviewed on a professional level.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I'm very concerned. Again, I don't feel anybody here is qualified enough to make that statement, that moving that parking to that south would help, or north would help, or east would help, especially with the retention basin. I think that's something that has to be done by Engineering. And, again, there has to be a proposal put together, submitted to them for their approval.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - If they're serious about moving the parking, then my suggestion is this be tabled. If they're not serious about it, and they're happy with the way the design is, then the Planning Commission should approve it.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, in listening to the Pastor and what he had to say, and he did offer a lot of good points, but this is one area that was a little vague, as far as the parking and as far as the structural integrity of the basin, retention basin.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yeah, it's an underground retention basin.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And also the length of time he needs to confer with his people on it, too. So I'm going to suggest to this Commission that we take a look at tabling this again to a date certain, out a couple of weeks, more than just to the next session, to allow the Pastor enough time to meet with his architects, to allow them to put together a proposal, to bring it back to the City, to our Architectural and Engineering Department, and let them confer with Mr. Wuerth on how we proceed with this. So, with that being said, I'm going to make a suggestion that we table this item. So I'll make a motion that we table it.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Mr. Vice Chair, I would suggest that we table it a month and that's going to November 7th.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - November 7th; okay. So I'll make a motion that we table this to November 7th to allow these things to happen. And, hopefully, at that time we'll get some answers that will satisfy the neighborhood, the community, and obviously allow us to move forward with this.

(Audience member requesting to speak to the issue.)

Vice Chair Kupiec - The audience portion is closed. Once we close the audience off, they're done. He can speak to Ron about it, but, I mean, as far as addressing the Commission, he's had his chance.

So, with that being said, I've made a motion to table this item to a date certain of November 7th, 2016. And hopefully during that time we can accomplish the architectural drawing.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Excuse me; to set a date like that would require me to immediately hire an architect. And you're talking about drawings, you're not talking about meeting with me, coming back in a couple of weeks. You're talking about a ton of money and me getting the architect back in, like we're ramping this project up next week, which requires a ton of money and a lot of board meetings. So I don't want you to think that tabling it for a couple of weeks and have me come back in here, you're going to get some answers that quick.

Vice Chair Kupiec - What would be good for you, 2 months?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Once I meet with my board, and then they look at what it's going to cost to bring an architect in right at this moment, because what we were looking at is working these numbers, looking at this, so that we can ramp this project up by the spring of next year. But what you just did is just moved it 2 weeks from now.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, what time frame would be good for you?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Let me meet with my board so they can give you an intelligent answer.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, then we could just table it indefinitely?

Pastor Adolphus Cast - Yeah, that will be fine.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - Now during this time, Mr. Wuerth, just for a point of record, will he continue to operate as they are currently doing in the facility?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - In the facility? I don't know that they are operating in the facility.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Okay, so at this point, right now you're not operating; your church is closed? I hate to prolong this, but we need to do it right, and I don't see any other way of doing it right now. So, again, I'm going to make a recommendation that we table this indefinitely. And I'd like to hear from the Commission.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - When you table it indefinitely, then the public needs to know that there will be notice sent out. Whereas, if it was to go to November 7th, that's a date certain and there is no requirement for notice. So there will be notice is what I'm trying to indicate here.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Notices to all the people within the area of the date that it will be heard again?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yes.

Vice Chair Kupiec - So, again, I made a motion to table it indefinitely to clear up some of the things we talked about. Now we'll hear from the Commission.

Commissioner Rob - Mr. Vice Chair, before you put it to the motion, can I ask Mr. Wuerth one more question?

From your experience, because there is already storm water, and everything placed there, moving your parking lot is not that easy. So is there any other alternatives that you'd recommend that would make it easier and also will go along with neighbors' needs? Do you think anything you'd recommend, besides removing the whole parking lot, because of course they have many other things to go through, just changing a site?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, there's quite a bit to change. If they change the parking lot, it's all been pre-engineered, ready to go. And now, if you move things around, obviously it's going to take new engineering to determine, first of all, what's in the underground, and what facility is already there, and then

APPROVED

to match them up, and hopefully they don't have to add additional underground facilities to handle the water and the drainage. So it's going to take some meetings between the professionals, the petitioner's professionals, and have some representative neighbors there to see and hear it also. So, you know, we'll schedule meetings whenever we're asked. It's when they're going to make some decisions. The Bishop indicated he's got to speak to his committee, I believe he said. And, upon what comes of that, will determine when everyone else meets. So it's not in my hands right now.

Commissioner Rob - But we are talking about just sounds and lights, other things, has a greenbelt, do you have tree shrub?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, I guess it's an open forum. We're going to talk about all of the issues more. We'll just continue the discussion until we can come up with a site plan.

Commissioner Rob - Thank you for the clarification.

Commissioner Robinson - Can I say something, too, before we vote? Since the church, petitioner, has expended a great deal of money, and I know how costly it could be, and it's already in place, if the shrubbery and the trees are in place to separate, 'cause I have seen some churches that were in close proximity to homes, and when that shrubbery and greenery grows out, it creates such a beautiful buffer in the neighborhood. And I feel that, if that was in place, then the church can go on ahead and complete their project without great expense, which is prolonging the phases that they started.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Commissioner Robinson, once we have a motion for a table, the discussion should be closed.

Commissioner Robinson - Okay; I'm sorry.

Vice Chair Kupiec - The thing is, you need to reflect this in your vote.

Pastor Adolphus Cast - And can I say I would like this Commission to approve once again the drawings, the same drawings they approved 3 years ago, and allow this project to go forth as they originally approved it so that we can get it done. That's what I'd like this Commission to do, rather than table it indefinitely, hedging on speculation. Because we could put a for sale sign up

APPROVED

there and you'll be back here again with a new owner. You can roll the dice and try a new owner.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Pastor, in all fairness, it hasn't been voted on yet, so the motion might be voted down. But we do have to vote on it.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Vice Chair Kupiec to table indefinitely, supported by Commissioner Pryor.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Karpinski……Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……Yes
Commissioner Pryor……Yes
Commissioner Rob……No
Commissioner Robinson…….....No
Assistant Secretary Smith…….. No

Vice Chair Kupiec - Looks like we end up in a tie, so to the Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - The motion needed a simple majority; it did not receive that majority, so the motion fails, so the motion on the table would be the approval.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Please explain that again.

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - The motion to table failed because it didn't get a majority; therefore, there's a motion currently on the floor to approve. I believe Assistant Secretary Smith made it, and I do not know who seconded it, Mr. Pryor?

Vice Chair Kupiec - When was that motion made?

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - To begin the discussion.

Vice Chair Kupiec - To open a discussion; right. Well, originally Assistant Secretary Smith made the motion to open up the discussion, in favor of it, and Commission Pryor approved that. So, based on what the Attorney is saying, we will now take another roll call vote to determine if it passed or not.

APPROVED

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Karpinski……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……. No
based on what I said previously, and
I do think it needs to be tabled.
Commissioner Pryor…… No
Commissioner Rob…….. Yes
Commissioner Robinson…… Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith……. Yes

Assistant Secretary Smith - We have 4 Yes, and 2 No.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Again, I'm going to leave this up to the Attorney.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - If I can address the Board, because I think this takes a vote of 5.

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - That is correct, Mr. Wuerth; it takes a vote of 5. Under the Bylaws, it's automatically tabled if they don't receive that vote of 5 members. So it will be tabled.

Vice Chair Kupiec - So it will be tabled indefinitely?

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - Indefinitely.

Vice Chair Kupiec - So the vote has been tabled indefinitely and, again, the reason was that we did not get the required 5 votes.

With that being said, that will conclude this portion of the agenda. We will take a brief break here and let people leave the area and we'll reconvene. Thank you for your presence tonight.

At 8:24 p.m., meeting in recess.

At 8:31 p.m., proceedings continued.

APPROVED

Chair Howard - Attorney Murphy, based on the last item that was before us, there was some administrative error there. Can you please speak to that on the record, please?

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - Certainly. The tabling would be to the next meeting, by the Bylaws, not to table indefinitely.

Chair Howard - And is it proper, according to our Bylaws, for the Chair to make a motion?

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - That is something that I'll need to look into a little further.

Chair Howard - Thank you so much, Attorney Murphy.

6.

B. SITE PLAN FOR OPEN STORAGE FOR EXCAVATING EQUIPMENT AND TRUCKS: Located on the east of Ryan Road, approximately 500 feet south of Toepfer Road, 21412 Ryan and 21446 Ryan Road; Section 32; James Carden (Kerm Billette)

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to remove from the table, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith. A vice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Kerm Billette - My name is Kerm Billette. I reside in Sterling Heights. I'm here tonight for the petitioner, Mr. James Carden. Mr. Carden is in the excavating business and he won't be here this evening. He's working nights on the new improvements by 696, and he's been working like 12 hours a day, and he's on the evening shift, or the night shift now. And I have a list here of items that were recommended by Ron Wuerth, the Planning Director. And, first of all, Mr. Carden agrees wholeheartedly with the lock box requirement of the Fire Department and will put one on the gate, which is sometimes locked in the evening. And the other item that raised some question with Mr. Carden was the recorded ingress and egress to the property, that it's been an agreement between 2 property owners since the original owner sold the property to the south. He sold the property with the agreement that the gate would be installed between there and each one would have access to the

APPROVED

gate. And this was done some 10 or 12 years ago. Mr. Carden has been in the business for over 30 years at this site. His father started the site and he and his brother are the 2 people that continue to utilize the excavating equipment, usually on contract with the Highway Department, right now. And he agrees with the other items in here except the items that go to the ZBA. This is the landscaped area along the driveways of the front of the property and the landscaping requirement at the east end of the property where the parcel abuts are P-1 residential.

He also has portions on the 2 parcels being identified as the parcel 007 and 008 to be combined. He will combine them, but he will exclude the residence. The residence is on the west 165 feet of the north 58 feet of the property. It's loaded on the site drawing that he wants to exclude his residence, but will combine the industrial properties on the whole site.

And that's about it. He has requested me to take the items to the Board of Appeals that are necessary to appeal, and agrees that the site plan can be changed to provide square footage. He mentions for the driveway and notes about the trash being stored inside the building. And I think that that's about it, if there is any questions.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No Delinquent Taxes
DTE: Approved.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comments:

1. The parking lot shall be hard-surfaced unless a variance is granted.

2. Provide the proposed pavement cross section.

3. Show all existing and proposed utilities along with a corresponding easement. There shall be no permanent structure building over an easement.

4. A storm water collection system shall be designed to meet current storm water ordinances. Detention may be required.

5. It is recommended that the parcels be combined. Otherwise, joint access agreements and easements may be required.

APPROVED

6. The parking spaces along the east property line may require screening and/or some measure to prevent vehicle overhang onto the adjacent parcel.

FIRE: Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comments:

1. Maintain existing Fire Department apparatus access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the storage areas. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 feet and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.

2. Provide Fire Department lock box (Knox box) as required by City Ordinance.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Chair Kupiec - You say there was a couple issues here that you were going to take before the ZBA for approval of Ron's recommendations?

Mr. Kerm Billette - I'm sorry; I need some assistance. My hearing aide is bad.

Vice Chair Kubiec - There are a couple of issues that you're going to go before ZBA for approval?

Mr. Kerm Billette - Yes.

Vice Chair Kubiec - Other than that, you accept everything?

Mr. Kerm Billette - I will take them to the Board of Appeals. He may request that the parking provided along the south border, towards the east, that the parking be removed and the blocks be removed, because that's part of his area that he uses as a circle to maneuver the trucks in there. And that may be added to it. But I will take any of the things to the Board of Appeals with a site plan that's remodeled according to the way Ron wants it.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - To the making of a motion, I would suggest we go along with Mr. Wuerth's recommendation for a $5,000 increase, $150 bond. I'd like to suggest a cash bond.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Vice Chair Kupiec for the $5,000 increase, resulting in a $500 cash bond, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carries as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith……. Yes.
Commissioner Robinson…… Yes
Commissioner Rob…….. Yes
Commissioner Pryor…… Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…… Yes
Commissioner Karpinski……. Yes
Chair Howard…… Yes

6.

C. SITE PLAN FOR OPEN STORAGE FOR TRUCK PARKING:
Located on the north side of Ten Mile Road, approximately 240 ft. of Easy Street; 14617 Ten Mile Road; Section 24; Joe Vitale.
Chair Howard - We did receive correspondence from this particular petitioner that he would like for this item to stay on the table until November 7th.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to allow this item to remain on the table until November 7th, 2016, supported by Commissioner Rob.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Chair Howard…….. Yes
Commissioner Karpinski……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Pryor…….. Yes
Commissioner Rob……. Yes
Commissioner Robinson…… Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith……. Yes

APPROVED

6.

D. SPECIAL LAND USE FOR CHEERLEADING GYM AND YOUTH PROGRAMS: Located on the east side of Dequindre Road, approximately 1,345 ft. south of Fourteen Mile Road; 32522 Dequindre Road; Section 6; Janel Pollice.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Paul Fritz - Paul Fritz, Paul Fritz Associates, Architects. This basically is a lease in the existing building. This is the inside plan, taking up a small place, special use. It is ideally fitted because of the high space and wide open bay space for the cheerleading operation. I'll let Janel explain a little more about her overall operations.

Ms. Janel Pollice - We typically work with public school systems. We are a statewide program, low cost, for youth. So we do run cheerleading, but we also run safety awareness, self-defense, and some other youth programs.

Chair Howard - Just a little bit closer to the mic; thank you.

Ms. Janel Pollice - We run youth programs, so safety awareness, self-defense, cheerleading. Our hours of operation are in the evenings from 5:00 to 9:00, Monday through Friday. Saturday is 10:00 to noonish unless there's like a special event or something we may be doing for our athletes. But Sunday we're never open at all.

Mr. Paul Fritz - Just the recommendations that were listed, there's 3 that we kind of object to in terms of it's out of our control. And that would be 2.e), 2.g), and 2.i). Basically you're asking for some improvements by the owner and it's kind of out of the control of the deal here.

Chair Howard - Can you give me those items once again, sir, that you're objecting to?

Mr. Paul Fritz - It would be item 2.e), 2.g), and 2.i).

Chair Howard - Okay; go right ahead, sir.

APPROVED

Mr. Paul Fritz - And basically Janel and her operation need this deal more than the landlord. The landlord can just as easily pass on this and wait for another use; there would not be any special approval and would not have to make these changes anyway. And her operation really could not afford to do these improvements for the landlord. And so basically these three items, if they are required, will probably kill the deal.

Chair Howard - All right, then, sir, we'll take that up with the Planning Director as we come into our comments.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
ENGINEERING: Approved.
FIRE: Preliminary review of the site plan has yielded the following comments:

1. Meet requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code for an A-3 use group.

2. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by City Ordinance.

MDOT: Approved.
Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommend of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to approve, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, can I bring you to the podium, please? Now, because the petitioner brought up this issue, the g) is actually just a handicap sign we're talking about; it's not a cost effective thing. The e) that he brought up, this is a Planning Ordinance somewhere, right, to have the bumper curbs along that parking line? Can you elaborate on these 3 things that he's requested to be exempted? So just elaborate your part, please.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I can speak to these 3. All right, there was a previous approval for a special land use in this same facility, and those 3 items were also part of that recommendation, and they were approved by the Planning Commission. That was about maybe a month or so ago. These are items, if

APPROVED

you read the finding, you'll find that those items were part of a bond inspection in which they were to provide these years ago. They did years ago, getting their bond release. And now we come back years later for a use issue here, and come to find out they don't have any bumper curbs, they don't have handicap parking signs, and they need to have some kind of screening for the trash enclosure, or trash dumpsters, so no one can see them, ideally from the public, the public's eye which is Dequindre Road. So that's why those are in there. I use the word "shall," or not "shall," but "should." That's whether the Planning Commission determines that these should be done or not. And, frankly, the owner should be the responsible person in this, as opposed to someone who wants to run a cheerleading and youth program. Did I answer your question?

Commissioner Rob - Thank you so much; that's very clear.

To the petitioner, can you come to the podium, please? Do you have any subsidiary companies all around, any other city? Is this the only location you have, or you have locations somewhere else?

Ms. Janel Pollice - No; we have locations all over Michigan.

Commissioner Rob - Because you brought up the safety, that's the first thing I was going to ask, but thank you for the clarification on that part. About those 3 things you have mentioned, you saw the Planning Director already mentioned, g) is nothing; it's about a handicap sign we're talking about. But those are part of any plan procedures that moves forward. I think you should talk to your landlord about that one, you know. And, with this, I think it would be a good addition to our city. Thank you so much, and I'll leave that to the Planning. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Assistant Secretary Smith - To the petitioner, I was by the place today and I looked at it. And I agree with Mr. Rob on the landlord should probably be the one to handle those 3 items, because a lot of that is not your space. A lot of it is not just your area, but deals with the whole section there, so what's before us tonight actually is a special land use to permit you to do your cheerleading, you know. The other items, like I say, deal with the landlord. Those need to be taken care of with them. But what we have to look at tonight is, this is a special land use to permit you to do your cheerleading and youth programs. So that's just what I wanted to bring up.

APPROVED

Ms. Janel Pollice - Forgive me my ignorance, but this is all new to me. And I don't really understand. So are we saying that there's going to be a way, by the City, be taken to the landlord, or is it going to be put on our program to kind of go fight this out with the landlord, to see if they can do this or not? Do you understand my question; I'm sorry.

Chair Howard - I do understand your question. No, by far, what we're saying is that some of these items that you've indicated are the property owner's responsibility. Mr. Wuerth is going to further answer that question for you on how you should approach that.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - In some cases, it depends on the use and who's coming in for whatever. In some cases both parties will share the cost. And it's just my opinion that these are issues that have nothing to do with use, the proposed use; they have to do with the site itself. And they have to do with the safety element, the handicap parking spaces, the bumper curbs, so people don't smash into anything, the visual part with the trash dumpsters that are out there. By the way, the original plan required trash enclosures, individual trash enclosures for each trash dumpster on that site. I think there are about 6. And what I'm asking for is 2 - 20 foot long chain link fences, 6 foot high with screening at the far west end so that people can't see down there and see the first 2. If they can't see the first 2, they shouldn't be able to see the rest of them. So we're moving away from the original requirement 25 years ago. But I'm trying to be reasonable here and not having to charge them too much. That was what the choice is here. So this has to be worked out with the owner. If the owner wants to lease out, he's going to run into this problem every time someone comes before us with a special land use. So, as I said before, the first land use, the gymnasium type thing, similar in nature, we said the same thing. And that was approved, and they have to work that out with that owner. The owner has the responsibility initially. I hope that helps.

Chair Howard - It does. To the petitioner, does that answer your question?

Ms. Janel Pollice - Yes, it answers the question, but now I have a new one. He had mentioned the other business that's in there that got the special land use. I'm assuming I know who it is, because it's a very similar business to what I do. But they are currently running their business. So, in the process of this landlord doing what he should be doing, am I allowed to get my kids in there and get everything up and running? Because that's what I don't understand. I've got about 300 little girls that at the middle of November are

APPROVED

going to have nowhere to go if this doesn't work out. So I'm kind of in a panic mode at this moment.

Chair Howard - Well, we don't want you to be in a panic. So let's see if we can resolve this. Most likely what you're going to need to do is, if this Commission votes today to approve your item, you need to take these recommendations back to your landlord and share with him, "These are the things that are required of this building because you own it." And then, from there, you'll talk with Mr. Wuerth, work out those differences. Do you have a Certificate of Occupancy already in place?

Ms. Janel Pollice - No.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth? So they don't currently have a Certificate of Occupancy. What about the landlord; where does that fall with him?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - They don't have a C of O because they can't operate. So I don't know what you want me to tell you. It's not needed at this time. This has to go to, remember, City Council for the recommendation. City Council approves whatever is on here. They may change things themselves; I don't know.

Chair Howard - And when are your children scheduled to come in?

Ms. Janel Pollice - Mid-November.

Chair Howard - Mid-November. And, when it leaves here, it will go directly to City Council. And then we need to try and get in contact with your landlord right away to address some of these items, immediately.

Mr. Paul Fritz - We have not submitted for a building permit until we get the approval. So that was part of it. It's about a month or so to get in and get approval to do the modification of the interior. It's going to be about a month process of getting the plans, getting the permit, so they can make the minor modifications to the inside, so that they're ready to roll. That's kind of the urgency that happens.

Chair Howard - Well, let's see how we can get you through this first phase first, and then correspond with Mr. Wuerth, and also our Planning Department, and then, from there, getting on the agenda for City Council as soon as possible. And then we'll try to get this up and going for you.

APPROVED

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I'd just add to this, whatever your vote is after this, if it's a positive vote or a negative, either way, I can still meet with the petitioner and explain, you know, what the future will bring, all right, so I can have a meeting with them.

Chair Howard - That was a motion by Commissioner Rob, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith. This is a two-part recommendation; this is first for a special land use and then also to approve the site plan. So I would need a motion first for the special land use.

I apologize; this is for just special land use completely.

Commissioner Rob - Madam Chair, before you move forward, I think maybe the Planning Director can clarify this thing, that those 3 things are not stopping them for getting a Certificate.

Chair Howard - No; that is correct.

Commissioner Rob - It is to go to the City Council, and then I think the Certificate issue comes up. So this thing, you can do it gradually, if I'm not wrong, Mr. Wuerth. So this thing is not actually stopping you from moving forward. You have to go to the City Council because you have the special land use. So, Madam Chair, I just wanted to elaborate that part.

Chair Howard - You're correct; thank you, Commissioner Rob.

MOTION:
A motion by Commissioner Rob to approve for the special land use, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Rob……..... Yes.
Commissioner Robinson…….. Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith…… Yes
Commission Pryor……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…….. Yes
Chair Howard……. Yes

APPROVED

6.

E. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO BUDDHIST MONASTERY: Located on the southwest corner of Ten Mile Road and Warner Avenue; 2690 Ten Mile Road; Section 30; Nhung Huynh (Vietnamese Buddhist Association of Detroit).

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Chair Howard - Mr. Billette, I had a motion here to table.

Mr. Kerm Billette - The request has been to table for a number of reasons. First of all, the petitioners, Mr. Le and Ms. Nuynh, submitted the application and the site plan with the thought that the Planning Commission would be able to approve just the location of the addition to the building. I believe it was 80 x 65. It's one large prayer room. But we were informed by Ron that it would require, in order to have full approval of the Planning Commission, to have a plan for the building and elevations. And right now we have plans to talk to the architect on Twelve Mile Road, and Mr. Studnicka, in Utica, two architects, to do the elevations and the floor plan. They will go there for prices for them. So we would request it be tabled for at least 2 months, to get the architect, to get the plans, and they'd be submitted. The plans would be for exactly the location on the site plan that the building's located.

Chair Howard - Would December the 12th or January the 9th of 2017 work?

Mr. Kerm Billette - January the 9th would be fine.

Chair Howard - January 9th; all right. So we're going to look at a date certain of January the 9th, 2017. The petitioner is before us, needing more time to speak with the architect.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to table to January 9th, 2017, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

APPROVED

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Rob…….	Yes
Commissioner Robinson……...	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith…….	Yes
Commissioner Pryor……..	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……..	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski……	Yes
Chair Howard……..	Yes

6.

F. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING REPAIR GARAGE: Located on the northeast corner area of Van Dyke Avenue and Twelve Mile Road; 30001 Van Dyke Avenue; Section 9; General Motors (Ghafari Associates).

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Todd Drouillard - So we have a new project at the GM Tech Center. I'm Todd Drouillard, the department manager with Ghafari in Dearborn. And the whole plan is to build a small addition to the existing repair garage facility that they do repairs on vehicles, like on site. And there's a small addition to the body shop and some minor site improvements to the building. And that's pretty much it; it's pretty small.

Chair Howard - And you indicated this was going to be in the body shop?

Mr. Todd Drouillard - Yeah; there's a repair garage. If you've been to the building, the back half of the building simulates a dealership. It looks exactly like where you'd take your own car. And it's used to bring the executives' cars to the shop where they're repaired. And they do bring in special project vehicles as well to do paint repair and mechanical work.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

APPROVED

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of the site plan has yielded the following comments.

1. There is the existing floodplain on the east side of this site per the flood insurance rate map (firm). If the floodplain extends to the proposed work area, either PE the firm or actual elevations, it should be shown on the site plan.

2. All existing utilities within the influence of the proposed building addition envelope shall be removed and relocated.

3. The plan shall indicate the proposed acreage of disturbance. If the area of the disturbance is one acre or larger, the site may be subject to additional storm water requirements.

4. Pipe bollards or some other means to protect the exterior doors and pedestrians may be required.

FIRE: Preliminary review of the site plan has yielded the following comments:

1. Must meet all the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.

2. If required by the building code, the building must be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13. Fire Department connection threads shall be national standard type and a fire hydrant shall be provided within 150 feet of the Fire Department connection.

3. Maintain existing Fire Department access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 feet and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.

4. Provide fire alarm system if required by code.

5. Provide Fire Department lock box (Knox box) as required by city ordinance.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendation of the Staff.

APPROVED

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Commissioner Rob - To the petitioner, can you elaborate on the operation, because I didn't even know there was a garage and all that. This is something new to me.

Mr. Todd Drouillard - Okay; it's a garage like on site. It's not for public use; it's for private use, like only through General Motors. Yeah, but it's a garage. Really, all their buildings are built like little factories, you know, with the back parts of them. There's an office in the front part of it. It is a garage; when I say that, I really mean repair facility, you know, the hoist and maintenance people.

Commissioner Rob - You said it's not open to the public anyway.

Mr. Todd Drouillard - No, no.

Commissioner Rob - Yeah, that's a new thing to me; thank you so much for the clarification.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Chair Howard…….	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…….	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……..	Yes
Commissioner Pryor……..	Yes
Commissioner Rob……	Yes
Commissioner Robinson……..	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith……	Yes

6.

APPROVED

G. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION; Located on the west side of Amber Avenue, approximately 650 ft. south of Stephens Road; 23751 Amber Avenue; Section 26; James Kinkenberger.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. James Klinkenberger - My name is James Klinkenberger. I'm with Nowak and Fraus. I'm the civil engineer, project manager, and petitioner on behalf of the owner. Michael Lesha is here. We both are here to be able to answer any kind of questions that you might have. On my side, for the site plan, site engineering, and Michael will be able to answer any type of questions you might have as far as the operation or functions of the building. We're proposing about a 33,000 square foot, approximately 33,000 square foot, building addition to an existing building.

Chair Howard - And what type of operation are you going to have there, sir?

Mr. Michael Lesha - The purpose of the facility is for the design, manufacture, and service of fluid power, motion control, and automation and robotic equipment. It's used in a wide variety of industries throughout Michigan primarily. But we also ship products throughout the world. And we're going to be consolidating facilities, hopefully, if the project goes forward, currently located elsewhere in the city of Warren, as well as 2 other locations in Oakland County.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No Delinquent Taxes
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of the site plan has yielded the following comments:

1. Commercial drive approaches must be a minimum of 26 feet wide at the property line.

2. There shall be no permanent structure over an easement or utility.

3. If there is over an acre of disturbance, the site shall comply with the storm water ordinance.

4. The increase in impervious area may impact the existing storm water collection system. Detention and pretreatment may be required.

APPROVED

FIRE: Preliminary review of the site plan has yielded the following comments:

1. Must meet all the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.

2. If required by the Building Code, the building must be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13. Fire Department connection threads shall be national standard type and a fire hydrant shall be provided within 150 feet of the Fire Department connection.

3. Maintain existing Fire Department access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 feet and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 feet 6 inches.

4. Provide fire alarm system if required by code.

5. Provide Fire Department lock box (Knox box) as required by City Ordinance.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendation of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Assistant Secretary Smith - To the petitioner, I was by the site today. It's a very clean site. I was really pleased. In fact, I was going over the drawings and a guy pulled up next to me and he says, "Is someone going to be occupying this building; it's been vacant a long time." I said, "Well, they're coming before us; they want to do something with it." And he said, "Well, it's good to see something being done with it." So he was pleased to have someone there. So I just wanted to commend you on that and hope that everything goes well.

Mr. James Klinkenberger - I just had one question, in reading the comments. There was engineering comments that was read into the record. I received

APPROVED

a fax with the recommendations from the Planning Department. They only had comments from the Fire Department. So I would just request that I get the Engineering Department's comments. And, in listening to what he said, and the recommendations that are on here, these are all things that we would be able to deal with during the engineering phase and approval. But, also I would like to get a copy of that.

Chair Howard - Yes, you should have had a copy of those in advance.

Mr. James Klinkenberger - I got a fax on the 7th, but it's missing the Engineering portion on it, it only had the Fire.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes - They submitted them; the Engineering Department submitted them late. So it will be in the letter after the meeting. You'll get a copy of it. They reviewed it after it had been faxed.

Mr. James Klinkenberger - But, in hearing the things that was read in the record, those are items that we will get handled, will take care of during the engineering phase. There's nothing out of the ordinary.

Vice Chair Kupiec - That was going to be my question to you, sir, is do you understand the recommendations and do you have any questions about them?

Mr. James Klinkenberger - No; I understand the engineering. Like I said, I was able to understand and hear the comments from the Engineering Department. We have the rest of the comments from the Fire Department and all recommendations from the Planning Department, so we're good with it.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Like Mr. Smith said, I visited your site also. How long have you been in business?

Mr. Michael Lesha - We've been in business since 1945.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And doing robotics for how long?

Mr. Michael Lesha - Not since 1945. Robotics has been recent, probably within the last 5 years.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - Good. That means your business is expanding. You should be putting more people to work.

Mr. Michael Lesha - It is. We currently have about 40 employees in the city of Warren. The plan is to have 105 in this facility when it's completed, consolidating some additional facilities that we have in southeast Michigan, as well as adding some new hires. So we think it will be a great project for the city of Warren.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Yes; well, welcome, and we appreciate it. And it's a very good looking facility you have. It looks like you're taking good care of it. Good luck in the future and hire more people.

Commissioner Rob - I'm sorry, due to the sound difficulty, I couldn't hear. So can you outline your operation again; I'm sorry.

Mr. Michael Lesha - We design, manufacture, and sell some products that we don't manufacture. Products in the fluid power industry, motion control, and automation, and robotics. And the fluid power items could be a hydraulic power unit that is used to a simple car wash at a car wash facility. It could be a hydraulic power unit that's operating a stamping press in a stamping facility. The motion control and automation products are used, are typically electronic devices that are used to move product from one place to another. And the robotics are collaborative robotic products. And collaborative robotic products are robots that can work side by side, next to a human, unlike the sophisticated caged robots you'd often see in an auto plant. These are light duty robots; they're used to do simple, repetitive tasks that could be programmed by anyone after about thirty minutes of instructions, very user friendly robotics. And, again, we sell the products, do some systems design and engineering, do some manufacturing, and service the products.
Commissioner Rob - Thank you for the clarification.

Chair Howard - To the petitioner, you were very thorough in terms of your product line and who you provide those to. Are you providing any services to any industries in Warren, business to business?

Mr. Michael Lesha - Yes, we are, absolutely. General Motors being a big customer, as well as the other auto manufacturers, and a number of other businesses, including the City of Warren itself.

Chair Howard - That's good news.

APPROVED

Mr. Michael Lesha - Thank you for your business.

Chair Howard - Thank you, sir. Well, we definitely wish you the best in what you're doing. It looks as if you're going to be expanding and doing a great job here in the city of Warren.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith…….. Yes
Commissioner Robinson……. Yes
Commissioner Rob…… Yes
Commissioner Pryor…….. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…….. Yes
Chair Howard……. Yes

7. CORRESONDENCE
None at this time.

8. BOND RELEASE:

A. SITE PLAN FOR TWO BUILDING ADDITIONS; South side of Twelve Mile Road, approximately 873 ft. west of Mound Road; 5580 Twelve Mile Road; Section 17, McDonalds; City of Warren. Bond release of $1,000 paid on December 23, 1996.

Chair Howard - I need a motion to release the bond.

Commissioner Rob - I would like to motion to release the bond, but I just have a question to Mr. Wuerth, if I can ask.

A simple question, why 20 years?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - It took that long to complete it. So you'll have to ask them. It's just one of those things. Good question

APPROVED

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to release the bond, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Chair Howard…… Yes
Commissioner Karpinski……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……. Yes
Commissioner Pryor…… Yes
Commissioner Rob…….. Yes
Commissioner Robinson……. Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith……. Yes

8.

B. MINOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN FOR COMMERCIAL COMPONENT "D"; "OUTLOT C", located on the west side of Mound; approximately 415 ft. north of Twelve Mile Road; 29287 Mound Road; Section 8; Grand Sakwa (Metro Detroit Signs; Paul Deters). The minor amendment is for the signage for Buffalo Wild Wings. Bond release of $600 paid on May 5, 2016.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to release the bond, supported by Commissioner Pryor.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith…..... Yes
Commissioner Robinson…….. Yes
Commissioner Rob…….. Yes
Commissioner Pryor……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……... Yes
Commissioner Karpinski……..... Yes
Chair Howard……. Yes

APPROVED

9. OLD BUSINESS

A. SITE PLAN FOR NEW RELIGIOUS CENTER; West side of Schoenherr Road; approximately 80 ft. north of Diena Drive; 27643 Schoenherr Road; Section 14; Sejad Melkic (Hisham Turk). Letter to the Planning Commission from the petitioner requesting approval to construct a split face block wall instead of a poured concrete wall.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Sejad Melkic - Well, we had back a few months ago requested from the City to give us the C of C so we can use the building, because everything is in it, it's finished, it's brand new. It's been pretty much gutted out. And they've been there; everything has passed, all the inspections. What was left is the work outside, which was, the wall that was currently there when we bought the building was a brick wall that was leaning towards the condominiums on the north side, I believe, and it was just crooked. So that thing could not be preserved. It had to be taken down, rebuilt, 6 foot high. Currently it was 4 feet high. That was in the original site plan that was approved by the City. So we were looking for contractors, and it was very tough to find someone who would do the job. Apparently it's not big enough for many of the companies. Anyhow, we have found a contractor and I wrote a letter to the City promising that they would complete the work within 6 months, if we get the C of C from them, so we can be in the building. And so, in an effort to keep my promise, or our promise, we signed the deal with the contractor, and they took down the wall. But they put up the orange safety fence around the perimeter because right now the wall is gone, so there's a trench all the way down to the foundation. The foundation has been inspected and it is good to be used for the new wall. And the City had, after long discussion, outlined that we must do a poured concrete brick pattern wall. There was no other options. After all was said and done, that was the final decision, that they wanted us to used poured concrete, brick pattern, wall. There was discussion about brick; there was discussion about face blocks. But, when we agreed, they want us to do it this way.

Well, when we started the project and we took down the wall, the two neighboring houses that we have from the south side did not really cooperate with us. One in particular, the first house, I spoke with the lady. Jim, from the Building Department, spoke with the lady. In fact, I spoke with Jim the other day; he was pulling into our parking lot. And he was just in disbelief that people are not willing to cooperate. Because they have their fence up against where our fence is. So, all we need to do is take their fence off, finish

APPROVED

the project, put it back on, by the contractor. Somehow they are not willing to do that. And those fences, I don't even know if they have a permit for it for not. I know if they have a permit, they're supposed to face the good side towards the neighbors. None of those fences are that way. But I told the Building Department, I do not want to go that route. It's just the neighbors. We were told we have to do this; I'm doing what I'm supposed to do. To be honest with you, I don't need to spend $50,000 right now. But this is to respect the City and what we agreed to do, and so we're doing it. But I spoke with the lady myself. There was claims that our contractor has hit the wall with the machine and took it off and was nailing it back on. And I told the lady, "This is simply not true. He's denying what you're saying. He took pictures before and after." And now, through a week ago, I had a claim from the insurance company for a little over $3,000 that they want, apparently with something that the insurance adjuster came and saw. Honestly, there's nothing there. The fence is as it was.

So, long story short, I do not want to argue about this. We need to finish the project. It's not safe for the other neighbors. And at the back there's a house, pretty much there's no fence at all. On the side right now, since we've taken the wall on the north side, the condominiums, there is no wall right now. So it's kind of like a trench there, and it's just not safe to sit like this. And the winter is approaching; it is already very cold outside. So all I want to do is finish the project. We talked to Building, and is it Paul from the Building Department, told me, "I wouldn't have a problem with it, but you've got to go to Planning." We're asking to change it from the poured concrete, a brick pattern, to split face block wall. I believe I sent the letter to you guys; I dropped it off. And I wrote down, as my contractor told me, the details which you have. I'm not qualified to discuss those, but I believe you have it with the details of how he's going to build it. The architect, Mr. Turk, has also submitted the drawing, which you should have. So either one is sturdy enough for our life time, according to my contractor. Either or is going to do the work. To be honest with you, from the community members who are contractors themselves and know a little bit about this, we all understand that the poured concrete is a bit more firm, or it will have a longer life span. We admit that. But I do not want to go the route with fighting the neighbors, and this and that. So we're at the point where I just need to finish the project. And I think either one will look very nice. We have to finish the parking itself after the wall. And there is another part of the project, which is we have to do the greenbelt or whatever in the back and the spiking and the parking lot. So I'm afraid, at the rate it's going right now, it might not be finished, at least

APPROVED

the parking portion, because, if it gets cold, I'm afraid to do the work and have it, because of the winter, not being firm before it's too cold.

Chair Howard - Thank you so much, sir; you've made a very compelling case. Mr. Secretary, is there any correspondence on this item.

Assistant Secretary Smith - There is no correspondence.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Madam Chair, I have provided a written log here, my thoughts on it. But, to get right to the point, it's to approve what the petitioner has proposed.

Chair Howard - That's very simple; thank you so much. I'll take a motion at this moment, and this is going to be a two part motion. First of all, I want to recognize this as a minor amendment.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to recognize as a minor amendment, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Howard - Now I need a motion to approve this split face block wall instead of the poured concrete.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to approve, supported by Commissioner Karpinski.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Assistant Secretary Smith - I looked at the drawing that we got from the architect. And, by building the block wall the way they want to do it with the rerod and the cap and everything and pouring the concrete down through the hollow, it's going to be very sturdy, so I don't really see a problem with it. And I understand the problem with the neighbor. And, being you already have a good foundation to building a wall up on, that's the reason why I made the motion to approve it.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I concur with Assistant Secretary Smith. I was out there myself and looked at it. And I think that, based on his drawing, the wall will be sufficient. And Mr. Wuerth says he's familiar with it, so I have to support what he says. But one of my concerns to the petitioner, looking at that wood

APPROVED

wall that your neighbor has, it's leaning and swaying and kind of floating in the wind. Do you have any responsibility to straighten that wall, or just strictly your cement wall?

Mr. Sejad Melkic - That wooden one, you're talking about?

Vice Chair Kupiec - The wooden fence.

Mr. Sejad Melkic - That's theirs.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Nothing there has to do with you? Your machinery didn't do that or nothing?

Mr. Sejad Melkic - No. The contractor took pictures before and after. The second neighbor hasn't really, just we couldn't get a hold of them, the contractor couldn't. The first lady, I'm going to be honest with you, from her wording, and talking to me and the contractor, is simply after getting whatever she can. That's just my opinion; I'm not going to say it any other way. And I told her, "This is very unfortunate." Because we have been very kind. All those fences, especially the back one, is really in bad shape. It just hasn't been worked on. So I can't clearly, with conscious mind, say I have ever touched her wall, and checked it out before, how shaky it was or wasn't. But you all know, if you take a big machinery and touch it just a little bit with, what do you call it?
Vice Chair Kupiec - Backhoe, yeah.

Mr. Sejad Melkic - It will just destroy it. And that thing does not look like it's been even scratched. So I don't even know where that insurance company that sent me this $3,000 bill is coming from, but you know how they work. She's been paying the insurance company; they come out, they look at it. And now I have this in my hand, to see what the contractor, you know, what to do. But the reason we're asking this, because this, I forgot to explain, the split face block does not require us to take off the fence. This is the only reason we're asking for this one, 'cause like you said it's sturdy, but we wouldn't have to touch them, we wouldn't have to deal with them. We just go from our side. The other one, the requirement is they cannot get around to finish the job appropriately.

Vice Chair Kupiec - You have to put forms up, yeah. No, I understand what you're doing.

APPROVED

Mr. Sejad Melkic - If we went this route, we offered them, our contractor will take it down professionally, put it up probably in better shape than it is right now. But they have refused to cooperate.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I think you're better off going where you are, because if you take that fence down, I don't think there's any putting it back. Well, good luck on your project; I hope you've got yourself covered.

Chair Howard - To the petitioner, by far I want to thank you for being very diligent to honoring your commitment to the City and staying within the time lines and being honorable there. Some of these situations that you are posed with at this moment, you don't have any control over. With that being said, we have a recommendation to approve. And so, therefore, this is the second part. We have a motion by Assistant Secretary Smith, supported by Mr. Karpinski.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Chair Howard……..... Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…….. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Pryor…….. Yes
Commissioner Rob……. Yes
Commissioner Robinson…….. Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith…… Yes.

9.

B. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING RETAIL CENTER; Located on the southeast corner of Nine Mile Road and Ryan, 4208 Nine Mile Road; Section 32; Najah Gasso. Site Plan Extension. Approved on September 29, 2014.

Chair Howard - We did receive correspondence from the petitioner asking for a 1 year site plan approval.

PETITONERS PORTION:
Mr. Najah Gasso - Good evening; my name is Najah Gasso; I'm the owner of that plaza. I would appreciate you guys granting the extension for 1 year.

APPROVED

I am still in discussion with some of the tenants for relocation, making a spot for a bigger tenant.

Assistant Secretary Smith - There is no correspondence.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendations of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to extend the site plan 1 year, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith..... Yes
Commissioner Robinson……. Yes
Commissioner Rob…… Yes
Commissioner Pryor……. Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec…….. Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…… Yes
Chair Howard…….. Yes

9.

C. SITE PLAN FOR NEW CIRCLE K GAS STATION AND CONVENIENCE STORE; Located on the northeast corner of Van Dyke and Vermont Avenues, approximately 351 ft. north of Eleven Mile Road; 27248 Van Dyke; Section 15; Kevin Baker, VD Warren Investors (Robert Wellert). Letter to Planning Commission from petitioner requesting the use of bollards in front of the building instead of concrete curbing.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Otis Carter - Good evening everyone; my name is Otis Carter. I'm with Circle K; I live in Novi, Michigan and work out of the Akron office for Circle K. I just wanted to address the bollard issue. We've done 11 sites in the Midwest this year, all of them for the parking lot level to the store, so no curbing there, with the bollards in front. This is mainly a safety issue for us. It definitely cuts down and prevents slip and falls in front of the store. But, even beyond that, it helps with cars, to keep them from running into the building and things like that. So that's what the bollards are for. I know there was a concern about the safety, the slip and fall portion of it, and I think that you would kind

APPROVED

of eliminate that when you have a surface level. I think it creates more of a problem when you do have that step-up. So I think it's different for our business, mainly because it's a convenience business, and most of our traffic comes directly up to the store. So the cars are constantly parked directly in front, in and out quickly. Whereas, in other businesses, most people have a parking lot, the cars park in the parking lot away from the building. So that's kind of what makes us a little different. And I guess that's really the point we're coming from with that; the bollard will help prevent any type of accidents as far as cars coming into the building. And we have had that happen several times, so that's why we use the bollards instead.

Assistant Secretary Smith - No correspondence.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - You've received a report from myself regarding this. The reasons that they provide are here. I can read the City's response to that, if you'd like.

Chair Howard - Yes, sir.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the response and recommendation of the City.

Chair Howard - First of all, I need to recognize this as a minor amendment.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to recognize as a minor amendment, supported by Commissioner Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Vice Chair Kupiec to deny with discussion, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Vice Chair Kupiec - Mr. Wuerth, I don't have the privilege of knowing Mr. Justin Reynolds. Is he a Civil Engineer with the City of Warren?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yes, he is.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And, obviously, you spoke to him and these are his recommendations, along with yours?

APPROVED

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I did speak with him. I wanted to clarify what that particular word usage meant. And so that's what I've provided in this report.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I'm sorry; did you say you did not speak to him?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I just said I spoke to him; yes.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Okay; and these are his recommendations also, based on our current specifications?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Excuse me, Mr. Kupiec, to answer your first question, number 1, that's his recommendation, and number 4, that's his recommendation.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, obviously, he knows what he's talking about. I can appreciate what he's talking about in number 4, because bollards do become, in the wintertime, a maintenance issue, as far as slip and fall. You can't clean around them. Generally, the sun beats on them, and they shed the water, and it becomes more of an ice trap; I have seen that quite a bit. Well, it looks to me by what the City recommends in their standards and recommendations, so I will support my motion to deny.
Commissioner Rob - We don't have the bollards in any other place; this is something new that he's proposing to the City?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - It is new. It's new to me that there's the usage of all these bollards. And this really is a design thing, more than anything. I understand the trip hazard that they talk about. But I can't find any other facilities that are quite like this, with the usage of this many bollards. And then you've got the issue of where water goes, and how it's sloped, and how it matches a regular asphalt surface. And, mind you, I'm not against any new design features. He did say that Circle K has these, I guess, at all their other facilities. And I'm just saying that it's not something that we normally see. The usage of these are for other purposes, as opposed to being out in front of a regular facility like this.

Commissioner Rob - Did the petitioner want to address something?

Mr. Otis Carter - So, as I stated before, we have them at all our other locations that we built, the new stores. They are all like that. I have pictures if you would like to see what that looks like at an actually built store. And, to address the issue of whether or not it's common, it is not common in a lot of

APPROVED

cases. Again, I think that's mainly because of the type of business that we do. So where you will see bollards in front of stores, to this point, is mainly in front of buildings and things like that. So you'll see like a drug store that may have them, like a Rite-Aid, or a CVS, or something like that. They'll have it right around that first corner where they normally have the doorway and some of the parking spaces. You'll see that Target uses them a lot; Walmart uses them a lot in front of their stores. But the difference between them and our use is that they don't have parking directly up towards the building. All their parking is away from the building and any traffic that goes by the building is generally parallel to the building, not perpendicular to the building. And that's the main difference. Not to bring up my competitor's, but if you looked at a Wawa or something like that, I don't know if you're familiar with that brand, but it's a convenience store, fuel station, as well, Wawa, they also have the bollards in front like that, to where, if you're going to park up against the building, they have to have something to keep you from running into the building, 'cause it's more common than you think. People are in a rush, they accidentally hit the accelerator versus the brake; that little 6 inch curb is not going to stop a car from going through the building, so that's a big part of it for us, in our particular business. And that's why I pointed out the Wawa's and different businesses. Convenience stores will use them, whereas a big retailer may not do that because their parking and travel patterns are different.

Chair Howard - Could you provide the photo to Elizabeth; she's going to give that to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Rob - Addressing this thing, I want to clarify, so the bollards would be on top of the 6 inch curb, am I right, on top of that?

Mr. Otis Carter - No, no curbing at all; it's flat. So that way there's no obstacle as you're going in between the bollards. The bollards are just to stop the vehicle from going into the building.

Commissioner Rob - Why can't you have on top of the 6 inch curb?

Mr. Otis Carter - I guess technically you could.

Commissioner Rob - I'm saying, the City, we love the 6 inch curb. And he has a point, too. I think it's more decorating part and the safety of the car getting to the store. Would that be an option, so you can have that on top of the 6 inch curb? Is that something you would like to do? I think you have a

APPROVED

couple other locations in Warren, if I'm not wrong, because we saw Circle K, you came, several times. So anyhow you're going to come up with maybe the other options. So is that an option, where you'll have the bollards on top of 6 inch curb?

Mr. Otis Carter - Generally, we don't; it's usually one or the other.

Commissioner Rob - Is that too important for you to have that, than not generally done like that? You see, if you have on top of that, you're already in compliance with the City. I don't think City will mind to just have bollard on top of 6 inch curb. I hate to say, "No," to something when I can work it out. Or maybe we can give you some extra time where you can talk to the City and explain what other options, the thing I told you on top of it. If you don't entertain that suggestion at all, then, of course, we are talking about city regulations. But, if you can still entertain that one, you know, "I need bollards anyway," why don't you have it on top of that one and then City compliance is done anyway.

Mr. Otis Carter - I can take that back and see. That's an approval level above me, but I can find out.
Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, is that an option? This has nothing to do with a Civil Engineering problem to have bollard on top of the 6 inch curb in front of the store, or whatever he's saying. This is something will not create a problem, am I right, because we are having still 6 inch curb? You need some time on it?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Commission Rob, what would you like us to do? I mean, I get the impression you're thinking about having this tabled so that we can have a meeting and discuss this.

Commissioner Rob - I think you had e-mail correspondence or mail. I think it's better if you talk to him and see if there is another option and make it nicer. Will the time help?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, I know that Mr. Willert, I don't know if you know him, he also intends to have some additional changes. Are you aware of that? He's got some issues there?

Mr. Otis Carter - Right.

APPROVED

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Well, then maybe this should be tabled, then we can expand on what the petitioner also wants in addition to this. And maybe we can have a meeting with our engineering group and see if we can work something out.

Commissioner Rob - Thank you for that clarification. I would request to make a motion instead of denying.

Chair Howard - I like what your train of thought is currently. To the petitioner, and then to Mr. Kupiec who was the maker of the motion, to see if we could table this.

To the petitioner, how many bollards do you believe you're going to have across the face of your building? Okay, I see 27 across the front. Is that about right, sir?

Mr. Otis Carter - You probably counted on the actual picture of the one that they built in Troy.

Chair Howard - We have 27 across the front. Now what is your design thought in the spacing of them? Is it every 3 feet, every 4 feet?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I believe it's every 4 feet.

Chair Howard - Every 4 feet.

So, Commissioner Rob, we're looking at tabling this to, let's just say maybe November, to give them an opportunity?

Is that amenable with you, sir?

Mr. Otis Carter - I think we have a meeting in 2 weeks, or we're trying to get on the meeting in 2 weeks, and I think we're just trying to combine with that.

Chair Howard - Now we did receive a correspondence for that date. We need something to the 7th, the 24th?

Commissioner Wuerth - I think it depends on Mr. Wuerth, am I right, because of his schedule.

Chair Howard - Ms. Michelle was saying the 24th or the 7th.

APPROVED

Ms. Michelle Katopodes - Circle K has actually submitted for a minor amendment for some other changes for the 24th. So I guess if we're adding, we could add this possibly to that, the same item.

Chair Howard - All right, so that will give us 2 weeks to do this, sir. Is there any way that we could expand the distance, or are you making it pretty much the width of a car? Is that the rationale?

Mr. Otis Carter - I'll find out. So, to your point, just to clarify the concerns. The main concerns are, first of all, how do we apply the bollard for a curbing? And you want both curbing and bollard; right? And then the distance is a concern? Those are the main concerns. And is there a concern about the spacing?

Assistant Secretary Smith: I have a concern about snow removal around the bollards. You've got a curb and gutter, 6 inch curb, running through there. The truck can come down through there along the curb and clear the snow. But, if you've got the bollards, then you have to try go between each one. And, like I say, if you're up higher, 6 inches, then even going into the front door, you're not going to have to deal with as much.

Chair Howard - So if we had a, let's say, a 5 foot, you would be able to navigate through there, you think?

Commissioner Rob - I think Assistant Secretary Smith is still wanting the same thing, the 6 inches.

Assistant Secretary Smith - A 6 inch curb going all the way.

Commissioner Rob - I concur with Assistant Secretary Smith; we are talking about the same thing. We're not talking about the gap; we are talking about the bollard on top of the 6 inch curb. That's the thing I was trying, and not one or each other.

Chair Howard - Okay; in addition to?

Commissioner Rob - Yeah. They really want bollards, and we want 6 inch curbs, so we both win.

APPROVED

Assistant Secretary Smith - Well, I was thinking just the curb. And if you want to put a couple bollards here and there, you can do that, instead of having the bollards all the way across. Maintenance wise, I think it would be a lot more difficult to try to get in between them, as far as the snow removal, versus if you just go right straight down through and clear the snow, you know, for the cars, for the parking there.

Chair Howard - So we have a motion before us to table this to date certain of October the 24th.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Madam Chair, what happened to my motion to deny?

Chair Howard - This is a very true statement. Go ahead.

Assistant City Attorney Murphy - The motion to table would be a secondary motion, so it actually takes precedence. You vote on the table, the motion to table, then, after you vote on that, if you deny it, then your motion would still be on the table.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Because unfortunately I had a difficult time hearing the conversation that Commissioner Rob was having, and Mr. Wuerth was talking to the petitioner. I had a difficult time hearing that one. So are we saying now they're going to put 6 inch curbing in with bollards in front of the curbing?

Chair Howard - Well, they're going to have that discussion, and that's why they're asking, Commissioner Rob, looking at tabling this item for 2 weeks to decide between the 6 inch and the bollards, or not as many bollards.

Vice Chair Kupiec - You have the other curbing; you don't need as many bollards. Because quite a few places have bollards with curbing, but it's just the idea that, if you've got 6 inches of the concrete, you don't need a bollard every 4 feet. Primarily, near the entrance and the doorways and the any seating areas.

So Mr. Wuerth will you then take this to Mr. Reynolds and discuss this with him, or is that strictly in your department?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - That's what the intention is, meet as soon as we can in between those 2 meetings and try to get some answers. Meanwhile, I'm going to go out to that Troy site and take a look at it and just get a feel for it.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Kupiec - Where is that Troy site at, what road? Do you have any idea offhand?

Mr. Otis Carter - I don't know the address offhand. I told him I'd get it to him tomorrow.

Vice Chair Kupiec - It would be nice if you could share that with us so maybe we could take a look our self. Let Mr. Wuerth know and he can communicate to us and let us know where it's at.

Mr. Otis Carter - That's Troy, Ohio.

Vice Chair Kupiec - That's what I was going to ask you; you took the words out of my mouth. Is it Ohio, or is it Michigan?

Mr. Otis Carter - It's in Ohio.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - How far do I have to drive?

Mr. Otis Carter - It's a little over 2 hours. Cleveland is probably the closest. Again, these are new facilities; these are not the old buildings that we've had in the past.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - I don't think a building inspection is in order.

Mr. Otis Carter - The ones that are close by, there are some that are close, they are older facilities that we either acquired or they're just really old buildings, so they don't have those at all. Troy is probably the closest one, other than Cleveland.

Chair Howard - So we will find a way, between you and Mr. Wuerth, if that's by Google maps, or video, or something, to show us that presentation to Mr. Wuerth.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to table to date certain of October the 24th, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

APPROVED

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried as follows:

Chair Howard…….. Yes
Commissioner Karpinski…… Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec……. Yes
Commissioner Pryor……. Yes
Commissioner Rob…….. Yes
Commissioner Robinson…….Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith……. Yes

9.

D. SITE PLAN FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE: Located on the east side of College Park Drive at the end of the cul de sac approximately 571.81 ft. south of Martin Road; 27610 College Park Drive; Section 13; David Potocki (Robert J. Tobin). Expired Site Plan. Approved on September 8, 2014.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to receive and file and to let the site plan expire, supported by Commissioner Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

10. NEW BUSINESS
None at this time.

11. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

12. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Thank you, Madam Chair. Between the last couple of weeks, just the highlights here in particular. I had a meeting with General Motors and we're starting to look at this, what I call, the General Motors District and all that entails. It will possibly make the General Motors Campus into its own district, with its own set of requirements for construction, that type of thing. We find that they're doing so much work there that variances are kind of holding them back on some of the construction and other things, needless to say. So this was proposed and we'll start looking at this is the next couple of months. So that's going to come up.

I did attend a staff meeting, a number of issues there. Also, the City Council brought up an issue about LED lighting. Some of it being too bright, or

APPROVED

scrolling too fast, or in the wrong place, and also including these rope lights. And I think you've all seen that; it's white usually, goes around a window. And we're concerned about how that looks and we'll get more information regarding it.

I did attend a meeting that involved Bob Gibb of Gibb Associates and All Quest. And Mr. Gibb is going to be involved with what I call a downtown master plan here for the City of Warren. It's in our downtown area. They're going to look at it, relook at it again, and he's going to come up with some ideas, doing that. It's like a mini master plan. And All Quest is a group that will help the City in private and public partnerships. And hopefully they can help us draw in a really nice hotel, that the Mayor has been making an effort to locate here in the downtown area.

I had some communication with the Attorney's Office regarding the Pawnbroker's Ordinance. I attended one block grant meeting. And we had a PUD minor amendment meeting in which Commissioner Kupiec attended. He is the Planning Commission's representative. And one of the items had to do with diesel signs at Meijer on the gas station, and some additional signs on the canopy. That's all. And that's the PUD, the Heritage Village PUD. The second PUD is the Wiegand PUD at Chicago and Thirteen Mile, I think it is, the big swooping thing. Anyway, he wanted to put in a storage building, attached to a trash enclosure. So we had to work on that.

So, with that, that's some of the activities I've been involved with the last couple of weeks.

Chair Howard - That's very good, sir.

Any news with Mr. Trupa on our RFP, sending that out for the Master Plan?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - He has not contacted us, so that means we better contact him.

Chair Howard - Okay; if we can possibly do that this week before the holidays get in too deep, because I that's been about 6 weeks, or maybe 2 months since the last time.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - It's been a while; yeah.

Chair Howard - Yeah, this is October, probably the end of August.

APPROVED

Mr. Ron Wuerth - We have been busy with a lot of other things, unfortunately, so it's hard to work all this in.

Chair Howard - Any questions for our Planning Director?

Vice Chair Kupiec - Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

You mentioned about the gentleman that might offer a master plan for downtown. Is he involved with the City or is he an outside vendor trying to promote business into the city?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - No, he's Gibb Associates, he's a planning group out of Birmingham.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, since we didn't have any funds appropriated yet, is he for hire, or is he for free?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - No, he's not for free. He's been hired through the DDA.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Oh, so Downtown Development hired him?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yes.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Good. Now are they sharing the plans with us?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Of course.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Of course. In the past they haven't.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yeah.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Okay. Like Ms. Howard said, we're waiting for some approvals to come down, and we haven't heard anything about the funding of it yet, so I just wondered if he'd been approved.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Like I said, this is like a mini master plan.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Any effort at all is an effort, and that's all I'm asking.

APPROVED

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Right. It's just a matter of he can do some economic forecasting and try to help us with uses that can be drawn to this area, and perhaps buildings. We'll see.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Is he going to focus primarily on the City Hall property?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - Yeah, around City Hall.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Any idea of the opening of the Cadillac dealership? Have they called you in for a final look-through yet?

Mr. Ron Wuerth - It's got to be soon; that's all I can tell you. We've got Cadillacs all over the place.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, when you get an invite, let us know; we'll follow you in.

Mr. Ron Wuerth - All right; I'll make sure that happens.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to adjourn, supported by Commissioner Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

_____
Jocelyn Howard, Chair

_____
Warren Smith, Assistant Secretary

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:
Sandra F. Sirovey - CER-3561

E-mail: ssreporting@outlook.com

Sandra F. Sirovey CER-3561
October 10, 2016

APPROVED

APPROVED