CITY OF WARREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on Monday, March 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, March 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden, Warren, Michigan 48093.

Commissioners present:
Jocelyn Howard, Chair
John Kupiec, Vice Chair
Jason McClanahan, Secretary
Warren Smith, Vice Secretary
Charles J. Pryor
Syed Rob
Nathan Vinson

Also present:
Ronald Wuerth, Planning Director
Judy Hanna, Administrative Clerk Tech
Caitlin Murphy – Assistant City Attorney
Michelle Katopodes – Planner I
Christine Laabs, Communications Department

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair, Jocelyn Howard, called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Per Chair, Jocelyn Howard, she did receive a call from and excused Kelly Colegio, Ex-Officio, from the meeting.

MOTION

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob, supported by Secretary McClanahan, to move Item 6-I, to be heard right after Item 6-A. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - FEBRUARY 23, 2015

Chair Howard - Due to some technical difficulties in receiving those minutes in the packages, they will be approved at next meeting in April.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY: located on the east side of Ryan Road, approximately 521.96 feet south of Chicago Road, 31830 Ryan Road, from the present zoning classification R-1-C, One Family Residential District to O, Office District in Section 5; Brian Jilbert (Mohammad Qazi). **TABLED.**

Chair Howard - This is a tabled item. They have requested that this item remain tabled until April 6, 2015.

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

B. SITE PLAN FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE OF LANDSCAPE EQUIPMENT: located on the northwest corner of Keifer Avenue and Ryan Road, 25161 & 25189 Ryan Road, Section 19. Ted Zimbo (Robert J. Tobin).

PETITIONER'S PORTION:
Mr. Tobin - This is a large landscaping company site of 1.26 acres at the corner of Ryan Road and Keifer Avenue, just north of Ten Mile Road. Keifer Avenue comes to a dead end 120 ft. west of this property, so, if you'll understand it, part of our property is on a dead end street. The site is zoned M-2 as are additional properties to the north, the west, across Ryan Road on the east side, and along Ten Mile Road. So this entire parcel is surrounded on all sides by the same zoning, M-2. This landscaping company occupies the entire 1.26 acres with a parking area on the north side for employees. At the west end of the site are concrete exposed bins that contain topsoil, sand, mulch, large boulders, and salt for winter use. The balance of the area contains 12 truck vans for grass cutting and 6 large trucks for hauling and tree cutting. That's all equipment that's available for a typical landscape company. This is a large landscape company, so you have a lot of equipment. Working with the Planning Department, we have provided a new 25 ft. wide x 3 ft. high, 75 ft. long, grass berm, along Ryan Road with 5 big Austrian pines on the top. This will provide a landscaping screening of the site, along with the area next to it which will contain shrubs and trees. This is an essential part of the landscape business; they have a lot of shrubs

and trees planted in the front also. The site also contains a 2,000 square ft. building, vacant building, not used. There is a 6 ft. high concrete wall along the west property line and the whole site is surrounded with a 6 ft. high chain link fence for security. The entire site was asphalt paved but there is a layer of topsoil and sand on the surface from many years of continuous use.

We have considerably enhanced the site with the new grass berm, trees, and landscaping and we request the Planning Commission to grant our request for outside storage on this site for landscaping equipment, material storage, and large, necessary, maneuvering spaces. There is one item -- we have complied with all the Planning Committee recommendations except Item 1(c) which is the asphalt paving. The owner has told us there is asphalt paving underneath that, but after many years of the landscape company, they have put lots of sand and topsoil on top of that. We would like the opportunity, when the weather is better, to expose that asphalt underneath there, if indeed it really is there. If it is, it will be fine; if not, we will certainly pave it with asphalt.

Chair Howard - Mr. Secretary, any correspondence?

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
ZONING: The following items do not comply with the Zoning Ordinance as follows: Section 17.02, the designated area shall always be hard surfaced. Section 17.02, further, the designated area may not exceed 50% of the gross floor area of the primary structure of the site. Section 17.02, in M-1 and M-2 zones, the designated areas shall not be located any closer than 75 feet to the front of the property line. Zoning variances will be required for the items listed above.
OTHER NOTES: The site data chart indicates a front setback of 25 feet. The required setback along a major thoroughfare in a district zoned M-2 is 50 ft. The primary structure is legal non-conforming located in the front setback. A Certificate of Compliance will be required to continue operating a business at this property. The proposed employee parking lot Is located offsite.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following comments:

1. Show the legal descriptions of the parcels on the plans.
2. Currently this parcel consists of 3 parcels. A parcel combination is recommended.
3. A system of internal drainage must be provided.
4. The existing fence encroaches onto the property to the north.
5. Clearly depict what is proposed and existing on the plans.

FIRE: Approved.
DTE: Approved.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Mr. Joseph Hunt - This property in Section 19 is in City of Warren Political District 1. I'm very familiar with Ryan Road. I, as a bicycle rider -- and looking at the site plan, just have a couple of comments. I'm all for the site plan, but I have some questions after looking at the map and the proposed site plan. Because there's going to be a berm that will be going and shielding the business from the passersby, I guess my question would be, because you're moving the fence back, on whether or not there's going to be stop signs that will be implanted for the landscape company, so that, when they are leaving their premises, that they basically yield to the people on the sidewalk. As you may or may not be aware of, with the recent snow, everybody's piling these big berms of snow right out across city sidewalks. And a lot of times, as a bicycle rider, riding along where all of a sudden a vehicle leaving a business does not necessarily yield to those on the sidewalk. I'm just thinking of basically children who ride their bike. This is a family neighborhood and perhaps, as far as the site plan, to alert the business or in some way have a stop sign to say "yield" at the sidewalk so that we don't run into any potential accidents, especially because it looks like this berm is going to be -- that somebody who is riding down the street isn't going to all of a sudden be conscious of the driveways off of Ryan.

The other thing I can think of, regarding the replacement of the sidewalk on Kiefer due to the tree roots, is on whether or not the Petitioner is aware that the City pays for 4 squares for free, that maybe the Petitioner, instead of paying for the whole entire cost -- I don't know if they have to go to the Sidewalk Board of Review, or the Sidewalk and Tree Board of Review, but the idea behind that, if they're going to have to replace something on the gravel street, that basically they should be entitled to their 4 free squares.

But I'm all behind it. I mean the idea is that it's shielding the business from the connector street, which is Ryan Road, but I'm concerned, as a bicycle rider, that the landscape trucks just don't blow by the sidewalk and hit, potentially, people, pedestrians, and bicycle riders, and that maybe a stop sign on the premises should -- or at least look both ways before crossing the city sidewalk should be considered.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Secretary McClanahan to remove it from the table, supported by Commissioner Rob. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Vice Secretary Smith to approve with discussion; supported by Commissioner Vinson.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - On the berm that the drawing is showing out front, is it in the long oval that has the 5 trees?

Mr. Tobin - That's right.

Vice Secretary Smith - And about how high is that berm?

Mr. Tobin - Three feet, so you can actually look over that 3 ft. berm, although the whole idea was to shield the traffic from the trucks that are parked there. As you see, it's along here; we put in 5 trees. And the owner is planning to keep his landscape area here, too, so we're trying to put all our landscape area and berm up in here. And, of course, all the things that was recommended by the Planning, it's a 8 ft. setback, move the fence back here, move the fence back here, we're very happy to do all that; it's a good idea and we think we have now a very viable site . Trucks are parked here; the big trucks are back here, and this is where all the bins are back in here. This is the building here, but the building right now, of 2,000 sq. ft. is not used at all; it's vacant. And we would have to go to the Board of Appeals to take care of some of the items, which we will certainly do. And I appreciate what Mr. Wuerth said about power washing, so we can find out if there really is asphalt down there below.

Vice Secretary Smith -- So the concern that there might need to a stop sign there really wouldn't be a concern because the berm is just in the one section there and all the rest of it is flat?

Mr. Tobin - We could certainly put a stop sign here, for sure, because, when the trucks come out, they will come out here. There's a lot of traffic on Ryan Road, so they would come out cautiously. They've been doing it for quite a while now, so it's something they're very careful of. We're closing this entrance on here and exit, so we only have one now to worry about. We could provide any safety measures you folks have in mind, be happy to come up with something; sure.

Commissioner Rob - Where is the square ft. that you're talking about, that the asphalt that you're trying to --

Mr. Tobin - The whole site is asphalted now. But years of being used by the truck traffic here, with the sand and the dirt and the clay, have covered that asphalt. There is asphalt underneath here; our survey shows that. But, nevertheless, the survey was done some time ago and meanwhile this area

is pretty well covered with topsoil, all kinds of things that a landscape company will be using. So we want to find out if there really is. If there isn't any asphalt left underneath there, we will certainly replace it like it was suggested by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, I have a question for you, please Can we have your input in regards to number 1(c), what you think about it, because it's talking about a whole area has to be newly asphalt; am I right? You are talking about new asphalt?

Mr. Wuerth - I modified it in my presentation here for the recommendation, but I just assumed that we could power wash it; maybe something else can be added if the asphalt doesn't exist, and they have to provide new. Is that what you're looking for?

Commissioner Rob - Like, from an audience point of view, are we going outside the rules if we --

Mr. Wuerth - If what, if it's left gravel?

Commissioner Rob - Yes, if it's left like that.

Mr. Wuerth: If it's left like that, then they should -- and they want it to stay that way, then it would require a variance for gravel, a gravel surface, or whatever surface there is. But it is required to be asphalt.

Commissioner Rob - And they're going to Variance anyway, am I right, for other things?

Mr. Wuerth - They're going for that. I don't know -- are you scheduled for this coming Wednesday, ZBA?

Mr. Tobin - No, no.

Mr. Wuerth - You're not yet?

Mr. Tobin - No, no. I wanted to see what I could work out tonight.

Mr. Wuerth - Then you could set that up, I guess, but what does the Petitioner want to do? If there's no asphalt, do they want to leave the surface the way it is?

Mr. Tobin - I haven't talked to them. I'm sorry, but I can't answer.

Chair Howard - To the Petitioner, Mr. Tobin, there are a couple of items here regarding a bond amount. Are you comfortable with the $2,100.00 bond?

Mr. Tobin - Yes. I would like to explain what happened there. Apparently -- it is my fault. When I was filling out the application, I left it blank, meaning to get back to it and fill it out, and I forgot to do it. So it wasn't anything we did on purpose, just something done on my part that I didn't finish. Naturally, it's certainly more than $0, and I think Mr. Wuerth is correct with about $70,00.00 is about the correct amount; yes.

Chair Howard: To the maker of the motion, Mr. Smith, would you like to amend the motion for the bond to be $2,100.00, sir?

Vice Secretary Smith - Yes, that's fine.

Chair Howard - Mr. Vinson, do you comply?

Commissioner Vinson - Yes.

Chair Howard - That was a motion by Vice Secretary Smith and it was supported by Commissioner Vinson.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes

Chair Howard - Just a couple of housekeeping issues. First, to the Petitioners in the office, we are missing two Commissioners on this evening. You do have the right to have a full Board or you can take the decision of this Committee on this evening. If you would like your item tabled until we have a full quorum, or a full body, that is your right to do so. Otherwise, we'll proceed with our decisions on this evening.

I do need to have -- I know we did it at the beginning of our Public Hearing, had a motion to have Item 6-I up; I just need a voice vote to move Item 6-I up to after 6-B. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

I. APPROVAL OF PARKS & RECREATION MASTER PLAN: Henry Bowman, Parks and Recreation Director.

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Bowman - I also have with me, Ralph Nunez from Team 4 Community, who helped us do the plan. And we have a short power point presentation we'd like to show everybody, and as soon as Ralph is ready, I'll have him narrate it. But the Team 4 Community did a wonderful job with the project, and we were lucky to have them.

Mr. Nunez: - My name is Ralph Nunez; I am principal of Team 4 Community, as well as Design Team+, two companies that we have. I'm a landscape architect and a land planner. I've been working in Michigan since about 1990; my wife's from Michigan. My partner grew up in Warren; his daughter is still in high school here, and he's on the Historic Commission, as well.

I'd really like to first thank Henry and his entire staff working with us on this project, as well as City Planning, when we needed their assistance on this project. They've been just up front with the information, very helpful, so I really want to thank them.

The presentation we have is -- what you're seeing before you was sections of the original presentation that was done, as far as the original report, that I have before you, which was this monster, several inches of documents. And what we were to do is to revise that and also look at how to streamline it, basically make it more user friendly. One of the problems that we had when reviewing the original City Recreation Master Plan was, in order to find any information on one of the parks, you had to go through five different searches throughout the book to just find the information on one park. And so we consolidated it, we refined it, it's more user friendly, it's a lot easier to carry around. So these are the two books side-by-side as far as comparison. We feel that it's a lot more convenient for the Parks and Recreation Department, as well as anyone who is looking for information on all the valuable parks within the city.

What we ended up doing is we had to meet DEQ requirements, as far as to make sure that it met for future grant applications. So there's a checklist on the left-hand side as far as what DEQ's looking for, and on the right-hand side is the contents and where those items have all been addressed.

You have the Master Plan right now, as far the overall Park Plan, which we have in front of us, as well. And basically it breaks down the community parks, the neighborhood parks, indoor recreation centers, as well as the schools that are broken down. One of the questions that came up before the Park Board are what are Special Purpose. Those are charter schools and religious schools that have been indicated on the map as well, as having some type of recreation associated with their facilities.

What you have now is a sample page of the book, and we do have some extra copies in front here if you'd like to go through it. But what we've ended

up doing was, as you open up the park information, you have one park is basically on both sides of the booklet. It gives you the name; it has its symbol as far as -- whether it's a circle, which is a neighborhood park, the hexagon is a community park. And then you have the park signage, you have the location in the city, as far as 1/2 and 1/4 mile radius as far as the service area, that is, the immediate walking distance to get to the park. It has the amenities, the programs, and the recommendations below that. On the adjacent side, you have an aerial photograph highlighting the features and the amenities of that, as well as the legal description, kind of the park entrance, the boundaries that exist, in a written scale. We have then basically the administrative structure and recommendations as far as in the back. One of the things that we looked at, working with the City and working with their GIS specialists, was able to ascertain a lot of the current demographics of the city and incorporated that, as well as local and regional information on trails and other park access -- or park activities in the region.

We did a number of workshops with the public. We also trained the recreation staff to continue to do additional workshops for engaging the citizens for their input throughout the entire process. And so those reports and the survey is also included in the book, as required by DEQ, as well as then just kind of the locations of what we were trying to do and have those throughout the city. And that's what we have.

Chair Howard: Well, it's very comprehensive.

Planning Director's report, Mr. Wuerth. We don't currently have any correspondence, so we're going to come directly to you, sir.

Mr. Wuerth: Thank you, Madam Chair. It's just simply; I'll read the recommendation. I had a review; it was a short review, because this is a wonderful document. I mean, you open it up, just as he said, to these various parks and it's all laid out there. And the recommendations in the back of the book are well worth looking at.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

Chair Howard - Mr. Bowman, would you like to add any additional comments?

Mr. Bowman - All I'd like to add is that the work we did with Team 4 Community and then our resident input, we brought in so many different groups, tried to find -- you know, we brought in church leaders, groups in from special needs, groups from each one of our facilities, so we were bringing people in from as many different angles as we could to get the most different type of responses. And we immediately look to put some of these practices into effect. As you would see in the book, that one group really

called for, and we had a few groups that were calling for this, that said, “Hey the comfort stations in the park are worn down, they need improvement, they need to be updated to ADA.” And we were given an opportunity, not only -- before the book was even published. We have already taken 3 of those comfort stations, at Shaw Park, Groesbeck Park and Wiegand Park, they’ve been totally redone. They’re due to be open this spring, all brand new tile floors, brand new dividers, accelerator hand dryers, and baby changing stations, in each of the bathrooms there. They’re absolutely -- they’re beautiful, if you can call a bathroom beautiful, but they’re very, very sharp. And I think they’re as nice as -- some of them are as nice as the bathrooms here in the Community Center. So I’m really looking forward to seeing residents utilize these in our parks.

Mr. Nunez - I would like to add that I did have to tour all the ones that we reviewed, so I really would appreciate your going and visiting these new ones because I’m sure they’re going to be spotless. But, while we were doing this, we came back from one of our reviews, we mentioned to Henry that there was graffiti on one of these structures and within minutes it was written down and it was going to be taken care of the next day. So your Department really, with limited manpower, limited funds, like all cities, is doing a major effort to keeping Warren Parks, Recreation, top first class.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Joseph Hunt - I’m an avid city participant, urging for a new City of Warren comprehensive Master Plan. I guess -- because this is a Parks and Rec Master Plan that is an update to the 2008 Parks and Rec Master Plan, which is conveniently located in the Planning Commission section of the website, I guess my question would be how soon this document can be scanned and uploaded to the Planning Department or Parks & Rec Department so that citizens, like myself, can actually review what you are approving. I didn’t have the opportunity to look at the booklet. I probably really can’t comment on it fully unless I actually take a look at it. I was not aware that there were any public input. I didn’t see any public notices that I was aware of, on the City website for input on this. However, I would like to find out on whether or not this Planning Commission intends on scanning the document and making it available to the general citizens. So I really can’t fully comment, except to say that, due to the urgent nature of creating an update, according to the Planning Enabling Act, in order to be eligible for grants, I’d like to have this document uploaded, hopefully, within the next week. And the reason I mention this is that Mr. Bowman mentioned the 3 comfort stations, that basically that they’re being rejuvenated in the south side of the city. Of course I am on the mailing list for the Community Development Block Grants and that involves the federal dollars that come into the city. There is going to be a public hearing at the City of Warren Council on the 24th regarding the expenditure of $275,000.00 for updating 3 comfort stations. And I think, by having this particular Parks & Recreation Master Plan available to me that

would be very helpful in advance, because I don't really want to submit a Freedom of Information Act request to the City, because that would cost like a lot of money, and it'd be delayed anyway, but I think that this is timely. I think that we're hearing the word "Master Plan" here in 2015; I would just like access to it.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to approve, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Commissioner Rob - I have a comment. I had a different opportunity to work with Mr. Bowman and I just wanted to say I really appreciate and give applause for what he has done and it's a great package. Thank you so much.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Just a comment. I looked over the booklet and the plans are very professionally done, very well done. I'm glad to see it done in our city; it's long overdue. And one of the concerns I'm going to express is the fact that, being a Planning Commissioner, we were not invited to any of your public hearings, and I think that that should have been done. But, anyway, it's a nice plan and I look forward to using it. Thank you.

Chair Howard - Mr. Bowman, again, I think I echo the sentiments of the Planning Commission in regards to this is an amazing plan, what you have laid, out, since that we are in the midst of constructing the City Master Plan, gives us a nice template going forward. You had several recommendations in the back that I see that you have addressed in your findings. And one of them was regarding the ADA. And can you just speak on that and how you came about dealing with those issues?

Mr. Bowman - Well, we do have new ADA requirements. And, when most of these recreation comfort stations were built in the first place, it wasn't the same ADA. So it's going to take us years and years and years to get through all of the comfort stations, to the point to where we can get them all to ADA compliant, but it will be something that we will work very hard at.

Chair Howard - Wonderful. And also, with your additional recommendations that you have, what is your time frame to actually implement all of these?

Mr. Bowman - I'd love to say that we'd implement them -- you know, all I can say is as quickly as possible. I cannot give a time line. Obviously, budget is -- for many of these projects and money is a big concern. So we do not have a time line at this point. We will be applying for grants; we will be utilizing this book to help us -- utilizing maybe a 25% match as one of our goals, and maybe we'll be able to get a lot more projects done because of

that. We're also going to be looking -- working hard with companies. And we've already started to do that through our Parks and Recreation Partnership Program where we can bring companies in and maybe they can help us meet our grant money by actually providing the seed money as the starting money. So that's something that we're going to be looking at also.

Chair Howard - And you did indicate that there were additional copies available, that Mr. Nunez has, that, if someone wanted a copy of the current Plan?

Mr. Bowman - Those actually are reserved for City Council; they were just brought here for me today. But the book is going to be available online and will be available in the office, if anybody needs; they're welcome to come in there. But they're welcome to view it from their home, or the library computer, whatever the case may be. I believe we can have it up and ready to go before the end of the week.

Chair Howard - Again, professionally done; it's an amazing document.

We just had one correction from the Planning Department, in regards to the Planning staff and some of our staffing that has changed. I'm sure that Mr. Wuerth will give you those necessary corrections.

With that being said, that was a motion by Commissioner Rob and was supported by Commission Kupiec. Secretary McClanahan, roll call.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . .Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . .. .Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commission Pryor . . . . . .Yes

C. SITE PLAN FOR NEW OUTDOOR STORAGE; located on the east side of Dequindre, approximately 29 ft. north of Bart Avenue, 23402 Dequindre, Section 30; Allan Saroki (Anthony Sycko). **TABLED.**

Chair Howard - We do have correspondence here from the Petitioner asking this item to be tabled until May 11, 2015. Do I have a motion to keep on table?

MOTION:
A motion was made by Commission Pryor to table until May 11, 2015, supported by Commissioner Rob. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

D. SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO AUTO REPAIR FACILITY; located on the northwest corner of Schoenherr and Eight Mile Road, 20855 Schoenherr, Section 35; Cal Maadarani (Jeffrey Graham.).

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Maadarani - Good evening, Maadarani.

Mr. Graham - Jeffrey Graham, the project architect. We're working on this project to enlarge one of the buildings on the site. The main reason for the addition is not to add a lot more additional service space, but actually to provide an area for our outdoor storage to now be -- the items in the outdoor storage area to be now taken into the building. And then what we would be doing is eliminating the outdoor storage on this site. We meet all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance with the exception of the setback of the building, which the addition is actually being built in line with the existing building. And the existing building never met the original setback requirements even prior, before Cal bought the building. We actually are on the agenda for the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval, and hopefully we can get a variance of that particular item.

I've gotten the response from the Planning Department and there's a number of recommendations, and every one of those recommendations is acceptable to us, and we will make sure that they are in full compliance.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
FIRE: Has been approved, contingent upon the following:
1. Build to the requirement of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Maintain existing fire apparatus access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 ft. of all portions of the exterior walls, as measured around the exterior of the facility. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of of 20 ft.
3. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by local ordinance.

DTE: Has no objection; however, the new addition will not extend on existing 20 ft. wide vacated public alley with DTE overhead power lines going in a north/south direction.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following comments:

1. Any improvements within the Schoenherr Road right-of-way shall be subject to the approval of Macomb County Department of Roads.
2. Topographical maps, including all existing utilities, shall be provided.
3. No encroachment of any portion of the building, including footings and/or roof overhangs are permitted within the existing easement area.
4. Any existing utilities within the proposed building extension must be relocated outside of the building.
5. Parcel I.D. 13-35-479-012 is missing from the list of parcels. Currently this property consists of several parcels; a parcel combination is recommended.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Joseph Hunt - I'm familiar with the facility. I think it's a fantastic plan. Any time I see building south of 696, improvements that increase the tax base and builds up the area, especially here in Political District 3, right off of the county road, I'm all for it.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Secretary McClanahan to approve, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

COMMISIONERS PORTION:
Chair Howard - You've been in front of this Board for several times. I drive by your facility quite often. You're doing an amazing job. It's nice and clean; you're keeping it up. Everything you said that you were going to do, you have done, and looking forward to you expanding right there on that corner.

In terms of your appointment before the Board of Appeals, the Zoning Board, have you scheduled that already?

Mr. Graham - Yes; it's for Wednesday, it's for this Wednesday.

Chair Howard - It's for this coming Wednesday; all right then.

Mr. Wuerth, are you comfortable with them going to the Board of Appeals on Wednesday and just proceeding as follows?

Mr. Wuerth - Oh, absolutely; yes, there's no concerns.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Secretary McClanahan .. . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . .Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . .Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . .Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . .Yes

E. SITE PLAN FOR OUTDOOR STORAGE TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING; located on the northwest corner of Miller Drive and Hollingsworth Avenue, 6811 Miller Drive; Section 4; J.S. Biondi Inc/Rob Neibel.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Neibel - Beside me I have the owner of the facility, Lee Bryant, and what we are here for today is site plan approval of a building addition. Basically it's a lean-to for outdoor storage. Included in that is also a chain link fence, fenced in area, with the PVC privacy slats. The reason for this is, about three years ago we built an addition on the south side of the property. Before it was completed, their business expanded considerably, took off. Part of the original agreement was to store the dumpster and their pallets inside the building. Since their business took off, the addition we built became full as we were finished, which forced the dumpster shortly thereafter back outside.

In the interim, because their business took off, the storage actually -- they have more materials. In turn, a lean-to was built outside to the north of the building. They were misinformed by another contractor who told them, because it was just basically an awning, that they didn't need permits. So it was built. That brings us here today. I'm the original contractor that built the addition on the south, which we did go through all the permits and everything was approved, so I'm here to help them.

What we're looking to do, because their business has expanded, they're forced to store these materials in the lean-to part of the addition there, which nothing is flammable; it's just potting soil, planting soil, things of that nature, dirt. There's nothing combustible there. The chain link fence, what that is proposed to do, that is in the center of the site, if you will, kind of tucked in the corner of the addition and the exiting building. And what that will do is alleviate the problem seeing the pallets and the dumpsters from the road. It's a 8 ft. chain link fence, so we can house the dumpsters in there and all of the pallets until they are picked up. And that's what we're looking for today.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
FIRE: Has been approved contingent upon the following:
1. Build to the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 ft. of all portions of the exterior walls, as measured around the exterior of the facility. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 ft. and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 ft. 6 in.
3. 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.
4. A fire hydrant shall be provided within 150 ft. of the Fire Department connection.
5. Provide fire alarm system if required by code.
6. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by local ordinance.

DTE: Approved.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following comments:
1. A legal description of the affected parcel shall be provided.
2. All existing and proposed utilities shall be displayed on the site plan.
3. The nearest flood zone is less than 200 ft. away from this parcel. The 100 yr. flood plan contour must be displayed on the site plan.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Joseph Hunt - This happens to be in Section 4 of the city which is also Political District 2. I go down this street in order to avoid the traffic at Fourteen and Van Dyke all the time. I'm familiar with the industrial neighborhood and I think that what they have going is fantastic, wonderful site plan; I fully approve it.

MOTION:
A motion to approve with discussion made by Vice Secretary Smith, supported by Secretary McClanahan.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Wuerth and to both of the petitioners, can you come up, please?

As I was going over the drawing, I notice the drawing that's on the monitor now, it shows the new portion of the warehouse. But on the L, the landscape part of the drawing, where it says "new warehouse," it shows

"existing warehouse." So the new building is where the canopy is at. This called for a new warehouse addition in the recommendation, but the new warehouse which is shown on this particular drawing is already there. What we're talking about is the other part on the back side where the canopy is at.

Mr. Wuerth - We're talking about it all, and they built it without any permits.

Vice Secretary Smith - So it's including both the new warehouse and the --

Mr. Wuerth - It's everything that's out there. They had no permits -- and let me go forward. They did come forward, once it was discovered, so they're doing the right thing. But that's the issue here, and it's really end issue. We accept what they're doing. But they do need that ZBA action. If they don't get that, then it's a problem. But I don't disagree with it. Fire trucks can get to it from the other property. We looked at that and considered those issues. But, as far as what they've done, that's why the recommendation is as you see it.

Vice Secretary Smith - The other question is, on the drawing it also shows the existing dumpster located inside the building. But it looks like, on the picture that we have, that there's a green dumpster outside the building. Is that the dumpster that's supposed to be inside the building?

Mr. Neibel - That is correct; yes.

Vice Secretary Smith - Because if it's outside of the building, it has to be in an enclosure.

Mr. Neibel - That's part of the plans here, our request, is the chain link fence area, to house the -- there are 2 dumpsters actually, and the pallets.

Vice Secretary Smith - So, Mr. Wuerth, we're going to allow the chain link fence to enclose the dumpsters, were the dumpster enclosure?

Mr. Wuerth - I guess I didn't quite pick that up. It wasn't clear; I did not notice it there. I only noticed what our pictures show. It cannot be 8 ft, it's got to be 6 ft., it can't go any higher. And you're going to have to put slats in this.

Mr. Neibel - Yes, we have privacy slats.

Mr. Wuerth - And how many dumpsters; do you expect more?

Mr. Neibel - Just the 2 that they have now.

Mr. Wuerth - As long as it has the slats in there, and it's along the truck well that's on the south side of that building, that appears to be acceptable. They're going to put slats in there. But that needs to be on our site plan, not on a landscape plan. That's not a proper place for that.

Chair Howard - So, Mr. Wuerth, do you want to add something to Item 1(g), would you like to make --

Mr. Wuerth - 1(g) yes. So, anyway, trash enclosure to be located within the 6 ft. high chain link fence square that's next to the warehouse addition and the loading area, with slats on all sides, screening slats. And that should take care of that.

Chair Howard - Now to the makers of the motion, that was Vice Secretary Smith and Secretary McClanahan, do you go along with the additional recommendations that Mr. Wuerth has provided?

Vice Secretary Smith - Yes, I do, but I still have a question about why we don't have to have a trash enclosure like most other places have to have it, with the dumpsters outside? Why are they allowed to just do the fence with the slats?

Mr. Wuerth - Because of their location. Not all of them are like that in industrial locations. Some have larger roll-off dumpsters that we allow that type of thing going on, so they're not all with a 10 ft. x 10 ft. concrete slab and walls, 6 ft. high walls. They're not all that way; occasionally we allow something like this.

Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, because there's a big space shortage for the parking, I think they're going to Variance for it. So if -- because they already have two variances on it, in case the variance doesn't -- suppose the Zoning doesn't go there and doesn't have proof of any variance, then what happens? Like there's a big space requirements for that one, so what are the alternatives on it, because they already build that one, so --

Mr. Wuerth - They need to provide it on the plan somewhere. And that's what we'll be looking for when they supply the revised site plans back to us. They have an enormous area there, frankly, as far as maneuvering. They could go anywhere along this south line. That might be where I'd suggest it, but, if they think in the middle here, and they can get around that, they can place it there. So it's just a matter of when we get the plan in. And we're not -- we don't object to anywhere there. That's why we left it up to them; we didn't get specific on where it can be. It's just -- it needs to be there.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, again, as the prior petitioner, they need to go before ZBA. Do you have a meeting time already? Are you going on Wednesday, as well, or have you scheduled a time?

Mr. Neibel - No, we have not; I was not aware I could apply for ZBA before I met you guys.

Mr. Wuerth - They are not scheduled, so they'll get scheduled; simple as that.

Chair Howard - Because, if we're going to encompass all of this within the plan, I think they need to go to ZBA as soon as possible and get all this sorted out.

Mr. Wuerth - Some petitioners are prepared to do that and others are not; it's just -- really that's their choice in something like that. It's not an automatic thing that they go the next -- the Wednesday after our meeting, although it helps them out, frankly.

Chair Howard - With all things being said, we do want to add the additional recommendation from you regarding the slats on the fence. And also,
Vice Secretary Smith, you had something additional regarding the garbage dumpsters?

Vice Secretary Smith - Yes, the trash enclosure with the fence around it, with the slats, they need a location on the drawing. And so that needs to be corrected.

Chair Howard - We want to move the location of the dumpster on the Site plan.

ROLL CALL:
The motion is carried unanimously as follows:

Commission Smith - motion to approve along with the changes -- as long as the changes get taken care of.
Commissioner Vinson - yes, to approve with the corrections.
Chair Howard - Yes, to approve with the corrections.
Vice-Chair Kupiec - Yes, to approve with the changes.
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . .Yes
Commissioner Pryor - Yes, to approve with the changes.
Commissioner Rob . . . . . .Yes

Mr. Neibel - One question, please? Will we receive correspondence on the findings from tonight?

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth should be able to provide those to you.

F. SITE PLAN FOR NEW CREDIT UNION CENTER; located north of Twelve Mile Road, approximately 812 ft. west of Mound Road, 5625 Twelve Mile, Section 8; Tina Dix (Grand Sakwa).

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Clark - I'm Doug Clark with the Case Group, and I'm the developer on the project. And we're seeking approval to build a new credit union on the site. And I have with me, Jason Covelle, who is our architect, and Mason Brown, who is the civil engineer, and Jeff Glaser from the credit union. And I can give you a little background on the credit union. They've been serving the Metro Detroit area since 1959. This actually would be their 4th branch. They're expanding into the area, relocating another branch which was in Royal Oak. And so it's a great expansion for them and certainly for the community. And I don't know if there's any other questions we can answer about the site plan or any of the items on it.

Chair Howard - Just give us an overview of what your proposal is, sir.

Mr. Clark - That's pretty much it, a new credit union on the site. If there's any other questions, I can certainly answer them.

Chair Howard - Sure, when we get to the public portion, our Commissioners will probably inquire some more.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
FIRE: After review, it has been approved contingent upon the following:
1. Build to the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Fire hydrants shall not be closer than 40 ft. or further than 400 ft. from any point on the exterior of the building. Distances shall be measured along the shortest feasible exterior route around the building.
3. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 ft. of all portions of the exterior walls, as measured around the exterior of the facility. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 ft.
4. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by local ordinance.

DTE: Approved

Mr. Wuerth - This is an excellent Plan. I don't know if you've looked closely at all the drawings. And the drive-thru, the two-story that they have suggested, the colors that they're going to provide. But I think it's a great fill in at that location in Heritage Village. And we're still looking to finish that out over there, but this going to help do that.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Joseph Hunt - I live right off of Twelve and Van Dyke and, before Walmart, I used to go to Meijer all the time. I thought that was great what Grand Sakwa did with that 312 acres, turning it into a shopper's paradise. What I was surprised about, the pictures that were presented, it didn't look like this particular area. And one of the concerns that I have, because this happens to be where, if you don't go in the first driveway immediately west of Mound Road, you have to make a real quick turn in. And, as Mr. Wuerth said, this particular thru-way that goes circulating around it, it's really a bad driveway. I don't think a truck, a 18 wheel truck, can actually go around it. I think that the idea of filling that spot is great, but I guess, after watching for years, and years, and years, you know, I go over to Verizon, the Smoke Shop, and to the Chinese place, that basically the issue comes down to the drainage and whether or not that there's adequate drainage in that area. Because every spring there seems to be a lot of water that accumulates. And I think that it goes underneath that road. And, if you go by it tonight, you know, you don't really have to, but, if you do, it's like a big pothole. My question, I guess, is on the plan itself, on whether or not there's going to be some separation on the property between the new credit union and of that access road, because people go in, and they fly down there. And I'm wondering whether or not there's going to be like those little teeny, tiny curbs in some way, some separation, between the property of the credit union and that road. I mean, the idea is that that access road is really dangerous. But, again, there's a lot of cars flying through there. In essence, I'm all for development of new plans, but my issue is, after watching it for many years, is on whether or not there's adequate drainage in that particular area.

MOTION:
A motion was made to approve by Secretary McClanahan, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Commissioner Vinson - I didn't get that gentleman's name to my right and your left. You're a member of the credit union; right?

Mr. Glaser - Jeff Glaser; I'm from the credit union.

Commissioner Vinson - I'll throw all these questions together, because he didn't actually mention any of them. What is your Cameo rating?

Mr. Glaser - Well, we're currently at 2; we just got our -- we just went up. It's not official yet, so I can't say it, but it will be going up.

Commissioner Vinson - That's good; the highest is 1, so, hey, the lowest, I think, is 5.

Mr. Glaser - You are correct, but I can't say.

Commissioner Vinson - What about your asset size?

Mr. Glaser - We're just over $20 million -- or just like $200 million. We were founded originally as a Parish credit union in Royal Oak in 1959. And then we became a community based credit union for the city of Royal Oak. And then in 2006 is when we expanded our charter for all of Oakland and Macomb County. And we've been looking for an opportunity to move. As it is, our original branch at Twelve and Campbell, used to be part of St. Dennis Parish, that's being redeveloped, and gave us the opportunity to relocate, as Doug mentioned. We're going to be relocating. Because we have so many members already in the Warren area, it made perfect sense, and it was just a few miles down the road from that existing branch.

Commissioner Vinson - You say "relocate," you don't mean getting rid of your old credit union and moving to this site?

Mr. Glaser - That branch will be closed as part of the development.

Commissioner Vinson - I didn't pick that up. So you're going to be transferring all employees over there; will you be hiring any?

Mr. Glaser - We anticipate it. We will be moving all the existing employees with us, but we're very hopeful to be picking up new membership which would then require us to have additional staff, potentially there, to help run the branch.

Commissioner Vinson - Now is Warren in your field of membership?

Mr. Glaser - Absolutely.

Commissioner Vinson - Good; that answers all my questions, and congratulations on your 2.

Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Wuerth, can you come up a second, please? I'm just trying to look at the drawing and figure out which curb you're talking about needs to be flattened out off of Twelve Mile. Is this where you're talking about, where it comes in off of Twelve Mile here before it goes to the south side of the building?

Mr. Wuerth - No. If you look at the site plan, look in the northwest corner. That's where I'm talking about. It's on the screen; take a look at what Michelle is indicating there.

Vice Secretary Smith - But that's not a driveway into the complex. Are you talking about wide- --

Mr. Wuerth - That's the service driveway; that's what I'm talking about.

Vice Secretary Smith - So you want to widen that curb?

Mr. Wuerth - That's correct.

Vice Chair Kupiec - To the Petitioner and Mr. Wuerth, while you're up, I didn't quite catch the name of your credit union.

Mr. Glaser - The credit union is called Our Credit Union, O-U-R.

Vice Chair Kupiec- I thought maybe, when you said "Our," I thought you meant the group standing there. But that's the name of your company; okay; thank you. And, again, you will be hiring some new employees, along with the transfers?

Mr. Glaser - Yes; we're definitely going to be moving all the current staff over with us and then the anticipation is, as the business grows and new memberships, new members, come on, we'll definitely have room for more.

Vice Chair Kupiec - How many people do you think might be employed in that facility?

Mr. Glaser - Right now we have, I believe it's between15 to 20, between full-time and part-time. We have a lot of part-time tellers and so it rotates. And so I would imagine that number would stay, would be closer to 20 probably, as we move forward. And, again, it really varies, depending -- because it's hard to give a number, because we have part-time, we have more bodies, because they rotate on.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And everything's been approved with Grand Sakwa as far as the land acquisition and the site; that's all taken care of?

Mr. Glaser - Yeah; this is our next step right here.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Mr. Wuerth, like you, I travel the area a lot, 6-8 times a day, and I'm very concerned about the width of the road, the driveway, the egress/ingress, onto Twelve Mile, and also the flood zone. That area tends

to accumulate a lot of water and I'm just surprised that Engineering hasn't said much about that in the findings.

Mr. Wuerth - What they're going to do, obviously, is they'll get the curbing in, in a proper way, especially on the inside at that -- and start draining that site in a better way than it currently is drained. And I know Grand Sakwa's worked it out; it's just a matter of waiting for someone to come and occupy the site. So that whole corner will be corrected drainage wise, I'm sure of that.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Well, good luck, gentlemen; welcome to the area. We look forward to seeing your operation. How long do you think before you might be operational? Any projected period?

Mr. Glaser - Well, I'm hoping 4-6 months would be fair. Our goal is to be in there in late fall.

Vice Chair Kupiec - And the old one at the old church there, St. Dennis, is closed down completely?

Mr. Glaser - Yes; the church closed down a couple of years ago; we're the one thing left on the property. And that's in the process of being developed itself into another building.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, one last time; I know that you mentioned in your prior statements about Grand Sakwa dealing with the drainage there. Is there any underground detention that they are planning, or are they just planning on leveling the property for proper drainage?

Mr. Wuerth - I don't have an answer for you; I don't know. I've never heard of any underground detention. My guess is it will just be handled in the standard way, through storm sewer.

Chair Howard - We didn't see anything regarding the Macomb County Drain in our recommendation, so that was surprising as well. So I guess they're just going to send it straight to the drain.

Mr. Wuerth - Well, I tell you what -- those are general statements that we receive from that department, or that division, I should say, and, once they come in for their permit, during that process that's when they get very detailed, our Engineering group does, and, if there's any problems, they'll solve them and have the developer make sure that they're corrected.

Chair Howard - To the Petitioner, I notice that you do have a drive-thru. What is your stack, as far as stacking, for your drive-thru?

Mr. Glaser - The stacking will be around behind the building, I guess it would be to the north of the building. And then there's 3 lanes. The 1st lane is strictly ATM, so there's -- it shows 4 lanes. The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th lanes are for drive-thru traffic, and then the 1st lane against the building is for ATM, as a drive-up 24 hours a day.

Chair Howard - So that's going to be a 3 lane; wow, that's adventurous. And how many cars can your drive-thru hold before you come back to the --

Mr. Glaser - You could easily get, I'd say, 3-4 cars lined up, which would be an extreme amount for us. I mean, that would be a very large number for us; it's not typical. But we could easily hold at least 3 cars lined up, queued up behind the car that was active at the windows.

Chair Howard - And your hours of operation will be?

Mr. Glaser - The lobbies are open 9:00 to 5:00, and the drive-thru is open 8:00 to 6:00 Monday through Friday, and then 8:00 to 3:00 on Saturday.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . .Yes
Chair Howard . . . . .Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes

G. SITE PLAN FOR SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR EXPANSION OF USED CAR FACILITY; located on the north side of Eight Mile Road between Albany and Syracuse Avenues, 5785 Eight Mile Road, Section 32; Majed Marogy (Kerm Billette). **TABLED.**

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Marogy - Good evening, this is Majed Marogy, owner of Julian Auto Sales.

Mr. Billette - I'm here tonight with the owners of the property requesting approval of a used car lot, an expansion of an existing car lot, on the northwest corner of Syracuse and Eight Mile. The Petitioner purchased the property from his existing used car lot, all the way over to the next street, and plans to demolish the buildings on Eight Mile Road, I believe there's 4 large buildings, and demolish these buildings to expand the car lot without expanding the building for the office and the garage for the used cars. The

building will stay the same as it is on the east side of the property. And he would request the City for the vacation of the alley between the 2 properties. Between the property to the north, we acquired a lot, and the properties on Eight Mile Road there's a 20 ft. alley. He's already retained an attorney to proceed with the vacation of the alley. The vacation of the alley would be necessary in order to tie the properties together and be able to fence it. He's requesting that the Board of Appeals, the proposal to fence it, to be closer to residential than permitted by ordinance, and to use the R-1-C for auto storage. And I think that one thing that's important here is the fact that he will demolish some very bad buildings on Eight Mile Road. The buildings over there to the corner were built about 90 years ago and they're in terrible shape. And he purchased these and would demolish the appliance store, which is a fairly new building, was built about 1970 or '72, and his lease is up for the building, I believe, in April. And they would expand the car lot and expand the fencing to match the existing around the property, vacate the alley, and store used cars in the 2 lots to the north. There would be no sales activity there. There would be only sales activity on the lot in the front and have an area for the parking of customers, as well as used cars, with a wide aisle way.

The proposal would cover approximately 3 months until the buildings would be demolished. The buildings to be demolished would probably start April 15th, as soon as he can a crew assembled and get somebody under contract to demolish the buildings. And, meanwhile, he would proceed with the application for the vacation of the alley, and attempt to get the site plan approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Appeals until that time. The site plan can be amended, as requested by Mr. Wuerth, to a point where the property would match what's there existing. The existing property is paved all the way out to the fence. The fence is out to the property line. And the existing entrances would be from the alley only and the one that's into the garage now on Syracuse, on the east side. The owner of the property is here, as well as the manager, and, if there are any questions about the proposal, they can answer.

Chair Howard - Thank you so much, Mr. Billette.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following comments from the Engineering Division.

1. The proposed drive approaches to Albany and Syracuse Avenues shall be constructed to meet current City of Warren standards.
2. The existing drive approach to Syracuse shall be removed and new concrete curb and gutter installed across the opening in conjunction with the proposed drive approach.

3. Any improvements within the Eight Mile Road right-of-way shall be subject to the approval of the Michigan Department of Transportation.
4. Internal drainage shall be provided. Detention may be required.
5. Existing DTE poles exist within the alley which is proposed to be vacated. Utility easements shall be granted, as necessary, prior to the alley being vacated. These poles will also impact the useable width of the maneuvering lane and the actual usable width shall be noted on the plans and shall be in conformance with minimum two-way traffic requirements.
6. The proposed parking area requires concrete curb and gutter around the perimeter. Also, adequate distance for vehicle overhang shall be provided around the perimeter of the site.
7. Along the southern face of the building there is a proposed 4 ft. gap between the bumper block and face of building. This distance does not meet current standards between pedestrian traffic and vehicle overhang.
8. The southern drive approach to Albany Avenue shall be eliminated due to the close proximity of the Eight Mile Road intersection.
9. Vehicles parked along the westerly property line may experience difficulty backing out of the spaces due to the proposed location of the wrought iron fence adjacent to those spaces.
10. Parking space dimensions provided do not meet minimum requirements for 90 degree parking.
11. Proposed handicap parking spaces shall be identified on the site plan.
12. The legal description does not match Macomb County Records. Parcel 13-32-482-037 is only lots 35 through 38. A parcel combination request may be required.
13. The maneuvering lane in the southeast corner of the site shall be dimensioned between the proposed parking spaces.
14. The location of the proposed trash enclosure shall be shown on the site plan.

DTE: DTE has no objection for the use of Lots 28-34 for the expansion of the used car facility, except for the 20 ft. wide proposed alley vacation.
DTE has utility poles and cables within that 20 ft. proposed alley vacation.
ZONING: The property referenced above is Zoned C-2 General Business District and R-1-P One Family Residential District. The parcel numbers are 13-32-482-037, -031, -032, -033, -034, -035, -036, -016.

Several variances have been granted for parcels listed above.

The following items do not comply with the Zoning Ordinance and will require variances to:

- Allot the expansion of an existing Used Car Lot into an R-1-P District.
- Allow the expansion of an existing Used Car Lot adjacent to an R-1-P Zoned District.

- Allow the expansion of an existing Used Car Lot less than 700 ft. from a proposed Used Car Lot at 20787 Mound Road.
- Allow hard surface for parking to the front property line and to the side property lines (north and south) as per plan.
- Allow 28 vehicles to be stored on property Zoned R-1-P as per plan.
- Allow Used Cars to be parked in a stacked formation as per the plan.
- Waive the required wall/greenbelt along the north property line.
- Install an 8 ft. tall wrought iron fence as follows:
  114 ft. along the north property line (25 ft. extends in the required setback.)
  160 ft. along the west property line in the required setback.
  114. along the south property line in the required setbacks, as per plan
- Waive 8 required customer parking spaces.

Other items observed:

- Unlicensed vehicles parked on Albany Street.
- Unlicensed vehicle parking in the public right-of-way along Albany Street.
- Sidewalk obstructed with a used vehicle at overhead door on east side.
- Maneuvering lanes in main lot blocked with used vehicles for sale.
- Vehicles for sale in other areas of main lot not approved on previous Site plan.
  (Approved spaces: 24. Actual number of vehicles for sale in main lot: 34.)
- No customer or employee parking spaces provided - customers have to park on the street.
- Spikes installed on metal fence.
- Dilapidated wood fence along Eight Mile Road.
- Dilapidated fence along north property line.
- Number of vehicles parked in lot at 20735 Albany exceeds number of parking spaces approved on previous variance. (Approved spaces: 13 Actual spaces: 23)

FIRE: Approved.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff with the exception of creation of new number 5, and that reads: City Council approval of the site plan is required. And then, finally, number 6, a performance bond in the amount of $600 is suggested here. Actually we have a note: The Petitioner did not provide an estimated cost of the project. The Planning Department believes that, due to the demolition plan, hard surfacing the lot, concrete curbing, drainage, and landscaping proposed on the site plan, an estimated

project cost would be about $100,000.00, resulting in a bond in the amount of $3,000.00.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Joseph Hunt - I believe the Petitioner's plan should be accepted. Several months ago, I came before this very same Planning Commission when another Petitioner had proposed an expansion off of Mound Road. I believe I said at the time, it's in the minutes, this is one of the areas in the city that needs a little bit of tender loving care at the corners. I applaud the Petitioners' ability to invest into the city, to expand their existing business, and, more so, to demolish structures on behalf -- instead of having the City come in and demolish these structures, that they're doing it on their own accord. As far as the vacation of the alley, it's not like it's being used anyway. However, they're willing to come into the city and spend money to, number one, expand their existing facility, and, two, get rid of some structures. And this may spawn and spur future development along Eight Mile, in an area of the city that I consider that needs as much investment as possible. So I strongly urge the Planning Commission to consider approving the Petitioners request for the Special Land Use Permit and the site plan, as well as, I know the vacation of the alley does have to go to Council. But they're going to do some amazing things here off of Eight Mile, and that will spawn development in the city. I notice that there were not any of the neighbors off of Albany or Syracuse here to argue against this expansion. But remember there is people that are willing to spend money in certain sections of the city, and it's up to this Planning Commission to weigh the options. But I'm all for this.

Chair Howard - What we have before us, ladies and gentlemen, so that we will know, this is a two part -- it's a Special Land Use Permit and also we have a recommendation to deny, for the following reason. So in your recommendation, please state your motion accordingly.

MOTION:
Secretary McClanahan - I kind of feel the same way the citizen just said. I want to make a motion to approve if they were to follow all of the guidelines here, and I want to see the neighborhood grow.

Chair Howard - So, Secretary McClanahan, you have a motion to approve?

Secretary McClanahan - Motion to approve.

Chair Howard - Is there a second for that?

Commissioner Rob - Madam Chair, I'm proposing something else, so I'm not seconding it actually.

Chair Howard - What we have currently before us is that we have a recommendation for a Special Land Use and we have a recommendation also from Mr. Wuerth to deny this current plan. We have the option before us to either approve or deny, and it's a two-part vote, to Special Land Use and also the site plan.

Secretary McClanahan - And I have a motion to approve.

Chair Howard - And Secretary McClanahan is stating that he has a motion to approve.

Commissioner Rob - But can we -- can I have an alternative option of tabling?

Chair Howard - We do have an option to table.

Commissioner Rob - I personally believe in the optimistic view; it should go to the Variance first. There's 9 variances required. If they go to the Variance and, if all the variances get approved, why not -- and comply with all the recommendations, I don't think it's a problem. So I would like to table and give them an opportunity to go to the Variance first.

Chair Howard - So what we have here is two things. We have Secretary McClanahan's motion as outstanding.

Secretary McClanahan - It's not been seconded.

Chair Howard - We have a motion here from Secretary McClanahan; we don't have a second. And then we also have a motion to table.

Commissioner Rob - Table until they have a variance from the Zoning and we can -- they need a new site plan based on all the recommendations they have.

Secretary McClanahan - I can support that. I'll take my motion off the table.

Commissioner Rob - That would make sense.

Chair Howard - What we have here, we have a motion to table -- our suggestion, sir, is that you go before the ZBA first to see if you receive all of those variances.

Mr. Billette - I had one question. If you might add to the conditions that Ron Wuerth mentioned, that the City Council has the approval of the site plan, and the bond is $3,000.00?

Chair Howard - Let me take a look at that, sir. That is right. We have a bond in the amount of $3,000.00.

All right; I have a motion to table, that was a motion by Commissioner Rob, and that was --

Vice Chair Kupiec - On that bond, since this was not approved, how can we approve the bond?

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, I believe the question from Mr. Vice Chair -- we have an opinion already from our City Attorney in that we're going to table this and then, in regards to the bond, when this site plan comes back, we will address the bond at that moment.

Commissioner Rob - I just want to clarify to the Petitioners where the steps going on, so they pretty sure know what the steps going on, what we are planning, what is the intention. If they know, then they'll understand. If you put all this money in fixing all these things and go to the Variance and didn't work out, it's a lot of waste. I think you better go to Variance first, come out with something. Then if you have -- if you come playing with a lot of teams, then of course Planning can come up with something, somewhere we will. And of course we want to see that built up around that area, so I think it will be a wise decision to go to the Variance first before you come here.

Chair Howard - What we're going to do, we have a motion to table. Do we have a date certain? Let's look at our calendar here; would April 27, would that give you time to go to the ZBA, Mr. Billette?

Mr. Billette - Yes.

Chair Howard - We have a motion to table, we're going to give a date certain of April 27th.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commission Rob to table until April 27th, supported by Secretary McClanahan.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith. . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes

Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commission Pryor . . . . . Yes

H. SITE PLAN FOR NEW BUILDING ADDITIONS AND PARKING LOT EXPANSION; located on Van Dyke Avenue, approximately 1,500 ft. south of Thirteen Mile Road, 3007 Van Dyke, Section 9; Charles Zablocki (General Motors)

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Zabalocki - I'm Charles Zalocki; I'm with IBI Group; we're architects and engineers in Southfield. And I'm with Norma Weingartz, who's with General Motors Global Facilities.

What we're looking at here, this is on the General Motors, Warren Technological Campus. This building is off of entrance 9, off of Van Dyke, and this is the old Chevrolet building. It's now called PPO. We're looking at an expansion on the east side, 132,000 sq. ft. expansion. It's mainly body shop. This is a kind of pilot, proto type pre-production body shop. And then we have a small expansion on the southeast side which is material handling. We have parking around the building, new parking on the south side, and basically a new front entrance to the building. This is a site that actually over a year ago they demo'd the office in front of the structure. It was a three-story office building that was demolished.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

FIRE: This department has reviewed the above captioned request and has determined the following provisions will be required.

1. Built to the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 ft. of all portions of the exterior walls, as measured around the exterior of the facility fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 ft. and a minimum vertical clearance of 13 ft. 6 in.
3. If required by the Building Code, the building must be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13.
4. Fire Department connection thread shall be national standard type.
5. A fire hydrant shall be provided within 150 ft. of the Fire Department connection.
6. Provide fire alarm system if required by code.
7. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by local ordinance.

MDOT: No objections to the above mentioned plans as shown, however, MDOT does not allow any additional water to be added directly to our ROW. If GM would like to do so, a permit must be applied for.

DTE: Approved.

Mr. Weurth reads the recommendations of the Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:
Joseph Hunt - When I look out my window, kitty-corner, I see General Motors. They occupy one square mile of Warren, and primarily they are Warren's largest tax payer. Anything they do is top notch, how could I say no, how could you say no; General Motors?

MOTION:
A motion to approve was made by Vice Chair Kupiec, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - To the petitioner, just a little question. What is a PPO body shop; I mean, what do they actually do in there?

Ms. Weingartz - PPO is a pre-production operation. So they do body shop work before we take it to the assembly plants. They do all their pre-testing there for General Motors. PPO stands for Pre-Production Operations.

Commissioner Rob - To the Petitioner, so your application estimated project is $27 million?

Ms. Weingartz - Yes.

Commissioner Rob - So you're talking about this project itself is $27 million?

Ms. Weingartz - Yes; it's a building addition; yes.

Commissioner Rob - Then $831,000.00 actually by Mr. Wuerth. Mr. Weurth, can you come up front, please? I just want to make a correction; you said $831,000.00, actually $831,000.00 here involved in the bond, am I right?

Mr. Wuerth - Did I make a mathematical mistake?

Commissioner Rob - No, you didn't make a mathematical mistake. I'm just trying to figure out why we lowered our bond from $831,000.00 to $100,000.00 and the actual project is still $27 million.

Mr. Wuerth - Because the key here is, when I said "exterior improvements." And so performance bonds are related to those type of improvements. There is an actual definition in the Zoning Ordinance that refers to those specifically. So it's proper for us not to ask for a bond that's the cost of the building itself. That's not looked at as that type of improvement. So, when I said, "exterior improvements," they are minimal. There'll be some

landscaping that's going to be placed in and around the parking lots and the drive aisles and things like that. That's what we look at as improvements. And it was my determination that $100,000.00 was appropriate.

Commissioner Rob - To the petitioner again, so, going back to the same concern. So, if you're looking at the exterior improvements, would you consider the estimate would be more than $3 million?

Ms. Weingartz - For the exterior improvements?

Commissioner Rob - Yes.

Ms. Weingartz - Well, there's parking lots -- the parking lots. I think it's about less than $3 million, because they're doing parking lot improvements and underground utilities.

Commissioner Rob - Because, if you're doing $27 million, then there should be a lucrative way, to see how much is for each section. So I'm trying to figure it out. So if you say it's below -- the exterior improvements would only be $3 million, and rest of the $24 million would be interior?

Ms. Weingartz - It's building, would be building, considered building instead of land improvement?

Commissioner Rob - So $3 million would be enough for --

Ms. Weingartz - I don't have the estimate with me right now, but most of the money is into the building itself, the cost.

Mr. Zablocki - You have building costs, you have HVAC for air handling units, power, and everything. So that's -- that would -- roughly $24 million. I would agree with you it's roughly $3 million for the site improvements.

Commissioner Rob - Mr. Wuerth, can I ask you again; I'm sorry. I'm trying to get a clarification on this thing. Can you clarify this issue? The building, when they're building up, it's not -- there's not a bond limit applies to that, the building, for the building itself?

Mr. Wuerth - The building itself?

Commissioner Rob - Uh-huh.

Mr. Wuerth - Not for Planning.

Commissioner Rob - You're saying total building, interior, everything?

Mr. Wuerth - I thought I explained this well enough. I'll do it again. The building itself, it's an improvement, but it's not the type of improvement that we assess a performance bond on; all right. The Planning -- not the Planning; the Zoning Ordinance clearly discusses performance bonds and what one can assess a certain amount of money on them. And that's what I've tried to do here is simply state $831,000.00, as applied to the cost of that entire development. You know, the $27 million, it's not appropriate to assess that kind of bond when actually it's the other improvements that are mentioned in the Zoning Ordinance that would be closer to $100,000.00.

Chair Howard - Thank you, Mr. Wuerth. I think pretty Commissioner Rob is looking at what the application says, as $27 million, versus a $3 million improvement where the bond would pretty much equal out to the $100,000.00. So probably some confusion on that end.

Mr. Wuerth - Okay; I didn't understand what's going on here.

Chair Howard - It's quite all right. I think we have some clarity now that we're looking at an exterior cost of about $3 million versus the entire project of $27 million.

Thank you, Mr. Wuerth. To General Motors, before you leave, thank you so much. We're going to vote on your item.

I had a question; I promise I had a question. With the construction, you are alleviating roughly 532 parking spaces within your -- within the building. Are you still going to have enough space for your employees to park where you alleviate 532 spaces?

Mr. Zablocki - Yes, we will. We'll still have -- well, it's 1,238 spaces available for employees around the building.

Chair Howard - So are these employees already existing, they're already on site , or are you bringing more employees onto the site ?

Ms. Weingartz - No, actually right now in that building we have 300 employees on the 1st shift operation, and 200 on the second shift, so we have ample parking for both shifts.

Secretary McClanahan - Do you guys foresee any new employees then, or is it going to stay at the 500 that you just mentioned?

Ms. Weingartz - Actually I can't respond to that; it would be GM Communications that would be handling that kind of information; I'm sorry.

Chair Howard - Now what we need to do, as well, is we need to approve the correction, or the recommendation in the bond. Commission Rob and Vice Chair Kupiec, do you support the recommendation for a $100,000.00 bond versus the $831,000.00?

Vice Chair Kupiec - As the maker of the motion, I recommend that we stay with the $100,000.00 bond as suggested by Mr. Wuerth.

Secretary McClanahan - It was Commissioner Vinson actually.

Chair Howard - I'm sorry; that was Commissioner Vinson.

Commissioner Vinson - And I agree with it.

Chair Howard - Thank you so much; that was Vice Chair Kupiec and Commissioner Vinson; you are correct; thank you, Secretary McClanahan.

And, Commissioner Vinson, you said "yes"?

Commissioner Vinson - Yes.

ROLL CALL:
The motion was carried unanimously as follows:

Vice Chair Kupiece . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . .Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . .Yes
Commissioner Vinson. . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . .Yes

7 CORRESPONDENCE

A Discussion regarding correspondence sent to City Council and Secretary, Scott Stevens.

Chair Howard - Yes; we did have in our package, and we do have in our package, a second request to our ex-officio, Mr. Stevens. There has been a call placed to the City Council office regarding this. Hopefully we can have a resolution to this issue by tomorrow, no later than Wednesday, on this particular issue. So I will take a motion to receive and file.

MOTION:
A motion was made to receive and file by Secretary McClanahan, supported by Commissioner Vinson. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

B A reminder to RSVP for the Michigan Municipal League on-site training seminar by March 12, 2015.

Chair Howard - we're going to have our City Attorney speak to this once again.

Ms. Caitlin Murphy - I'm just going to plug it once again. March 25th, 7:00 p.m., you're all invited. Please RSVP by March 12th or 13th, so check your schedules and call the City Attorney's Office, please. Thanks.

Chair Howard - We want to make sure that we are there. They are planning this very diligently, so we definitely want to be there. So that is Thursday, I believe, is the deadline? The 12th would be Thursday.

Ms. Murphy - Yeah, the deadline's the 12th. I did give Commissioner McClanahan 'til the 13th, so I'll extend that invitation to the rest of you. But please respond; if not, I will be calling you.

Vice Chair Kupiec - To the City Attorney, how has the response been?

Ms. Murphy - It's been good. I'm not sure on the ZBA side as much. And then I'm not sure if we've heard from any City Council members, but we'll see; they might just show up.

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

C Notice from the City of Detroit Zoning Board of Appeals for 3910 E. Eight Mile Road.

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

8 BOND RELEASE

A SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A LOADING PAVILLION ABUTTING AN INDUSTRIAL BUILDING; located on the northeast corner of Groesbeck

Highway and Fisk Avenue, 22534 Groesbeck Highway, Section 35; Walter Winkle (Vincent Cataldo). Release of $5,250 cash bond paid July 19, 2013.

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

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard.. .. .. Yes
Vice Chair Kopiec . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commission Pryor . . . . . Yes

B SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING, north side of Twelve Mile Road, approximately 272 ft. west of Ryan Road, 3665-3675 Twelve Mile Road, Section 7; Michael J. Gordon (Leonardo Ryan LLC). Release of $1,000 cash bond paid July 28, 2009.

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

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kopiec . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes

C SITE PLAN FOR DRIVE THRU ADDITION TO TUBBY'S RESTAURANT, east side of Mound Road, approximately 150 ft. south of Ten Mile Road, 24900 Mound Road, Section 28; Youil K. Ishmail (Krieger/Klatt Architects, Inc.). Release of $1,500 cash bond paid November 16, 2011. Work never done.

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

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes
Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . . Yes

9 OLD BUSINESS

A MINOR AMENDMENT TO APPROVED SITE PLAN FOR SEASONAL OUTDOOR SALES AREA TO PRODUCE PALACE, ease side of Dequindre Road, approximately 390 ft. north of Twelve Mile Road, 29300 Dequindre Road, Section 7; Produce Palace International (Kerm Billette) proposes to expand the size of the outdoor sales area.

Chair Howard - This is a tabled item; I need a motion to remove from table, please.

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

PETITONERS PORTION:
Mr. Billette - I'm here tonight representing the owner of the Produce Palace. Ms. Katz, who was here, the owner, and she got a phone call from her caretaker for her mother that there was some emergency, so she left, so she's not here. She waited all this time, but she had to leave.

This is in response to the petition to the Planning Commission for the approval of the site plan with the conditions. And I read over the conditions and I believe that I would comply with all of them except the $500.00 bond requested for site improvements. There are no site improvements to be made. The only improvement was to move 2 -- the last request was approved by the Board of Appeals except that the plans went back to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Appeals now for the inclusion of 2 vacant, or large, trailers at the east end of the -- behind the property. And we're in the parking lot. And it's required that, if these are to be permanent up against the building, that they require the Planning Commission approval. And that's the only improvement made to the site, so I would request that

the bond be reduced maybe to $50.00. But there are no site improvements to be made.

I agree with the recommendations made by Mr. Wuerth and all of the conditions that he has, and all of the rest of the items that are to be appealed to the Board of Appeals are to be made this Wednesday. They're the final thing, to the Board of Appeals. And I would submit the 5 copies with the requirements listed on there that Mr. Wuerth has.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
DTE: Approved.
ZONING: The Zoning Bureau inspected the property on January 27t , 2015 and the following items were observed.
1. Two semi-trailers stored along the south property line.
2. Cinder blocks stored along the south end of the building
3. Shopping carts buried in the snow along the east wall.
4. Semi-tractor and trailer stored along the north side of the building.

ENGINEERING: Approved.
FIRE: Approved.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion is made that this is a minor amendment by Vice Secretary Smith, supported by Commissioner Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION:
A motion is made to approve the minor amendment that just received recommendation for by Secretary McClanahan, supported by Commissioner Pryor.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Billette, question. I drove by the property today and I drove behind where the trailers are going to be. And the maneuvering lane, I was trying to imagine the 2 trailers being there. You said they're going to be there permanent. Now it seems like that's a narrow maneuvering lane to go back through there. There is a trash compactor down on the other end, and also there was some bundled, I don't know, boxes or whatever, all stacked behind there. What's going to be in the trailers, and is there still going to be other debris, or is that going to be in the trailers?

Mr. Billette - That would be produce.

Vice Secretary Smith - Be produce in the trailers. What about the other debris that's behind that?

Mr. Billette - It's rotated from the persons that deliver it, to the trailer, to the store, very quickly. And I agree with the $500.00 bond. Ron explained it quite well. It's due once and it gets refunded after the cleanup and so forth the first year.

Vice Secretary Smith - Now the semi-trailers that are on the north side of the building, are those going to be eliminated?

Mr. Billette - Those are trucks that are for sale, and they've been trying to sell them for about the last 6-8 months or more. And they did have a sales prospect for it, but it fell through, and they're still trying to sell them. Those are only temporary.

Mr. Wuerth - I thought there wasn't enough in the recommendation, and there isn't, needless to say. So three additional notes. I have to amend it. And they have to do with the semi-truck trailers in our finding that should have been bolded and called attention to. But anyway I'll read three more additional notes:

1. The size and square footage of the trailers shall be indicated in the site data chart. This additional square footage shall be added to the overall square footage of the site.
2. A note shall be provided stating "the existing semi-truck trailers located on the north and south side of the building shall be removed from the site."
3. The maneuvering lane along the east property line shall be indicated with directional arrows in a one-way system of circulation.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, on that last one, it was the maneuvering lane, one-way direction?

Mr. Wuerth - For a one-way system of circulation.

Vice Secretary Smith - What about the debris that's being stacked up in the back? The debris, the boxes, or whatever, is that something that's going to be -- 'cause don't believe that's going to be allowed to be back there. Is that going to be taken care of also, is that going to a dumpster, or the trash compactor, or what's happening with that?

Mr. Billette - I believe that the owner has already said that the condition of the one-way drive and back is strictly up to the drivers that deliver. There's some that deliver to the north end only, and some deliver to the south end.

But we can put directional things for one-way. Whether they follow it or not, that's their choice.

Vice Secretary Smith - No, no, what I'm asking is, the boxes and stuff that was pelleted, or stacked in the back, next to the building, they're not near a dumpster, they're not near the trash compactor, they're like in the middle of the building, is that going to be an ongoing thing to have --

Mr. Billette - No; those are only temporary until they pick them up. They're usually about 2 weeks in between picking them up. When they're stacked up, they get quite a few of them, they pick them up.

Commissioner Pryor - I would like to clarify that for you, Vice Secretary Smith. I was back there today and all the boxes are stacked and bound, ready to be picked up. It's not a trash heap; it's fairly good there. If they had anything there, you couldn't even walk or drive through it because it's pretty narrow. But that looked good to me.

And I would like to clarify, in the statement "widened sidewalk." Now I live in that area and there's a raised portion which I think is maybe called a sidewalk, where the cars park against this raised area. And now is that going to be increased, the width of it increased, or is it -- as it shows on the picture, it looks like it's pretty stable there. But, when it says "widened sidewalk," I don't know where that is, what's the sidewalk area they're talking about.

Mr. Billette - On the north side of the building?

Commissioner Pryor - Well, I don't' know. Is it on the north side or is it on the west side.

Mr. Billette - Well, the west side is the entire sidewalk in front of the area, in front of the building, to be used for the display. Except there will be walkways among the display, and there would be entrances from the parking lot still left open.

Commissioner Pryor - But they are not changing the width of that area?

Mr. Billette - No.

Chair Howard - And, Mr. Billette, you said that you were in compliance with the $500.00 bond?

Mr. Billette - Yes.

Chair Howard - All right; we'll just make that a regular bond. No one has an objection to a cash bond, the maker of the motion?

Vice Secretary Smith - No objection.

Chair Howard - With that being said, we're going to add three additional notes from Mr. Wuerth. Those are the size and the square foot of the trailer that needs to be on the site plan. The existing trailers must be removed, and the maneuvering lane has to be in the direction of a one-way system of circulation.

ROLL CALL:
The motion was carried unanimously, with the changes, as follows:

Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes

B. MINOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN FOR EXPANDED WAREHOUSE AND PROPANE FUELING STATION, west side of Van Dyke Avenue, approximately 1,058 south of Fourteen Mile Road, 32401 and 32501 Van Dyke Avenue, Section 4; Menard, Inc. (Thomas O'Neil.)

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. O'Neil - I'm Tom O'Neil with Menard's. I'm here on behalf of Menard's, obviously, regarding the site plan amendment. One thing that -- well, this is regarding our store generally located at the southwest quadrant of Fourteen Mile and Van Dyke that we've yet to open. One of the things I've always been impressed with at Menard's is the fact that we're continually reinvesting money in our stores and our operations, and sometimes we change our mind before we open the store. So, as part of that process, our merchandisers wanted some additional warehousing space. And so we have a little bit of an elongated warehouse on the very far western edge of our lumber yard area. Also, in addition to that, we've proposed to have a propane fueling station for the sale of -- we can fill tanks in a 4-5 parking spot area in front of the store. And, with those two changes in mind, that's the substance of our site plan amendment request. We respectfully request your approval and will be happy to answer any questions that the Planning Commission might have.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No delinquent taxes.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following:

1. The subject parcels have been combined and the new parcel identification number is 13-04-226-024.
2. The Menard's pylon sing cannot be over the existing storm sewer.
3. There is a flooding concern with the floodplain compensation area east of the Beaver Creek Drain. Either a shelf shall be created or an outlet pipe installed so that the potential of flood waters reaching the sidewalk is minimized.
4. The proposed propane tank may require approval from the State of Michigan under the Aboveground Storage Tank (AST) Program.
5. Engineering Division approval will be required for any proposed grading, utility, or site layout revision.
6. Any improvements in the Van Dyke Avenue (M-53) right-of-way are subject to approval by the Michigan Department of Transportation.
7. Any work within the Beaver Creek shall be subject to the approval of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the US Army Corps of Engineers.
8. A portion of this property is located within a regulated floodplain. All applicable federal, state, and county, and local requirements shall be complied with

FIRE: Has been approved contingent upon the following:
Storage, handling and dispensing of propane shall comply with Chapter 61 of the 2012 Edition of the International Fire code. Minimum separation distances from buildings, public ways, and adjoining lot lines shall comply with table 6104.3.
DTE: Approved.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

Vice Secretary Smith - Madam, Chair, do we need to make a motion on the minor amendment?

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

Chair Howard - Now I need a motion to approve this minor amendment.

MOTION:
A motion was made to approve the minor amendment by Secretary McClanahan, supported by Vice Secretary Smith.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - One of the things I was looking at was the propane tank out in the middle of the parking lot; well, it's not in the middle of the parking lot, but in the parking lot. And I was going to try to go up to the Clinton Township store to see if they had one out there, but I didn't make it up there. But most places just have a place where they sell the containers, and a truck brings them, and they don't refill them on site. Is this something that Menard's has done in other areas, or is this something new that they're trying?

Mr. O'Neil - This is something new that we're transitioning to. We have staff that is trained and certified in the actual refilling of the tanks. And some vehicles are transitioning to this type of fillable, larger, propane tank, as well, as far as utilizing that. And so this aboveground storage tank that would have the propane in it can fill the larger tanks as well. So it would be trained, certified, personnel of Menard, Inc., that would only be doing the filling. It would not be our guests at our stores.

Vice Secretary Smith - Another thing I noticed also on the drawing, it shows an emergency electrical shut-off switch. Is that as a safety if there's a problem with the refilling of the tanks?

Mr. O'Neil - Yes. This is not generator run, it's not -- excuse me, I'm thinking of the wrong thing. But, yes, that is exactly what that is for, is for emergency purposes.

Commissioner Rob - Just I have a question. When are you planning to open; what is the --

Mr. O'Neil - That's a $64,000 question, just because of some of these changes that we have sort of made on the fly. We were planning on opening about a month ago, but, because of these changes, some other ongoing things, that we are in the process of getting some variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals. We still have some interior mezzanine construction to do; we still have all of our fixturing and merchandising to do, so it's probably going to be summertime at this point before we're up and open.

Commissioner Pryor - Is it possibly that you can re-certify old tanks at that site?

Mr. O'Neil - I don't know the answer to that.

Commissioner Pryor - I just asked the question because I do have an old tank and it's in perfect condition. But could it be refilled, or how do I get it

certified? Do I have to go to somebody qualified for that? And I thought maybe he might have somebody on site that would do that.

Mr. O'Neil - Our staff is certainly going to be certified in the filling of the tanks by the gas company that brings the propane to the store. Whether or not that certification runs to that level, I just don't know the answer to that, sir.

Commissioner Pryor - I would like to see you do it, if possible.

Mr. O'Neil - Okay; I'll ask the question. I should know that.

Vice Secretary Smith - This is to Mr. Pryor's question. I know on certain tanks they have to be tested every so many years, because I have CO2 tanks and they have to be tested every 5 years. So, if someone brings in a tank, there should be a test date on it when it was last tested. And, therefore, if it's not within the range of the term that the test allows, then they shouldn't be allowed to refill that tank. Are the people qualified to be able to recognize that, you know, that's a possibility? They need to check the date before they go and refill a tank, for that reason.

Mr. O'Neil - The answer to that question is "yes." The certification process that we have, the team members go through, they will know that. But, as far as whether they have the ability to re-certify those older tanks, I don't know the answer to that.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, just briefly, and then we'll take the vote on this minor amendment. In terms of the bond amount of $100,000.00, I know the initial bond for Menard's wasn't just $100,000.00. Is there an additional bond that's here besides --

Mr. Wuerth - No, there's isn't. I thought that was their bond.

Chair Howard - The bond was only $100,000.00, sir?

Mr. Wuerth - Yes.

Chair Howard - I thought it was a larger bond amount when we had first --

Mr. Wuerth - I think it was lowered back when this was approved 3 years ago.

Chair Howard - So we're going to carry this bond over. I didn't know if we had two existing bonds out.

Mr. Wuerth - No, just one.

Chair Howard - Secretary McClanahan that was a motion by yourself and it was supported by Vice Secretary Smith.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Secretary McClanahan . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Pryor . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Rob . . . . Yes
Vice Secretary Smith . . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec . . . . . Yes

C. MINOR AMENDMENT TO APPROVE SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO EXISTING VIVIO'S RESTAURANT, located on the north side of Twelve Mile Road, approximately 60 ft. east of Ohmer Drive, 3601 Twelve Mile Road, Section 7; Mijo Alanis and Pamela Vivio (Robert J. Tobin). Minor amendment is to reduce the size of the building addition and provide an outdoor dining area in its place.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Tobin - On June 30th of 2014, we did receive site plan approval for this project, but meanwhile he changed his mind, to change the size, to reduce the size a little bit and change the addition that was for a banquet hall to be an outside patio instead. This is a one acre parcel and it's presently a 3,218 sq. ft. building in size. The restaurant is currently one large room, and the owner is proposing to add 1,046 addition to the east side of the building. That's the same thing we proposed back here in June. But the addition consists now of an open patio, 620 sq. ft., and a storage room of 420 sq. ft. So we're actually downsizing the project as it is. The new addition will be brick faced to match the existing restaurant. The building is set back 55 ft. from Twelve Mile Road, with a large grass area, 3 trees, 65 lineal ft. of shrubbery in front of the building. And we're required to provide 47 parking spaces, but we provided 57 parking spaces, so we have adequate parking for employees and customer parking.

Just a quick glance, so you can see what we're talking about. This is the same place we got permission in June. Right here the building came from here, is shown here in this area, instead of being part of the existing building, it's an open patio, which changes the parking a little bit. And this is the 57 parking spaces we've provided on site.

I would like to discuss one of the items. We go along with all the items that Mr. Wuerth has recommended, except one of the items - maybe I should

wait until after he makes his presentation or his recommendations, or should I go ahead.

Mr. Wuerth - Go ahead.

Mr. Tobin - Shall I go ahead; all right. One of the items that were asked for; we went along with all of them, was item number 2. The petitioner must provide a recorded document for ingress and egress across the shared parking with the owner of the property abutting to the east. It's talking about this piece of property here. This happens to be Lavdas Jewelry Store here, and between Mr. Vivio, the owner, Vivio, and the jewelry store, they had an 8 year verbal agreement that, if there's a problem, that he needs more parking at night, he can park here, and, if he has a problem here, he can park here. So they've had this 8 year verbal agreement. When I proposed that they go back and make it a written agreement for the shared parking, Mr. Lavdas did not want a written document as it would affect a potential future buyer of his property. So what we have here is a stalemate where they both want to retain their existing verbal agreement. So that's the only thing I can't solve with Mr. Wuerth's recommendations.

Secretary McClanahan reads the correspondence as follows:

TAXES: No deqlinquent taxes.
ENGINEERING: Preliminary review of this site yielded the following meents from the Engineering Division.

1. A grease oil interceptor may be required on the proposed sanitary lead.
2. The parking space as shown adjacent to a 5 ft. wide concrete walk appeared not to meet minimum depth requirements. Additionally, sidewalks adjacent to parking spaces and buildings are typically 7 ft. wide to allow for 2 ft. of vehicle overhang.
3. The parking space provided in the southeast corner of the site appears to be located on the adjacent parcel. Additionally, it may be difficult for a vehicle to enter the two southeastern spaces, if turning from the curved easterly drive approach and maneuvering lane.
4. The existing light pole within the sidewalk on the easterly side of the development may limit accessibility and use of the walk and should be brought up to current standards.
5. The existing 12 ft. diameter storm sewer may need to be relocated outside the influence of the proposed footings, foundations, for the addition.
6. Any improvements in the Twelve Mile Road right-of-way are subject to approval by the Macomb County Department of Roads.

FIRE: Has approved contingent upon the following:

1. Build to the requirement of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code.

2. Maintain existing fire apparatus access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within 150 ft. of all portions of the exterior walls, as measured around the exterior of the facility. Fire apparatus access roads must have a minimum width of 20 ft.
3. Emergency egress from the patio must meet the requirements of the 2012 Edition of the Michigan Building Code for the assembly occupancy.
4. Provide Fire Department lock box as required by local ordinance.

DTE: Approved.

Mr. Weurth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

MOTION:
A motion was made to receive this as a minor amendment by Commissioner Rob, supported by Vice Secretary Smith. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:
Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Weurth, just one quick question. On line 1(f), it says the total sq. ft. of 4,342, under parking required, shall be changed to 4,258 sq. ft., which is a lower square footage, but then we increase the spaces.

Mr. Weurth - I see that and it's probably supposed to be switched. We'll look into that and correct it.

Secretary McClanahan - Mr. Tobin indicated that on item number 2 in the Recommendations, he was not going to be able to take care of, Mr. Weurth?

Mr. Weurth - It is a legal document that actually supports both parties. I don't frankly understand Mr. Lavada's thought process when it comes to such a thing. If they begin to have a lot of traffic between themselves across that area, and the roadway begins to break down, then there's going to be an issue between the two of them as to, 'Let's see, who's going to pay for the maintenance; who's going to do this; who's going to do that." And it's wonderful that people can have a verbal agreement on things; that's kind of hard to believe these days. But I'm a believer in something in black and white. And that's why we provide it, we ask for it, and we'd like to see that.

Secretary McClanahan - Mr. Tobin, your response to that?

Mr. Tobin - You don't know Mr. Lavdas very well.

Secretary McClanahan - Yes, I do. I know him very well.

Mr. Tobin - He's a very stubborn man, and since last June we've been trying to get him to agree for something like this in a permanent written document, but he says, "I'm very happy with the way it is right now, with our 8 year old verbal agreement." So how to pursue something like this is difficult and I don't have any good ideas right now tonight.

Mr. Weurth - If I may respond? If in fact they don't want to do this then they have to close it, no more ingress/egress, simple. It gets closed.

Mr. Tobin - That'll solve the problem.

Mr. Weurth - So one or the other, that does solve it.

Secretary McClanahan - And I think he's a great guy; I don't think he's stubborn at all.

Chair Howard - We may have an opinion from the City Attorney.

Ms. Caitlin Murphy - I wouldn't say an opinion, but just a suggestion that maybe a conditional contract where they agree as long as they're still the owners of both properties. I don't know if something like that's been suggested, but then it wouldn't run with the land. So his concern about it encumbering his property wouldn't be, you know, because of the way the contract was drafted. You could draft around his concerns, but I don't know.

Mr. Tobin - We have really been trying since last June to get this settled and it hasn't been settled. And, as I said before, and I suggested the good suggestion that Mr. Wuerth made, "Let's close it unless you want to make an agreement," and that'll open that up right away.

Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Tobin, when's the 8 years up? They had a 8 year agreement; when's the 8 years up?

Mr. Tobin - I don't know. It's still in effect as far as I know tonight.

ROLL CALL:
The motion carried unanimously as follows:

Vice Secretary Smith, yes, with changes on the parking requirement. . . . . Yes
Commissioner Vinson . . . . . Yes
Chair Howard . . . . . Yes
Vice Chair Kupiec, yes, to approve but hopefully with some kind of settlement on this agreement and close it. . . Yes

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

D. SITE PLAN FOR AN OPEN STORAGE AREA FOR A WAREHOUSE, to be located on the east side of Hoover Road approximately 765 ft. south of Nine Mile Road, 22728 Hoover Road, Section 25 [sic]; Hadwin Warren Holdings LLC (Roberty J. Tobin). Extension of site plan. Originally approved on 3-25-13 and expires on 3-25-15.

PETITIONERS PORTION:
Mr. Tobin - This is a very unusual site on Hoover Road that we're discussing here tonight. It's long and narrow. If you can believe, the shape is 66 ft. x 572 ft., so it's long and narrow. And we had quite a problem with laying it out, even trying to decide what portion of it we were going to work on. We worked on the portion right next to Hoover Road. And we have received Planning Commission approval, that's one. We received Board of Appeals approval, we did that. We have secured the bond and we have completed the engineering design. Delays were encountered to solve all the problems and then the problems were solved by the Planning Commission, the Board of Appeals, and the Engineering Department, as well as we had a problem after. We went to all these agencies, and approvals, and back and forth, and talked to the neighbors, which was very important. We also had a very poor communication with the remote owner. So we, therefore, request a one year extension to 3-15-16 for the owner to complete all the site work, and it will be done by that time. But we do need another year to finish up the work. Obviously, we couldn't do any engineering work in this time of the year, but we will get our approvals, we'll go to work, and we'll finish it up if you give us this one year extension.

Secretary McClanahan - No correspondence.

Mr. Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff.

Chair Howard - And are you saying that they do have to submit a new site plan, or have they already?

Mr. Wuerth - They haven't completed some of those things, so it's just a matter of working it out between the architect and the owner, to finish those things so that we can move it on to the Building Division, and then they can get permits to finish up.

Chair Howard - And this is an existing bond that's already posted, sir; it's in place?

Mr. Wuerth - Yes, that's right.

MOTION:
A motion was made to grant the one year extention by Vice Secretary Smith, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

E. SITE PLAN FOR DRIVE THRU ADDITION TO TUBBY'S RESTAURANT; east side of Mound Road, approximately 150 ft. south of Ten Mile Road, 24900 Mound Road, Section 28; Youil K. Ishmail (Krieger/Klatt Architects, Inc.). Withdrawal of project, work never done.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, we're just going to allow the site plan to expire and withdraw -- no, the work was never done, so they're going to withdraw the project, sir?

Mr. Wuerth - I'm sorry; I wasn't listening.

Chair Howard - They're withdrawing the project, so they never started the work, is what we're saying?

Mr. Wuerth - That's correct.

Chair Howard - So they are withdrawing the project, not letting the site plan expire.

MOTION:
A motion is made to withdraw the project by Vice Secretary Smith, supported by Commission Pryor. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

10 NEW BUSINESS

A Letter to the Administration requesting Planning Director to be an alternate representative for the City of Warren to SEMCOG.

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

B BUDGET REPORT

Mr. Wuerth - I believe you have a handout in front of you that discusses the changes that were made to the proposed -- to the budget that was approved actually by the Planning Commission. And then that budget goes before the Administration where they evaluate what we're looking for and sometimes

make changes. And in this case they did make changes. Do you want me to read the changes, or do you want a comment on these?

Chair Howard - Yes, comment, sir. We can receive it and file, but you can definitely comment.

Mr. Wuerth - So, if you have any comments regarding these changes, voice them, but there were three changes

Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Wuerth, the mileage changed from $1,070.00 to $500.00; what was the reason behind that?

Mr. Wuerth - Okay, mileage -- I still don't understand what you want. Do you want me to explain what mileage is?

Vice Secretary Smith - Yes, and why such a -- why the change; I don't understand.

Mr. Wuerth - Oh, why the change. Well, first of all, mileage is when someone uses their own vehicle and they go a certain distance, they get paid a certain mile per mile. And I have -- apparently, they don't believe that our private vehicles will be used as much as they have in the past. Now one of the reasons is that we are provided a small truck that we can go around, make inspections. There was a time when it was all done with private vehicles. And, if we do go to different seminars and things, say, in Lansing, then there are other vehicles. We don't use that truck; it's not the greatest truck. So we'll use other vehicles to go to Lansing and back. So, therefore, mileage by private vehicle isn't used that much. I guess they assume that they could lower it to $500.00 that would be enough.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Mr. Wuerth, last year you turned some money back in, $8,000.00, some odd dollars, was, by any chance, some of that mileage? Do you remember it; do you recollect? In your analysis of last year's budget, you turned in $8,000.00 and some odd dollars back to the budget?

Mr. Wuerth - I returned $8,000.00?

Vice Chair Kupiec - You refunded it back to the budget, didn't use it, you wouldn't be using it for last year. When you gave us the budget --

Mr. Wuerth - Well, I don't have that information available.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I don't either, but, when you gave us the budget, you Had something like $8,000.00 and some odd dollars returned back to budget.

Mr. Wuerth - I don't have that information here. All I have is -- the only thing I was focused on were the three items that were changed from the budget. I don't know what you're talking about.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Okay; I guess the question came up, you know, why the reduction, and you explained it. Nobody wants you to use your own car, use a piece of equipment they have available to you, if it's available. And, if not, I guess you don't go. Other than that -- it's a small amount of money, but, nevertheless, I was just wondering if that was part of that $8,000.00. I guess I'll have to do some research when I go home.

Secretary McClanahan - Vice Chair Kupiec, it says here in the Actual, Estimated, Requested and Approved, in the 2014 fiscal year for mileage it was $256.00.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Oh, it was; okay. Well, we just received this and I haven't had a chance to look at it.

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, there is a promotion, we see, from -- to Judy Hanna to Senior Administrative Secretary. Does her functions change, as well as her responsibilities, or is this -- this isn't lateral, I presume?

Mr. Wuerth - No, it's not lateral. No, it would have been an improvement to her wage. It would have placed her at the same level that the previous secretary was at. And so it was natural to do that; she simply does everything that was done before. That happened to be Sherry Carroll. And so that's the reason that -- we put it before you, you approved it. They have decided that that promotion is not feasible at this time. But it's before the Planning Commission, and I'm just simply reporting to you. If you -- it's up to you, evaluate that.

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

C. MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE

Chair Howard - Mr. Wuerth, you're here again. We're going to speak about the Master Plan Committee.

Mr. Wuerth - Actually I thought you were. But I'll say a few things about it. Yes, we did meet certainly. I thought we had a very good meeting in which we did discuss some beginnings here going into the RFP. I did call Mr. Trepa, as I said I would. And he won't be able to attend our next meeting; however, he will write up a basic way that -- or a process and procedure that

he goes about providing the -- or how we go about doing the RFP. And it is RFP, not RFQ. That's a design by somebody else. You saw Joe Hunt here tonight. I have not talked to him as yet; I've been rather busy, so I didn't get a chance to do that. Mr. Smith contacted me today, and I can get copies of the original Master Plan to the Committee, so that everyone can take a look at that, see what the old goals were for that Master Plan, see what were met, what were not met, and certainly take a look at what we want to do in the future, because that's what a Master Plan is all about, the future. Also, I did talk to Kelly Coligio and she most certainly wants to attend the next meeting. And I mentioned we had this meeting; she's always been a supporter of the Master Plan, so she'll be invited to our next one.

Chair Howard - To the body as a whole, we did have our sub-committee meeting last week to discuss the beginning of the Master Plan. We did have some interruptions in our schedule initially when we first started working on this process. We think that we have a process in place that we can work with, having some small committee groups' start. As Mr. Wuerth indicated, we have Mr. Craig Trepa, who will be assisting us, who is from Administration, who actually does some of the buying and procurement for the City, who can assist us in this process. So we're moving along swiftly. We will be engaging City Council in the days to come, as we proceed. And so, therefore, we can have an unhindered and unfettered process going forward. I think it's an exciting time for us in the City. We've had some great ideas regarding the things that we would like to see. We're going to formalize those things and also somewhat scale those things down so that we can have great focus groups, invite some unique people in from the community, to kind of pick their brains. And then, forward, then we'll go into a more formalized fashion, bringing everyone in. I think it's going to be great. We meet on the 18th, if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct, Vice Secretary Smith?

Vice Secretary Smith - Yes, at 4:30.

Chair Howard - At 4:30 on the 18th, and the sub-committee will meet again to go forward, and looking forward to doing some great things.

Mr. Wuerth - It's important, Madam Chair, that we continue to meet every two weeks at the minimum so that this process --

Commissioner Rob - Madam Chair, didn't you have something going to come to our e-mail about --

Chair Howard - Yes; we're looking for a response back. We're going to reach out to Dr. Jacobs from Macomb Community College, he's the top economist in the area, the President of Macomb Community College, someone to speak to us about the economy of the region at the time and

what things we can look forward to, going forward as a region and also as a county, highly respected, as well as some other key people and then from there we will begin to formalize our process. We don't want to be too helter-skelter before we bring everything in, streamline everything, get a plan of action in place, and then go forward. But we thank Mr. Wuerth and also Michelle for the information that was brought forward. We saw some plans that we can review and somewhat get an idea of what direction we should be going in. So we're going to bring all parties on board. But the sub-committee is going to meet again next week.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Madam Chair, before you get off to new business, I have one thing that I'd like to interject, if the Commission would allow me to, just a quick question?

Mr. Vinson, on the commission of Commission Dinner, are we going to get a correspondence out, so we can respond.

Mr. Vinson - One is coming to each Commissioner.

Vice Chair Kupiec - Thank you, that will do it. Because I knew it was coming up in May; I just wanted to make sure everybody is aware of it.

Chair Howard - Yes, sir; thank you for that reminder again.

11. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

None.

12. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Wuerth - The report's not very long. I had a few meetings with people, as usual. I did attend the Mayor's staff meeting; that was on the 24th, along with going to City Council. And I had Michelle attend that with me, and that had to do with the Geo-Thermo Ordinance in which it was approved. Unfortunately, it didn't get notice. It was a lapse there, so it will come back before City Council one more time, once notice has taken place. That's what I was informed.

We did meet with Gardner White on Groesbeck; they've got a very complicated lot split issue and so we worked that out with Lynn Martin and Everett Murphy, in a discussion regarding that. I attended one block grant meeting.

Now, when it comes to our personnel, as you know, one of our planner aides left us, so today we went about interviews. And so we interviewed some candidates and we have chosen one; that person's accepted. And so

we expect that person to be working for us within the next week or week and a half. And we'll bring her to a meeting and you can meet her.

Chair Howard - Any questions? I know we mentioned, when we moved to the end of the agenda, if there were any questions that we wanted to pose to Mr. Wuerth, this would be the proper time to do it.

Vice Secretary Smith - Mr. Wuerth, we have a letter here from you to the Planning Commission. I would make a motion to receive and file on moving the Planning Director's Report to number 12. Do we need to receive and file this?

Chair Howard - Actually that is going to be item 10(a), and did I not do that?

Vice Secretary Smith - No, that was the SEMCOG.

Chair Howard - SEMCOG; for the bylaws.

Mr. Wuerth - It was -- you did mention it.

Chair Howard - So this is February the 18th; okay, so we'll have a motion to receive and file.

MOTION:
A motion was made by Vice Secretary Smith to receive and file the change moving the Planning Director's Report to number 12, supported by Secretary McClanahan.

Mr. Wuerth - That was an error, by the way, that shouldn't have been in there.

Chair Howard - It should not have ?

Vice Secretary Smith - Oh, sorry about that; remove the motion.

Chair Howard - So then we'll just take this motion off. We'll just have an extra sheet of paper. We will leave that here.

Let's see what we have; we have Calendar -- well, let's go back to you, Mr. Wuerth. There was something else we wanted to talk about. Oh, in terms of -- I think we mentioned this previously in my statements regarding a correspondence to the Council Office regarding our 2nd request to our ex-officio, so we're hoping to have some resolution of that, as I mentioned in my prior statement, by tomorrow, no later than Wednesday. I think we need that to move forward with what we have to do. Thank you for working

feverishly in getting someone into your office to help support what you're doing. I know you were down to four individuals and seeing --

Mr. Wuerth - I have to say, during the process of interviewing, there was so much going on out in the outer office, our whole staff was in doing the interviews, and we ended up with a complaint from the Mayor's Office because we didn't have anybody serving the public. So it got a little rough there, but that's just the point, we need the people. And so we're going to get one replaced and certainly we'll look at getting someone else also. We need them, and we need to get planning done.

Chair Howard - I love it, because, of course, our program, our packet, was quite full today. And I think that's just a statement of what type of business we're doing currently in the city.

Mr. Wuerth - Just a little, Madam Chair, and I think we can expect more in the future.

Vice Chair Kupiec - One more question while Mr. Wuerth's up there. I know we've already received and filed it, but, due to the fact that you are running shorthanded, and you are overwhelmed with work, do you really think you're going to have time to get involved with the SEMCOG?

Mr. Wuerth - Well, it's a pick and choose type of thing. There is a representative, his name is Shawn Clark. I would expect that Shawn will go to all the meetings that are there. I intend to attend meetings that have more to do directly with planning and transportation. And, as they come along, frankly, I've been going to them anyway. But it's just a matter of making it a little more official. At least it ties the Planning Director into the issue that SEMCOG's, their amount that we pay them, is in our budget. And there should be a relationship between SEMCOG and us.

Vice Chair Kupiec - I agree with your involvement; I'm just questioning how much time do you have in a day.

Mr. Wuerth - No, I do it already. It's just a matter of keeping track of things. They give me notices via e-mails, all sorts of things.

13. <u>CALENDAR OF PENDING MATTERS</u>

Chair Howard - I would like to say, and I want to thank this Committee, for all of your hard work. Trust me, I know it is now getting close to 10:30, but we have worked hard and very feverishly, and I want to thank you for your diligence and also for your commitment to what we're doing. Definitely we're moving forward with the Master Plan. And also there was the Rules and Procedures, and I want to thank Commissioner Vinson for suggesting

and coming, and the By-Law Committee, to moving the Director's Report to the end of our agenda. So thank you again for being very diligent with that as well, and also Vice Chair Kupiec.

14 ADJOURNMENT

That being said, I am going to take a motion to adjourn.

MOTION:
A motion was made to adjourn by Commissioner Pryor, supported by Vice Secretary Smith.

Chair Howard - Thank you and good night.

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 p.m.

_____
Jocelyn Howard, Chair

_____
Jason McClanahan, Secretary

Meeting recorded and transcribed by:
Sandra F. Sirovey, CER-3561
E-mail: ssirovey@gmail.com