

CITY OF WARREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on November 7th, 2016, at 7:00 p.m.,

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, November 7th, 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
Jason McClanahan, Secretary
Syed Rob
Claudette Robinson
Warren Smith, Assistant Secretary
Nathan Vinson

Also present:

Ron Wuerth – Planning Director
Michelle Katopodes – Planner I
Elizabeth Saavedra – Planner Aide
Annette Gattari-Ross - Assistant City Attorney
Megan O'Brien - Communications Department

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Howard called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Chair Howard – We did receive Commissioner Pryor's letter of resignation is that correct Mr. Wuerth?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Yes that is my understanding.

Chair Howard – So we are going to excuse him on this evening I would and then we'll look for that official letter.

MOTION:

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

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION:

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

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – October 24th, 2016

MOTION:

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

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Chair Howard – As I've indicated before this is the ministry that I belong to so I will recuse myself and I will now offer the chair into the hands of Mr. Vice Chair who will go forward with items number A and B and then I will return for item number six C.

- A. RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING RELIGIOUS FACILITY: Located on the southwest corner of Schoenherr Road and Masonic Blvd; 31731 Schoenherr Road; Section 2; Andre Cast, Life Application Ministries (Tiffany J. Lenman, Neikirk Engineering). Reconsideration requests regarding approval of site plan for building addition to existing religious facility and moving some items as a public hearing item to an old business item on the October 24, 2016 agenda. **3rd TABLE.**

Vice Chair Kupiec – This was a reconsideration of an item that was in dispute from last meeting.

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – If you'd like Mr. Chair I can explain to you the reconsideration procedure since it's not a common practice with respect to this Commission.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Yes, please.

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – Pursuant to your bylaws this Commission has a right to reconsider. So a reconsideration was filed, so under 6A what happens is if somebody makes a motion to

reconsider the item and there is support then there could be discussion or debate regarding the reconsideration.

If this body decides to reconsider the matter by a vote of the majority then basically what action was taken previously, which was approval of a site plan that action would be null and void and then it's like starting over again. So it's like whatever decision you made it's just void and you start over again that's for the first item. So if the majority of this Board decides that then the next decision is how you're going to procedurally handle the matter. If you are going to hear where it was originally held at the old business or if you're going to consider placing it in the public hearing session that will be your second decision. First you have to decide A and decide if you're going to reconsider the matter and if it is reconsidered the matter and if it is reconsidered by a majority vote then the approval is null and void and you will reconsider that approval but then the decision is how are you going to decide that procedurally. Does everybody understand?

Vice Chair Kupiec – I'm sure we'll have questions as we go along.

Commissioner Rob – Just to clarify if I may, so the actually decision will be on part B for site approval?

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – Right now you have a site plan that's been approved, if by majority vote this Commission decides to reconsider that approval then you just start all over again. Then B will be where you place it and then you'll discuss how you're going to make that decision after you get through item B.

Vice Chair Kupiec – First we need a motion to remove this from the table.

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – No you don't have to remove it from the table it's not on the table. It was an approval so basically it's if you wanted to entertain a reconsideration somebody would make a motion to reconsider. Then there would be support and then you can discuss the matter and then take a vote on the reconsideration.

Vice Chair Kupiec – We need a motion for a reconsider.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Vinson to reconsider, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Vice Chair Kupiec – I personally was a little confused by what took place last week. I thought that the public would have an opportunity to speak and was advised later on in the meeting they were not, so with that I filed a motion for reconsideration.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes
Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – Mr. Chair, for the record the site plan that was approved is no longer been approved now it's up for discussion. So now we go onto item 6B.

- B. RECONSIDERATION REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING RELIGIOUS FACILITY: Located on the southwest corner of Schoenherr Road and Masonic Blvd; 31731 Schoenherr Road; Section 2; Andre Cassdt, Life Application Ministries (Tiffany J. Lenman, Neikirk Engineering). Reconsideration request regarding moving the item as a public hearing item to an old business item on the October 24, 2016 agenda. **3rd TABLE.**

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – Mr. Chair, to clarify, so what you'd be doing here if you make the motion to reconsider if this Board make a motion and support to reconsider it's a placement issue. Because the last decision made was to place the item into old business and there wasn't a public hearing held. If you want to reconsider that decision taking it from the public hearing and relocating it to the old business, which a public hearing was not held. If you decide to vote for that reconsideration it would nullify that movement and put it back in the place of the public hearing portion of the agenda.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Secretary McClanahan to make this a public hearing, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes

Ms. Annette Gattari-Ross – Mr. Chair if I may. Now we need to clarify the intent of this Board. You have now reconsidered the action. It appears the intent is you want to move it to the public hearing portion, however based upon the record that was reviewed it was a tabled item so a public hearing is not required but this body can suspend the rules. Once a public hearing is held and closed and then the matter is tabled pursuant to your bylaws you would need a majority vote to conduct a public hearing plus Planning would need to send out the notifications. So if you want to have a public hearing then I recommend you make a motion and support to do that. This decision was to move it to that portion of the agenda but even though it's at that portion of the public hearing section the last time it was decided it was tabled to a date certain after a public hearing was held. And pursuant to your bylaws you need a majority vote to suspend the rules to allow for a public hearing. And if you want a public hearing they need time to notify the parties that are within 300 feet of the property.

Secretary Smith – Mr. Chair we definitely want to get everybody's input on this and we want to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to know about the hearing so I'd like to make a motion to table this to a date certain.

Mr. Annette Gattari-Ross – I think you need a motion to schedule a public hearing and have notices mailed out to the public. For clarification, it would be a motion to schedule a public hearing on this item and have notices sent out to the people who are within that area.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Secretary McClanahan to schedule a public hearing on November 28, 2016, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes

Mary Clark CER-6819
November 7th, 2016

Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes

Mr. Dorian Cast – Excuse me I’m the petitioner I have something to say.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I was advised by the Attorney that in order to allow this petitioner to speak we have to suspend the rules.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Secretary McClanahan to suspend the rules, supported by Commissioner Karpinski.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes

Vice Chair Kupiec – The motion passed we have suspended the rules to allow this one person the petitioner to speak.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Dorian Cast – Thank you so much I appreciate it. Just briefly, I’d like to start by saying again as we have throughout the entirety of this process that we are empathetic towards and apologize to all in the community who have been negatively impacted by the current state of our building project. It was never our intention to have this type of impact. However, the opportunity that came about during our construction to purchase St. Shabel and its land were far too important to the long term viability of our ministry to pass up. Unfortunately, it appears that due to the negative impact of putting our construction project on hold that a fight against our ability to get these current plans approved again has become a proxy for some to voice their displeasure with past events and the current state. This is adverse as this does not serve anyone’s interest, it only further delays our ability to correct the properties current state.

We haven't had anyone in the position on this Commission or in the City government that could communicate this clearly to all concerned parties. And my opinion speaks to a larger issue that we are facing and that appears to be a trend that is happening with the governates in this city. We are in front of this Commission for the fourth time and being summons back for a fifth time for reconsideration of an item that has already had two public hearings, that has been voted on by this Commission, and approved unanimously with all members of the Commission present except one. Should be alarming to anyone observing these proceedings, all of this being done with no material change to the plan or the drawing. As such it appears that the angry crowd has subverted the process of governments. Everyone loses when reason, logic, and the process are discarded. I say this because there was no one on this Commission that approved it unanimously that can say that what LAM Christian Church is requesting is not imminently reasonable.

For us to continually be subject to this scrutiny can be described as nothing short of harassment and noting the cities engagement with Iona Group in the recent past we do not feel this is coincidence nor easily resolved. For this reason we request that this item be tabled indefinitely until the city hears from our legal representation. We will seek to determine who specifically has been responsible for this item being put in new business, how the city has allowed for this matter to continue to process outside of normal process. And we will seek to the fullest extent any remedy that is made available by Federal Court. We hold no ill will towards any member of the community whatsoever. Again, we do apologize for the negative impact that we've had on you all and our only desire is to remedy that.

The city governates politicizing an issue that only boils down to regulations and rules of which LAM Christian Church has shown ourselves to be more than willing to accommodate rules and regulations. More than a quarter million dollars that's underground in a water retention system that was designed by the city and the government. Deacceleration lanes anything that the city has asked us by way of regulation we have been more than willing to submit to. The process has apparently decided at the vast of many angry members of the community to continue to put the church on trial. We will no longer subject our church body nor the character of our Bishop Adolphus Cast to such slander, it is unnecessary for a man and a church that have shown themselves to assets of this city, allies to the Mayor, and advocates for the City of Warren.

It is unfortunate that we find ourselves in this place so again we ask that this matter be tabled, we do not wish it to continue further or

Mary Clark CER-6819
November 7th, 2016

heard by this Commission and we will have our legal representation reach out to the city. Please understand if you give power to the angry crowd you might retain your position but you will not get the power back. I know it was motioned to be heard at the next meeting but we do not wish this item to be heard any further. Thank you.

Vice Chair Kupiec – We will move on to the next item.

Unidentified speaker – Excuse me could I have a moment to speak too?

Vice Chair Kupiec – No sir this is no longer a public hearing. You'll have your chance at the end of the meeting during the public audience, right now it's shut down.

Unidentified speaker – Why would you let someone speak and not somebody else speak I don't understand that.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I've been advised you'll have an opportunity to speak in the audience portion of this meeting so please reserve your thoughts for then. Thank you.

- C. SITE PLAN FR OPEN STORAGE FOR TRUCK PARKING: Located on the north side of Ten Mile Road; approximately 240 ft. east of Easy Street; 14617 Ten Mile Road; Section 24; Joe Vitale. **2nd TABLED.**

MOTION:

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

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Joe Vitale – I spoke to Mr. Wuerth with the City Planning Department and we reviewed the recommendations from the city for our site plan. We weren't able to get them on the site plan in time for this meeting because there was some stuff that we changed. He told me to come to the meeting anyway so that's why I'm here.

Chair Howard – Could you tell us what your business actually does sir?

Mr. Joe Vitale – We are a concrete company we do residential and some commercial work. We store our equipment in the building we have some heavy equipment that we park on the lot.

Secretary McClanahan reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No Delinquent Taxes.

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

1. Parking and storage areas shall be hard surfaced with concrete curb and gutter unless a variance is granted.

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

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

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Smith – You met with Mr. Wuerth you said last week and you went over some changes do you agree with all the changes that you discussed?

Mr. Joe Vitale – Yes I do.

Assistant Secretary Smith – I went by the building it looks pretty good from what I can see, from the front, and everything it's a nice looking building on the outside.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I would make a recommendation that we make this a cash bond.

Chair Howard – Do you agree with a cash bond of \$600.00 dollars Assistant Secretary Smith?

Assistant Secretary Smith – Yes that's fine.

Chair Howard – Now sir you did indicate that there are some modifications that you are going to be upgrading on your site plan that's not complete yet?

Mr. Joe Vitale – Yes the stuff that Mr. Wuerth was talking about will be updated on the new site plan.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as followed.

Assistant Secretary Smith..... Yes
 Commissioner Vinson..... Yes
 Chair Howard..... Yes
 Commissioner Karpinski..... Yes
 Vice Chair Kupiec..... Yes
 Secretary McClanahan..... Yes
 Commissioner Rob..... Yes
 Commissioner Robinson..... Yes

- D. SUBDIVISION PROPERTY SPLIT REQUEST: Property located south side of Guy Court, approximately 292 feet east of Lorraine Avenue; One subdivision lot split into two parcels; 11050 Guy Court (13-10-252-036); Section 10; Mohammed Miah.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Ms. Tayaba Miah – Could I speak on his behalf I’m his daughter.

Chair Howard – Yes go right ahead.

Ms. Tayaba Miah – We are requesting the split of this property do to primarily the main reason of reducing our household expenses. My father is a retired worker and we have three college students living in the household including myself. We were hoping that with the split of this lot if you agree with it in the future we can build a house on it and have my older sister that way we can reduce the expenses that comes with maintaining the property and also reduce the taxes we have to pay on the property.

Secretary McClanahan reads the following correspondence:

TAXES: No Delinquent Taxes.

DTE: Each resulting parcel has adequate easements for electric utilities from the parcel to existing electric utility facilities. The customer plans to treat these parcels as division, not as a subdivision. Therefore, unless local municipal ordinances or existing electric utility facilities dictate otherwise, the customer will have the option of being served overhead or underground.

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

1. The legal descriptions shall be revised to state that the property is located within Macomb County instead of Wayne County. Also, the documents for the proposed split shall be signed and sealed by a state or licensed surveyor.

2. The driveway approaches on parcel "B" shall be removed and the curb and gutter across each opening be replaced.
3. There shall be a driveway approach constructed for parcel "A". Access to the existing garage may not be possible since the garage is accessed from the side of the house and the proposed property line does not leave enough room for standard driveway.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

PUBLIC HEARING:

Mr. Kevin Schneider – I live next door at 11078 Guy and I received notice of the split. I didn't know and I do believe at this point you're requesting that the house be built for family members. I have of course numerous issues regarding taking that piece of property, which is beautiful and large, and adding an additional house. He's going to have to deal with the City regarding that and the numerous conditions that are associated with trying to build there. Putting a secondary house in that area is going to be very complicated. This is on a court, the pieces of property that are associated, mine is a pie shape, his comes out and is very large it does have an in ground pool and a tennis court in the back. As for placing the property and a regular built house there the area itself doesn't really purport to the use of that.

Also the Guy Court area and that area in general is a relatively historic area for the City of Warren. These were houses that were all built in the late 60's and early 70's. There are 10 houses on the court, I bought specifically to be on the court, every single one of the houses are solid brick, and the houses range in size from 1800 to 4000 square feet. This was an area put together explicitly to be of an area where these houses were known to be a specific size, this is the area and this is how we want it to look.

My biggest problem at this point is going to be if we add any additional properties to this area it will take away the nature of the court. I don't believe that it's economically feasible, at this point, to add an additional driveway, to take out the existing in ground pool to build a house that's not going to come close to the 2000 square feet which is normal for the area, let alone to even have it be a brick house, which I know is far too expensive. The property is there and it can be done but just because you can do it doesn't mean you should do it. There are few areas in the City of Warren that are known as historic as this the Guy Court area, the Chicago Road area, and some of the areas off Masonic that are part of the history of the City of Warren. My family has been in the City of Warren since 1930 I enjoy the City of Warren and those individuals that

bought the houses and that will buy the houses on Guy Court do so for particular reason and that is to be in that area.

I'm concerned that anytime we come across adding additional houses, especially in today's economy, you just can't build the houses like they used to anymore it's just too expensive. I do have a letter from Ms. Herr who lives on Campbell, she is sickly, and she's objecting to it I will provide it to the Secretary. So for those reasons I object to splitting the property and adding any additional building structures in the area.

Mr. Joseph Hunt – Good evening members. The last gentleman that spoke, he did bring up some specific points regarding different neighborhoods in the city. There's actually 314 sub-neighborhoods that are assigned on the plat list. Whenever there are proposals that come before the Planning Commission regarding variances, or lot splits, or vacations of easement and such I always look and see whether or not that there's been a fielding of the opinions from the neighbors before this august body makes a decision. As far as the petitioners rights I always look at if they own the property and they want to make improvements and builds upon the tax base I'm all for it. And the real question before this august body as you weigh your decision is on whether or not the improvements are in line with the neighborhood values and qualities. If you go up to 14 and Hoover you see a lot of colonials and ranches if you go to Eight and Van Dyke you see a lot of old houses. Where this is being proposed in the actual splitting of the lot on whether or not this is conducive to the neighborhood and whether or not that the improvements that are being suggested if the bond is assessed correctly. I don't live in the neighborhood so I didn't get the notification but is this conducive to the neighborhood itself.

Ms. Kathleen Kosa – First of all I'd like to say I've never done this before I've never been to a Planning Commission Meeting. I am hard of hearing and it's hard to hear all of you up there down where I'm sitting. But what I've read in this paper that was sent out to us we are totally against any development in this property behind us. It's historic value back there with a creek that used to run through there. The reason we moved there 25 years ago was for this openness for this feeling of acreage in the heart of a big city it's wonderful, we want to stay there, it's great. Subdivision behind us will push us out. I hope you take that into consideration we've all enjoyed this land for so long we do not need any subdivisions back there and we do not need any more homes back there. The houses that we have are beautiful everybody takes care of them so please do not let this happen. Thank you very much I live on Lorraine.

Chair Howard – Before we go any further we do see Mr. Warner part of the City Council and also Mr. Cecil St. Pierre, who is the City Council President in the audience today.

Commissioner Rob – Due to a lot of recommendations and other things I think we should table it so the petitioner can have enough time to talk to the residents so I'll motion for a table.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to table until 12-12-16, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes
Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Chair Howard.....	No
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes
Secretary McClanahan.....	No

Secretary McClanahan – The motion has been tabled.

Chair Howard – We will see you back on December 12, 2016.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

None at this time.

8. BOND RELEASE

None at this time.

9. OLD BUSINESS

A. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR PARKING LOT EXPANSION FOR

PUD: Located on the east side of Davy Street, approximately 89.53 ft. Northeast of Chicago Road; 31630 Davy; Section 4; Michael Weigand (Robert J. Tobin). Approved on December 8, 2014. Requesting an extension of site plan for one year.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Michael Weigand – I'm the property owner we are asking for a 1 year extension on the property, I won't need that much time we had a little difficulty getting the meeting set with the Historic Society, we

are in the Historic Village of Warren where the property is located. We have all the approvals set and everything is underway but now we're fighting the weather. So we hope to do part of the work now and if we can't get it finished we will finish it up in the spring.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to extend 1 year, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Chair Howard.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes
Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes

- B. 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). Approved on September 8, 2014. Closed Out on October 10, 2016. Letter from petitioner to reinstate project for one year.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Earl Ferree – I own and operate E.J's Complete Car Care there, the owner is David Potocki he resides in Florida. Basically what happened was is the Board graciously granted me the application for the storage but somehow I didn't understand that I had to put up a gate in front of the dumpster. It wasn't communicated to me from Mr. Tobin nor did I receive any kind of notification. So it slipped through the cracks, it's not a big request from you. I will gladly do it I just didn't understand that I needed to do it. I was blind sighted at the end that you wanted a gate in front of the dumpster. I have other dumpsters around me that do not have gates on them so I didn't know. So I need an extension so I can put the gate up.

Chair Howard – Have you completed everything else regarding this site plan sir?

Mr. Earl Ferree – According to Mr. Tobin that was the only request that I had the repair of the wooden gate on the dumpster enclosure.

Secretary McClanahan – This is to the Warren Planning Commission from Mr. Ron Wuerth, Planning Director. The petitioners above mentioned request to reinstate the site plan approval for an additional year is for the following reasons. Planning Commission approval was received on September 8th, 2014, Zoning Board of Appeals granted the variances on December 10th, 2014 since the project just recently expired on September 8th, 2016 instead of restarting the project the request is to continue and finalize the project requesting a 1 year extension.

The Planning Staff recommends that in cases when the petitioner or petitioner’s representative promptly notifies the Planning Staff upon expiration the Planning Commission may consider the request to continue the site plan for an additional period of time. In this case the representative sent a letter on October 17th, 2016 a few days after receiving the expired site plan letter. While there is a site plan approval process in place which spans 2 years a process Administrative relief may be appropriate when the petitioner provides a reasonable explanation for his or her inability to fulfill requirements within that time frame. It is also recommended that the petitioner provide the five copies of revised site plan and a \$150.00 dollar cash bond within 2 months of this approval.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendations of the Staff:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to reinstate the site plan for 1 year, supported by Commissioner Robinson.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

Assistant Secretary Smith.....	Yes
Commissioner Vinson.....	Yes
Chair Howard.....	Yes
Commissioner Karpinski.....	Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec.....	Yes
Secretary McClanahan.....	Yes
Commissioner Rob.....	Yes
Commissioner Robinson.....	Yes

10. NEW BUSINESS
None at this time.

11. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Mr. Larry Tadych – I live at 13539 Masonic across the street from the church. First I would like to say thank you for reconsidering this and letting us meet again. I'm confused about one thing does the petitioners comments have anything to do with our next meeting are we still going to go ahead with the 11-28-16 meeting?

Chair Howard – The petitioner has asked for this to be tabled indefinitely so whenever that item comes back forth the neighbors will be notified.

Mr. Larry Tadych – So we're not going to meet again?

Chair Howard – No sir.

Mr. Larry Tadych – Okay I just have a couple quick statements if I may. For one, I know the petitioners keep saying that we are against the church and we are not. The church I believe got what they wanted by moving next door and getting the bigger land and parking lot. We were okay with that we just want the box gone.

Second of all you can't have that and return it say to the building that used to be there I believe a day care and it was used for several other things. At the last meeting it was said that the petitioner had met with the neighborhood and considered and honored our request as neighbors and that never happened, he never asked us our opinions or what we thought. That was kind of evident by saying he was going to submit the same plans that he had five years prior. If the building has to go up what we have requested or what we would like is that the parking lot on Masonic be moved to the other side where there's plenty of property I think that would appease most of the neighborhood.

12. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Ron Wuerth – First on the list myself, Michelle and some of the Planning Commissioners went to Kalamazoo first conference I've been to with Commissioners at in probably 15 years. I hope that they enjoyed themselves, I know I did, it's nice to be around people that you're familiar with. Those that went I think got an understanding of what we as Planners do and how in-depth we get with subject matters. There is another seminar coming up it's called the Transportation Bonanza that's what they've always call it, that will be December 1st on Thursday. Michelle and I will be going to this, we always do, and anyone interested in going let us know and we'll set it up. This conference took up a whole week of my time.

We spoke with Najib Atisha he has a massive piece of property on Eight Mile Road that we site planned approved probably 1 ½ ago it has trucks on it and cars all sort of things for storage, it's an M3. He's been to the Zoning Board of Appeals a couple times they've turned him back so we meet with him to discuss his changes in his plan. One of his biggest issues it's a wall along the east property line it's lengthy, there are a lot of trees that are in the property line itself so it's a little difficult to work out but we will work on that.

We had a SEMCOG Forecasting Meeting, actually had I known I would have invited some Commissioners to be at that because it's for future. When we say forecast that's what it is it's like a weather forecast only we are trying to forecast the future of what development is going to be in this town. The Mayor attended that, he spent a good ½ hour just talking about the future it would have been something for everyone to hear. We had other staff there and others from the Assessing and Building Division just sharing thoughts about what the future would be just in general. SEMCOG was interested in buildings and those that could be coming up into the future. As an example we are still looking at Kroger's site plan at Schoenherr and 13 Mile so that's a future development they want to know the footprint of the building, where it would go and that type of thing. So we mentioned other places Meijer's is going up at Schoenherr and 10 Mile and a few other locations were buildings were going up.

We also talked about the Master Plan and how that should be taking place here. As a matter of fact we finally completed the review of the RFP the way we think it should be so we'll send that off to Craig Treppa the Purchasing Agent that will be on Wednesday. So he'll look at it and make any changes that he thinks need to be done from there it will start moving. I apologize for it being so late it just seemed so many things got in the way of it, but nothing is in the way of it now so we are on the move.

Secretary McClanahan – Congratulations to Michelle the big award winner. It was an honor to be at the conference that Michelle won the award at she did well.

Commissioner Rob – Congratulations to Mr. Wuerth I think it's been 19 or 20 years, I'm still confused why you weren't awarded. It was a good conference there was a lot of information and we get to see other Commissioners. I enjoyed it I plan on going next year if everything goes well and I encourage other Commissioners to join also.

Assistant Secretary Smith – I'd like to thank Mr. Wuerth and the City for allowing me to go, it was a great experience with a lot of information it probably could have gone on for another week with all the information we gathered. It gives you some ideas on how to look at things and since we are working on the Master Plan it gives us some input of things to look at that we hadn't originally thought about looking at so it was very informative.

Vice Chair Kupiec – You mentioned that Planning Bonanza on December 1st where is that located at?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – That will be located in Lansing so it's a drive there and a drive back type of thing. It usually starts about 8:30 in the morning and that will run until 4:30 in the afternoon.

Vice Chair Kupiec – The SEMCOG seminars how can we be advised of these and if they are available to us?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – We can certainly send notice to you. You can also go to the Michigan Association of Planning website and have them mail to you and they will give you those updates. I get them about three times a week updates on education, or meetings, or seminars, or conferences that are occurring in this area. So if you contact or send an email to the map group they will start sending those notices to you or I'll bring them up in the director's report as they come up.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Who is our representative to SEMCOG from the City?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – I think that's now Tom Bommarito he works for the Public Service Department.

Chair Howard – Mr. Wuerth how are we coming on the footprint for GM?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – A zoning district?

Chair Howard – That's correct sir.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Well again, as mentioned at the last meeting when we receive something from them there was discussion and they know they can come forward at any time, so once we get what they are proposing then we'll work on it. But anything like that it's proposing like a rezoning of that entire property so that will come before the Planning Commission. A two-step process, first we have

to amend the zoning ordinance to create a district for General Motors Technical Center. The second part would be to rezone the property for the Tech Center that's there.

Chair Howard – Well we are looking forward to it I know at the last meeting there was some conversation that the representatives from General Motors and yourself will be meeting soon.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Yes that's Patrick Doherty he's part of Smith Group he and two others are working on the document. I provided him with documents and examples of districts that we already have in our zoning ordinance that they could use as a boiler plate they can get familiar with the language and move forward with whatever they think General Motors could use and what would be advantageous to both the city and General Motors when it comes to site plan approval. Perhaps to some degree short cutting some of the process by eliminating the variances that currently slow down the process, so we'll see how that works out.

13. CALENDAR OF PENDING MATTERS

Assistant Secretary Smith – We got a copy of the bylaws is this just for our reference?

Chair Howard – If we could have a motion to receive and file those.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to receive and file the bylaws, supported by Secretary McClanahan. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Jocelyn Howard, Chair

Jason McClanahan, Secretary

Meeting recorded and transcribed by
Mary Clark - CER-6819

E-mail: maryclark130@gmail.com

DRAFT