

CITY OF WARREN  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING

Regular Meeting held on June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, at 7:00 p.m.,

A Regular Meeting of the Warren Planning Commission was called for Monday, June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Warren Community Center Auditorium, 5460 Arden, Warren, Michigan 48092.

Commissioners present:

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

Also present:

Ronald Wuerth - Planning Director  
Judy Hanna – Senior Administrative Secretary  
Michelle Katopodes – Planner I  
Nicole Ciurla – Planner Aide  
Caitlin Murphy - Assistant City Attorney  
Christine Laabs - Communications Department

1. CALL TO ORDER  
Chair Howard called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL  
A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to excuse Secretary McClanahan, supported by Assistant Secretary Smith. A voice vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.
4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA  
Chair Howard – One addition to the agenda, we will be adding a bond release making it 8A.

MOTION:

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

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016

MOTION:

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

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. SITE PLAN FOR NEW RETAIL CENTER AND RESTAURANT:

Located on the northwest corner of Thirteen Mile and Mound Roads; 5843 Thirteen Mile; Section 5; Nicholas Shango. **TABLED.**

Mr. Ron Wuerth – I don't see Mr. Shango here at this time. You have a choice to either table it again or to put it further down the line to give him a change to attend. I spoke to him today my impression was he would be here this evening.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to keep item on the table until July 25, 2016, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

B. SITE PLAN TO DIVIDE TRI-CITY PLAZA WITH FENCING TO ELIMINATE ALL INGRESS AND EGRESS BETWEEN EACH PROPERTY:

Located on the southwest corner of Thirteen Mile and Hayes Roads; 15078 Thirteen Mile Road; Section 12; Phillip Tayah, Jacques Chaptini (Kem-Tec Anthony T. Sycko, Jr. **TABLED 2<sup>nd</sup>.**

MOTION:

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

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Phillip Tayah – I was wondering if I could postpone this one more time because we are still in negotiation and my attorney who could not be here, he is out of town. So can we table this one more time?

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to table item to July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016, supported by Commissioner Vinson.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- C. SITE PLAN FOR EXPANSION OF JUNK YARD FOR M-97 CAR PARTS: Located on the west side of Groesbeck Highway; approximately 800 ft. south of Eleven Mile Road; 26395 & 26301 Groesbeck; Section 24; Jennifer Chupa (Robert J. Tobin). **TABLED.**

MOTION:

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

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Ms. Jennifer Chupa – Good evening I’m here on behalf of the petitioner M97 Auto Parts. My clients have gone through Zoning Board of Appeals for some issues. Originally Mr. Yousif who owns M97 purchased this business in the early 1980’s. This has been a legal non-conforming use for a long time, he purchased it from someone who had opened it in the 40’s. We had appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals back in 2014, prior to that it’s my understanding that my clients had appeared before the Planning Commission and had not filed their updated site plan. I have reviewed the recommendations from the Planning Department and I’d ask to correct that issue of not having filed the site plan in the appropriate time and that the Commission adopts the recommendations from the Planning Department.

I have discussed some of the issues here with my client already he is aware of the mesh on the fencing and that part of it has been damaged. It's durable but very light and the wind is very strong in that area and plays havoc with it. He will repair what he can repair and replace what cannot be repaired. He has indicated to me that he does want to be a good citizen and a good neighbor, he will follow the recommendations.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** No Delinquent Taxes.

**DTE:** Approved.

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

1. All parking areas shall be hard surfaced and shall have concrete curb and gutter around the perimeter unless a variance has been granted.
2. Any work within the Groesbeck Highway right-of-way shall be subject to approval from the Michigan Department of Transportation.
3. The site shall comply with the City of Warren storm water ordinance.

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

1. Must meet all requirements of the 2012 edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Maintain fire apparatus access roads. Fire apparatus access roads must extend to within the 150 feet 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 feet.

**MDOT:** Work in MDOT right-of-way will need a permit. The permit plans will require maintaining of traffic operations when lane and shoulder closures are required due to the proposed driveway work. The driveway detail and the curb and gutter are good, will review more depth once the permit is applied.

**ZONING:** Concerned about the separation of junk yard and parking area.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

Chair Howard – Mr. Wuerth that is being provided not being continued am I correct?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – That's correct.

Mary Clark CER-6819  
June 20th, 2016

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Vice Chair Kupiec – You're familiar with all the recommendations and you agree with them all?

Ms. Jennifer Chupa – Yes, like I said we did go through Zoning Board of Appeals back in February of 2014 and I do believe that they approved the expansion of the non-conforming use, the legal non-conforming use. What had happen is they owned a used car lot and an auto part salvage, the same family owned those two things. They relinquished their rights to the used car at that time and has since moved out of the city. Because they owned the two parcels connecting they continued the auto salvage.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Did you say there's been an ownership change recently?

Ms. Jennifer Chupa – No in the 1980's.

Vice Chair Kupiec – There seems to be a housekeeping problem with that particular yard.

Ms. Jennifer Chupa – That was before I came onboard, but I do agree I'm going to do everything within my power to make sure the site plan gets filed appropriately. I'm going to be contacting Mr. Tobin to have him make those small changes to the site plan and then have the copies filed.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Driving you can look through the front gates and see junk laying all over the place, it seems like a hazardous area for customers to walk into. And last the fence are you going to be able to maintain the fence?

Ms. Jennifer Chupa – As I stated once I became aware of these recommendations I did contact my client, he's going to have his guy working on the fence repairing the fabric and replacing what needs to be replaced.

Commissioner Rob – Due to some maintenance issues I would like to propose the maker of the motion to make the bond to a cash bond.

Chair Howard – Assistant Secretary Smith do you agree with a cash bond of \$1050.00?

Assistant Secretary Smith – Yes I do.

Vice Chair Kupiec – The only concern I have is that Mr. Wuerth stated in his recommendation that it’s a continuation bond.

Chair Howard – He actually corrected that, it’s going to be a \$1050.00 actual bond to be posted.

Vice Chair Kupiec – So it’s going to be \$1050.00 for the bond, yes I agree.

Chair Howard – We will make that amendment that it will be a \$1050.00 cash bond. Again thank you for being here this evening. Again I have visited the site and I agree with my fellow Commissioners the fence by far is one of the most troubling. The presentation originally was that the geomesh had a life span of 25 years with the fabric, I do understand it’s a thin fabric but I did not anticipate that all of the tears and rips would be there because we just approved that within the last year or two. So to have that type of injury to the fabric is a little troubling. I would like to add to the maker of the motion that this portion would be repaired within 90 days. I think that your neighbors to the north can see in and anybody else who’s walking pass shouldn’t have to see all of the activity that’s going on inside of the yard. Assistant Secretary Smith would you support a 90 day repair of that fence?

Assistant Secretary Smith – Yes.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I will also support that.

Chair Howard – An amendment to this motion, that the fence be repaired within 90 days. With that being said I believe everything else you have addressed and that you’ll be able to take this back to your client.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

- Assistant Secretary Smith..... Yes
- Commissioner Robinson..... Yes
- Commissioner Vinson..... Yes
- Commissioner Pryor..... Yes
- Commissioner Rob..... Yes

Vice Chair Kupiec..... Yes  
 Commissioner Karpinski..... Yes  
 Chair Howard..... Yes

- D. AMENDMENT TO APPENDIX A, ARTICLE XIV: An ordinance Amending Article XIV entitled C-2 General Business District, Sections 14.01 and 14.02 of the Zoning Ordinance relating to the Pawnbrokers.

Chair Howard – We did receive correspondence from our Planning Director wanting to have this item tabled until July 25<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wuerth do you want to speak to this item prior to us taking a vote sir?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Yes I would I can at least indicate to the Board the reasons at this time for the tabling. So I'll read the recommendation as it is up to this point.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendation of the Staff:

Chair Howard – According to our Planning Director and based on the items that he has presented to us currently he is asking us to have this item tabled until July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to table until July 25<sup>th</sup>, supported by Commissioner Pryor.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- E. SUBDIVISION LOT SPLIT REQUETS: Property located on the west side of Lorna Avenue, approximately 1,179 feet south of Twelve Mile Road; One lot split into two lots of Supervisor's Plat of Heath's Clearview Subdivision; 28505 and 28517 Lorna (13-16-201-015); Section 16; Parcel Lorna Corporation (Bruce Kopitz).

**PETITIONERS PORTION:**

Mr. Bruce Kopitz – That's my property I own through a corporation, Parcel Lorna, and we wish to split the parcel so that we can sell to another person that's interested in buying it.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** Property taxes delinquent in the amount of \$18,079.62 as of 6-16-2016.

**DTE:** Approved.

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

1. If the parcel split is approved, it will create a landlocked parcel. A joint access agreement/easement would be required.
2. The supervisor's plat of Heath's Clearview Subdivision shall be amended, if approved.
3. Existing utilities are currently being shared between the proposed parcels. If the parcel split is approved easements/agreements across the parcels will be required for the sanitary sewer, water main, storm sewer, and other public utilities (gas, electric, phone, etc.).
4. Legal descriptions and other corresponding documentation for easement dedications shall be provided for review if this parcel split is approved.

**FIRE:** Approved.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

\*\*Just a comment on item number 2: We received a copy of the ingress/egress and shared parking with the owner of the property abutting to the rear in our file from the petitioner and it appears that we didn't get everything that we needed. So we will look into that and get that straightened out.

**MOTION:**

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

Mr. Bruce Kopitz – Just a quick question. We were able to pay \$10,000.00 dollars of that tax bill today but it's going to take us at least another 60 days to pay the balance.

**COMMISSIONERS PORTION:**

Chair Howard – I was going to ask you questions about that because typically we do not move forward regarding a site plan unless the taxes are taken care of or there's some type of payment plan in place. Mr. Wuerth, based on the fact that he made a payment today

of \$10,000.00 dollars are you comfortable with us moving forward or would you like to give him the 60 days to take care of the balance because I know we can't forward this to City Council until those taxes are paid. What is your position on this sir?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's a fact it can't be forwarded until we get the whole amount, but if it's going to take the gentleman another 60 days the recommendation could be approved but it won't go anywhere it will stay with us until we get the taxes paid. So this recommended approval will stay good for I think a couple of years in this particular case it's like a site plan, but with City Council it's only one year if these conditions aren't met.

Chair Howard – Sir you're saying you need approximately 60 days to complete the final payment for the taxes?

Mr. Bruce Kopitz – Right, at the same time that this came about we were informed that our original certificate of occupancy had never been completed by the City, some problem with an employee of the City. So we had to file for a new one and that's many of thousands of dollars we had to spend that's why we are in our position.

Ms. Caitlin Murphy – We can proceed as a conditional so the Commission could either vote to table it and bring him back or you can recommend approval to City Council and know it won't get released to City Council until he has proof that he has paid the balance of the taxes. So it would be a conditional approval based on the conditions that Mr. Wuerth has placed on the record.

Chair Howard – Assistant Secretary Smith do you want to table this or move it forward conditionally?

Assistant Secretary Smith – I would like to move it forward conditionally because it is stated in the recommendation that this has to be taken care of before anything else can happen. And he's suggesting to do it in 60 days so I feel that's a reasonable time. I don't see any sense in tabling it, I think it would be okay to move it forward.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I support Assistant Secretary Smith to move forward. Mr. Kopitz you do understand that this will not move forward to City Council until the taxes are paid?

Mr. Bruce Kopitz – Yes we will pay within 60 days maybe earlier.

Chair Howard – We have before us the petitioner who has paid \$10,000.00 of the \$18,079.62 dollars he is indicating that the balance will be paid within 60 days. According to our Planning Director this is a conditional approval it will not move forward until those taxes are paid.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- F. SITE PLAN FOR OPEN STORAGE OF TRUCKS AND TRAILERS:  
 Located on the east side of Mound Road; approximately 1,750 ft. south of Ten Mile Road; 24260 Mound Road; Section 28; Ray’s Trucking Express, Inc. (Arthur Rose/Kerm Billette).

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Arthur Rose – This is our petition for site plan approval of open storage of trucks for Ray’s Trucking. We have read the recommendation of the Planning Department and most of these things have actually been done on the somewhat revised site plan that Mr. Billette is putting up. In fact the only thing that Mr. Wuerth recommended that isn’t done on that is that the lights aren’t on the plan yet but we will get them on there. So we were in concurrence with that recommendation.

We’d also add that there’s an existing recorded easement for that 20 foot easement at the south end of the property. It’s a very long thin narrow property as you can see. There is a 20 foot easement that’s accorded at Liber 14966 page 506 of Macomb County Records, I don’t have that easement with me tonight but I will get that for the Planning Department. I know it’s been approved because it’s went to assessing not that long ago, when there was a little issue with the lots.

I would also say that this is a former shingling reclamation recycling plant that has been cleaned up substantially. This is a property that is an M2, it really is a good use of this property and I think you can see that the plan is well executed.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** No Delinquent Taxes.

**DTE:** Approved.

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

1. Any proposed improvements within the Mound Road right-of-way will require approval from the Macomb County Department of Roads.
2. Concrete sidewalk shall extend across the Mound Road frontage.
3. The plan shall include a written legal description of the parcel.
4. The scale of the drawing shall be provided.
5. The plan shall bear the seal of a state of licensed architect or engineer.
6. The plan shall show the locations of existing utilities and any corresponding easements.
7. The plan shall include the entire parcel. A plan was not provided east of the match line.

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

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

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

**MOTION:**

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

**COMMISSIONERS PORTION:**

Assistant Secretary Smith – Mr. Wuerth page 3, number 4, it says auto truck parking area measuring approximately 35 feet by 660 feet containing 23,100 square feet to be located along the south property line south of the easterly building. The area would have an asphalt surface and the area would contain 66 parking spaces on the drawing it shows 67 parking spaces so I don't which is correct?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Well I counted that also but I have this feeling that the architect there can put one more parking space on that site. If you want you can make that part of the condition.

Chair Howard – So the correction will be 67 spaces.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I'd like to make a motion that we make that a \$150.00 cash bond.

Assistant Secretary Smith – I support that.

Chair Howard – We have these two minor amendments that it will be a \$150.00 dollar cash bond and that the recommendation will reflect 67 spaces.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- G. SITE PLAN FOR FREEZER WAREHOUSE: Located on the east side of Bunert Road; approximately 440 ft. south of Eleven Mile Road; 26700, 26600, 26500, 26440, 26420, 26200 Bunert Road; Section 24; Kenneth Bowen (Joseph N. Webb).

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Joseph Webb – I was the Site Engineer for the project but Mr. Tippmann here has much more knowledge of the workings of the building so he'll be doing the presentation.

Mr. Adam Tippmann – Thank you for the conditional approval. This is located over two existing salvage yards so Ashley Capital has purchased the lots and Lipari Foods is proposing to build a 200,060 square foot refrigerated cold storage facility. It will include roughly 45 foot tall warehouse portion, 32 foot tall dock, and then the area up closely you see with the brown band down lower is the office, machine room, and maintenance area.

We've read through all of the conditions on this approval and I had a question on one item which was 3B, the entire perimeter of the warehouse building shall be provided with an 8 foot high masonry wainscot. My question, comment, on that is we would love to get

away from that if possible, for a few reasons. One there is the option to expand on the north and south portions of the facility and the masonry would create a difficult obstruction at the time that we would expand. When we do expand on these refrigerated facilities the exterior wall becomes an interior wall and then we cut the doors in for forklift traffic, so we would like to avoid the masonry wainscot. We constructed the Lipari Foods Facility which is very similar to this similar footprint and square feet right across the road on Bunert and we were able to get away from having wainscoting with the architectural band that we did around the perimeter of the building. So that would be my only request.

Chair Howard – Well by far when we turn this over to the Commissioner for further action we will addressing this with our Planning Director to see what options we have before us.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** No Delinquent Taxes.

**DTE:** Approved.

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

1. Build to the requirements of the 2012 edition of the Michigan Building Code.
2. Fire hydrants shall not be closer than 40 feet or further than 400 feet 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 feet 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 feet.
4. Provide fire department lock box (knox box) as required by city ordinance.

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

1. The six parcels should be combined.
2. Detention and pretreatment of storm water runoff will be required for this site.
3. The proposed pedestrian crossing at Bunert Road requires ADA ramps, “stop” or “pedestrian crossing” signs, and crosswalk pavement markings.
4. As per city ordinance, wet ponds having 25 inches or more of water in depth shall be enclosed by a fence.

**ZONING:** Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comments:

Ordinances and requirements.

Section 4.32 paragraph (h) item 23: One (1) square foot of parking area required for each sq. ft. of floor area for buildings in M-2 Districts.

Section 17.02 item (d): building heights, building heights not to exceed 30' or 2 stories.

Section 17.02 item (a): front yard, front yard setback shall be 25 feet.

Variations requested:

1. Petitioner seeks permission to build an approximately 260,150 feet building to no greater than 50' high.
2. To waive 214,535 square feet of parking.
3. To hard surface to 8' of the front (west) property line for parking.

Chair Howard we did also receive a letter from Ms. Lark Samouelian the DDA/TIFA Director, if you could read that into the record.

Assistant Secretary Smith – Dear Planning Commission: Item 6G is on the Agenda for June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Item 6G is the site plan for the Freezer Warehouse. We are familiar with this project as it relates to Brownfield Redevelopment of two salvage yards into the 252,000 square foot freezer and the approving of the Brownfield Plan. This environmentally difficult project will significantly enhance the Warren area once it is cleaned up. The proposed project is estimating the amount of 337 new full-time permanent jobs. We look forward to this discussion and support a positive outcome.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Smith – In regarding the question by the petitioner about the entire perimeter of the warehouse building being provided with a 8' high masonry wainscot being he may do future expansions where that outside wall would end up being an interior wall the cost of removing that masonry wall could be a factor is there a way we could not do that what's your thought on that?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Well I suppose those walls could be excluded from the requirement of the wainscot.

Assistant Secretary Smith – What is wainscot I don't know what it does or what it looks like.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It's masonry, typically it's decorative, can be colorized concrete block, just in general. We want it 8' tall that puts it as high if not higher than the regular doors the man doors that are placed all around the perimeter. What it does is certainly solidify the building it creates a hard surface 8' feet tall so that when machinery within the building run into the wall, and it happens we've seen it, the wall doesn't get damaged. Whatever was approved with Lipari that was that particular facility but our common requirement is that wainscot is used and required on warehouses and freezers and buildings like this for the reason of the perimeter base of the wall won't be damaged in the same way that a material perhaps like this would be.

Assistant Secretary Smith – Did you understand what Mr. Wuerth is requesting and his feelings on that?

Mr. Adam Tippman – I did and I think if we keep talking a little we will understand this. However, I know there's the esthetic for this as well what I would propose and like we did across the street would be to that 8' foot masonry band across the bottom on the front office, machine, maintenance and material handling areas it's the areas closest to the street. Basically all of the perimeter walls of the warehouse are protected with a steel face concrete curb that is anchored into the slab so a forklift can't puncture or damage those walls.

Chair Howard – Mr. Wuerth does that satisfy you are you comfortable with that option?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It certainly sounds as though they've provided enough protection I feel that certainly is going to be sufficient, they've thought about it. To have the masonry aspect on the exterior facing the street that's something that we would like to see and I would agree to what they proposed in that case.

Chair Howard – So in your recommendation are we going to waive item number 3 or are we going to recommend that the wainscot be added on the rear of the building by the office space and by the machinery wall?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It should be specified, yes, and I can get the exact terminology that he used for the different locations and I can talk to Mr. Tippman later this week.

Assistant Secretary Smith – I’m satisfied.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I’m satisfied with that it sounds like they have plenty of protection to prevent the perforation and the damage to the walls which was what the main concern was.

Chair Howard – We are going to modify item number 3b and the wainscot will be on the area on the area where the office spaces, material room, machine room, maintenance room, and material handling room. It’s on the south west corner of the building that’s where that wainscot will be.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- H. SITE PLAN FOR FUEL STATION AND PARKING LOT EXPANSION FOR TRUCKING COMPANY: Located on the west side of Mound Road; approximately 750 ft. north of Eleven Mile Road; 27275 Mound Road; Section 17; James Burg (F. Matthew Ray).

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. James Burg – James Burg Managing Member of Center Line Investments which owns the subject property I’m also President of James Burg Trucking Company the sole tenant of the subject property. We’ve been occupied in the site for 11 years next week since we’ve moved in we’ve increased total employment count to 110 people, we’ve increased annual revenue from 11 million to approximately 20 million a year, and we’ve paid approximately \$550,000.00 dollars toward our property taxes. The city has been a great partner to work with in our operations.

The site has exceeded all of our expectations we’ve been operating at the capacity of the property footprint yet still have excess office space that we’ll be using when it’s appropriate to expand our

operations. Safety and compliance is a top priority of the company on a simple scale of 199 and 1 being the best the trucking company operates a score of 66 which is a suggested pass by the Inspection Selection Rating by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. The company received two safety awards this year, one from the Michigan State Police we received the distinguished partner award and recognition for our commitment to safety and collaboration with State Police on commercial motor vehicle safety and efficiency matters. Our insurance company gave us their outstanding fleet safety performance award and who would be better to recognize the company's safety performance then a company that would write a check when we are not. I share these awards with my entire staff. As I mentioned we are nearly at capacity of our property footprint during the recession we began parking idled equipment beyond the previously approved parking area and I'm asking for approval to pave this area to clean up the back lot and to bring us back into compliance with our agreement.

I understand that there are stipulations to the Planning Commission's suggested approval which I believe are reasonable. We have challenges with our current fuel pump it is old and slow it takes approximately 10 minutes to fuel up a truck. When trucks are backed up to the fuel pump beyond three we then risk impeding traffic on the southbound service drive. Driver's will make a decision not to impede traffic and pull into the site without fueling and then fuel up at a later time or even leave our site and fueling up at a truck stop or somewhere else which cost the company more money then what we would pay for fuel on our site.

Additionally it is a 12,000 gallon tank that we currently have which can be filled to 90% capacity. We received 10,000 gallon deliveries and this gives us about an 800 gallon or a 3 hour window to be able to order 24 hours in advance to be able to not overfill and to not run out of fuel. So it's a really tight time line for us to order fuel for the site. You may recall that this site had a cell tower occupied by two cellular providers, I see that's in your old business of today's agenda, both Nextel and AT&T jointly operated the tower. Nextel decommissioned their operations a couple years back which made AT&T revenues undesirable to me so we negotiated with AT&T for a mutual benefit for them to decommission the site and have it removed. We looked at that to use that existing footprint to relocate our existing tank and add an additional 25,000 gallon tank to the facility. Our plan calls to add an overhead canopy and two fueling lanes, a high volume fuel pump, we will reduce our fueling time from 10 minutes until 4 minutes per vehicle. And we also make other

items available at the pump including windshield solvent, diesel exhaust fluid and engine oil for our driver's convenience.

The fuel dispensary regulatory oversight is the State of Michigan Bureau of Fire Services Storage Tank Division whose direction we will follow completely. An inspection of the existing tank was completed last week and is compliant and I have a copy of that report. The Inspector noted that the tank would need to be repainted and then recertified to its standard condition when it's relocated, so we'll obviously comply with those request.

To put this Commissions mind to rest the current and additional tanks are double wall both high level and secondary containment monitoring. That means that there's a secondary alarm within the containment wall, so if there's a breach from the interior to the exterior wall and the void fills then there's an immediate alarm after like 5% or 10% of capacity into the containment wall. Then there's a high level alarm that won't allow the tank to be over filled. And that's a DEQ requirement and what that does is it actually shuts off the fueling mechanism so there's no chance of a spill. So it's very safe and trustworthy product. We set the maximum fuel delivery at 250 gallons through our computer system, so that means anyone that's fueling a truck can only request up to 250 gallons. So if introvertedly if they're not doing their job properly and the handle were to fall out less than 250 gallons would be spilled which is minimal compared to the whole tank being emptied. Part of our spill containment system is that we have a fuel spill kit which includes an adhesive back rubber manhole grate cover so if there is a spill then we go into the kit that's right alongside of the pump we put this industrial band aid and we apply that to the manhole grate. Preferably before the spill got to that point where we could remediate any spill before it got into the sewer system that is not a requirement just something that we do to insure that we are not contaminating the other water.

So for all these reasons I respectfully request the City of Warren Planning Commission to approve the companies plan to relocate and expand its fueling operations and expand the parking area with stipulations. I'm interested in hearing any opposition or questions and would like the opportunity to address those.

Assistant Secretary Smith reads the following correspondence:

**TAXES:** No Delinquent Taxes.

**DTE:** Approved.

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

Mary Clark CER-6819  
June 20th, 2016

1. Any proposed improvements with the Mound Road right-of-way will require approval from the Macomb County Department of Roads.
2. Any proposed improvements within the Bear Creek drain easement or change in rate of discharge will require approval from the Macomb County Office of Public Works.
3. Pretreatment of storm water runoff may be required for this site.
4. Detention may be required for this site.
5. Based upon the proposed elevations provided for the parking lot expansion, it appears alternations to the berm may be required.

**FIRE:**

1. Meet all the requirements 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 feet 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 feet.
3. Provide fire department lock box (knox box) as required by city ordinance.

**ZONING:** Preliminary review of the site plan yielded the following comments:

Ordinances and Requirements:

Section 17.02, item (b): side and rear yards twenty (20) feet each in m-2.

Section 17.02, item (p): above ground storage tanks not allowed in m-2. In M-3 and M-4 zones require all tanks shall be located not less than one hundred fifty (150) feet from property lines.

Section 17.02, items (s) paragraph (2): industrial standards, open storage other than junk. The designated area shall be hard surfaced and screened from the public street and any residential zoned areas. Further, the designated area may not exceed fifty (50) percent of the gross floor area of the primary structure.

**VARIANCES:**

To allow an above ground fuel tank installed to no less than 20' of the side (south) property line, as per plan and to relocate the existing fuel tank to no less than 35' of the side (south) property line as per the plan.

Ms. Michelle Katopodes reads the recommendation of the Staff:

Mary Clark CER-6819  
June 20th, 2016

\*\*Remove item 2 from the recommendation it has been added under 8b for a bond release so it will be renumbered.

Mr. James Burg – Madame Chair I will say that the President of the Central Home Owners Association of Warren is my neighbor to the west and they called me this morning to give their approval of this plan. They suggested that they would be here today but I don't see them here but that is the call that I got this morning.

MOTION:

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

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Smith – I see the area where your above ground tanks are going to be and I know when we deal with General Motors when they have areas where's oil containers or containers where there might be some spillage we have a curb that goes around it. So if it gets spilled it contains it to that area is that provided around the tanks?

Mr. James Burg – Around the tanks themselves no, that's why they're double wall tanks. So there's two ways you can get out of containment if you're only using a single wall then you have to have an alternative detention and that's where you would have a wall based upon it. But the double wall nature of tank supersedes that request so that you can get away from that. That's the way I understand the regulation.

Assistant Secretary Smith – Do you concur with that Mr. Wuerth?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Yes I do, just simply the fire department will also verify that but yea I've heard of this.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Just out of curiosity why is it that you opt to use the above ground tank verses the in ground tank?

Mr. James Burg – A couple reasons, in my personal opinion it's easier to see what's spilling above the ground then underneath the ground. So if an underground tank got a leak which I'm not suggesting that a lot of them do you wouldn't know that until you went to extract that tank and then realize that there was contamination in the soil. Having it above ground makes it easier to see if there is a leak and if it is then it's easily remediated a lot quicker. There was a tank on this site prior to me buying the property and they did have leaks in that. For whatever reason they

went from an underground tank after remediating the spills from that tank, they choose an above ground tank at that point.

Vice Chair Kupiec – In reference to your comment about the loss or shrinkage, normally if you have a good accounting system of your fuel usage that's how you determine the amount of loss by the amount you put in verses the amount you are pumping out. The difference between your tanks volume on a daily basis will tell you if you're losing fluid or if you are dispensing fluid.

Mr. James Burg – I agree with that with one stipulation that a liquid will expand or contract with temperature.

Vice Chair Kupiec – You always allow for that in your measurements, it's part of the system, that's the way it works. I pass your facility quite a bit and it's a very professional looking organization.

Commissioner Rob – Are you addressing the issues hazardous metal inspectors say (In audible).

Mr. James Burg – If I understand you, what we plan on doing when we relocate the tank is we are going to send it out and have it professional sandblasted powered coated, and painted and then set back into the original new site, is that what you're asking me?

Commissioner Rob – Yes.

Mr. James Burg – We scraped it down a few years ago and painted by hand we obviously didn't get the result that we expected so we need to do a better job with it so we are going to send it out and have it done during the move.

Chair Howard – I want to thank you for being as thorough as you are concerning your business. I love to see when petitioners are very engrossed and very competent about what they are doing. I do love the fact of your reduction of your refueling time from 10 minutes to 4 minutes, that's very good. I think that's going to be an added benefit just for traffic as a whole. In terms of your safety measures that you put in place I believe those are going to be a benefit to the city and we thank you for the half million that you've given to the city in taxes. With that being said sir, you are in agreement with the recommendations that Mr. Wuerth has placed before you?

Mr. James Burg – Yes I am, he's very reasonable.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

7. CORRESPONDENCE

City of Troy Planning Commission Public Hearing tentatively on Tuesday, June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., to consider the adoption of an amended Master Plan.

MOTION:

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

8. BOND RELEASE

A. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR NEW FAMILY DOLLAR STORE: To be located on the west side of Schoenherr Road approximately 126 ft. north of Nine Mile Road; 13505 Nine Mile Road; Section 26; Morning Star Partners, LLC (Josh Allen).

and

MINOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN FOR NEW FAMILY DOLLAR STORE: To be located on the west side of Schoenherr Road approximately 126 ft. north of Nine Mile Road; 13505 Nine Mile Road; Section 26; Morning Star Partners, LLC (Josh Allen). The amendment is for the relocation of the new building and parking area. Release of \$24,000.00 surety bond paid on December 12, 2014.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Vinson to release the \$24,000.00 bond on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014, supported by Commissioner Rob.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- B. SITE PLAN FOR NEW OFFICE AND SHOP BUILDING ADDITION TO TRUCKING MAINTENANCE FACILITY: Located on the west side of Mound Road; approximately 750 ft. north of Eleven Mile Road; 27275 Mound Road, Section 17; James Burg (F. Matthew Ray). Release of \$29,250.00 surety bond paid on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004.

MOTION:

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

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

9. OLD BUSINESS

- A MINOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN FOR OPEN STORAGE AND BUILDING ADDITION FOR TRUCK REPAIR FACILITY: Located on the south side of Ten Mile Road; approximately 468 ft. west of Thomas Street; 3200 Ten Mile Road; Section 30; Sam Shamay (Kerm Billette). Originally approved by Planning Commission on February 22, 2016. Heard by Zoning Board of Appeals on May 11,

2016, rescheduled until heard at Planning Commission again for revisions.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Assistant Secretary Smith to recognize as a minor amendment, supported by Vice Chair Kupiec.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

PETITIONERS PORTION:

Mr. Kerm Billette – I’m here for the approval of this trucking company which was brought into the Planning Commission on February 22<sup>nd</sup> of this year. We had a number of conditions applied to the property. One was a removal of a building that was in a required side yard setback, new pavement for the one area that had holes in it and it needed some repairs, and provide bumper blocks. We went to the Planning Commission and got the approval of the site subject to all those conditions and since then we’ve met all those conditions. We’ve removed the building that was in the side yard the, 20 foot has been removed according to site plan. We’ve added an outdoor storage area for the trash bins new pavement was put over the entire site, it was a \$100,000.00 dollars to put in new pavement for the entire site. They redid the actual millings on the south 160 feet and there’s four catch basins there that had to be cleaned out and repaired.

They replaced approximately 400 feet of 6 foot chain link fence, the fence had been up there since about 1955 it’s all rusted out and there’s undergrowth on it. They cleared the undergrowth and put in new fencing for over 400 feet. They leveled the holes in the asphalt that were getting near the entrance by the gates into the property. They provided bumper blocks for the trucks and there’s probably still going to be a requirement for bumper blocks on the west side where there’s parking. I believe that we’ve complied with all of the requirements of the Planning Commission except that we may have to go to the Board of Appeals to get approval of asphalt millings on

the south 160 feet of the property. The lessee is here, Sam, and he's ready to answer any questions you have about what's happened to the property. We are requesting approval all the improvements have been made and we are trying to get our Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Ron Wuerth reads the recommendations of the Staff:

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Vinson to approve, supported by Commissioner Robinson.

COMMISSIONERS PORTION:

Assistant Secretary Smith – Mr. Wuerth on item J dealing with the trash enclosure on the previous site plan it said that the trash was going to be stored inside but now it's going to be stored outside with a 6' foot high cyclone fence with slats. And it's going to be installed in the 20' foot setback of the property, I guess my question is why is it the chain link fence verses the concrete poured wall, is it because of it being in the setback where we can't have a permanent structure in the setback?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Can we start with having the petitioner describe what the reason is?

Mr. Kerm Billette – The petitioner has requested that we use chain link fence in this area for the trash enclosure with vertical green strips to block out the view. Because there's a possibility that if it was built with concrete that he couldn't do the building expansion, in the future years he wants to expand three spaces to the south so that would be in the way it would have to be torn down. Right now if you put the trash enclosure with chain link fence you can destroy that when you add onto the building.

Assistant Secretary Smith – Is that also the reason why it's saying it's going to be on gravel, I believe I saw where it says it was going to be set back in gravel.

Mr. Kerm Billette – Oh no that's all hard surface, that's all paved and part of it is concrete. I had the owner ask me if he could make it smaller then that if he decided I told him that if we get approved for 25 you can always go less but you can't go more.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Originally when you were before us housekeeping was a big issue in your facility, tires laying all around, junk trash laying all around, stacked up, a lot of junk was laying

around the area. I know you talked about a trash enclosure now so are you planning to move all that stuff into the trash enclosure and keep it out of the open area, is that your plans for the future?

Mr. Kerm Billette – What the petitioner is proposing, the size is bigger so he would put trash cans in there to put any trash in, there will be no open storage of trash. Any car parts or whatever would be in trash containers.

Vice Chair Kupiec – So the area that you're talking about is for what purpose to store trash parts?

Mr. Kerm Billette – Yes there's no storage of any parts other than in the small building that's still left there, no storage of parts out on the property where the trash enclosure is.

Vice Chair Kupiec – So the truck and trailer tires that used to be stored on the outside would no longer be available, it will be cleaned up, at one time you had tires laying around the yard.

Mr. Sam Shamay – There are no more tires outside, it's all cleaned up. It's not going to be like it used to be because we are not doing any business for the public, we are just going to take care of our trucks that's it. We used to be very big now it's very small.

Vice Chair Kupiec – So you're primarily now just going to repair your own trucks you're not going to bring outside work and fix trucks?

Mr. Sam Shamay – Not really, not like we used to.

Assistant Secretary Smith – I want to make a recommendation also on item J about the trash enclosure. It does say it would be on a gravel surface they said it was going to be paved so I want to be able to change that in the recommendation from gravel to paved.

Chair Howard – That the enclosure will be paved?

Assistant Secretary Smith – Item J says it's gravel but they decided they are going to pave it so we need to change it from gravel to being paved.

Chair Howard – In item J we are going to correct that where it would no longer be gravel that it would be paved.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

- B. SITE PALN FOR CO-LOCATION FOR COMMUNICATION ANTENNA ON COMMUNICATION ANTENNA TOWER: Located on the west side of Mound Road, approximately 712.88 feet north of Eleven Mile Road; 27275 Mound Road; Section 17; Nextel Communications. Withdrawal of Site Plan, AT & T Tower has been decommissioned.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Commissioner Rob to release the site plan, supported by Commissioner Karpinski.

ROLL CALL:

The motion carried as follows:

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

10. NEW BUSINESS  
 None at this time.

11. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION  
 None at this time.

12. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT  
 Since the last Planning Commission Meeting I attended meetings mostly. I attended a DDA Subcommittee Meeting in which we discussed the loft or the condos that they are thinking about constructing at the City Center. A newer idea might be to phase it so

that you build on one plot of land and see how that's going to go and then move forward and then build on a second part of the property. So we'll see how that works in regards to the financing of it.

I attended also a regular DDA Meeting and we were discussing the fact that Majestic Plaza located at Martin and Van Dyke that has been sold and so now it's a matter of the survey. We brought the lot split here and that will go to City Council for them to approve that. Secondly had to do with the survey of the City Center itself and all the different land areas that we hope to develop. You will see that at the next meeting or the meeting after for approval, these are acreage parcels but there's a lot to it then it will be forwarded upon your recommendation to City Council. There was a little bit of discussion about the hotel location and the Mayor has spoken to a couple of prospects that's all I can say about that. The DDA has chosen to conclude its contract with Signature and Associates at this time. Finally they did discuss, what I call what the potential of it could be, is the pocket park at Chicago and Mound property that's the north and west corner. So they are discussing what exactly they can do with that.

Michelle and I attended a TIFA Meeting and listened to a lot of different issues but our issue had to do with the parking lots that are located in the area. That generated out of the Good N Plenty site plan where we had those people with trash dumpster in the parking lots. I did have a meeting with Steve Elturk, he's the Imam for Iona and Attorney Mary Michaels. We discussed the consent judgment regarding that particular site and we will provide the Planning Commission with a copy of that consent judgment the results of the approval and that will come at the next meeting.

I had a meeting with Pat Westerland he got site plan approval from the Planning Commission for a site that's on the east side of Ryan Road south of Thirteen Mile. It's a small parking lot going to have two driveways to the site and the driveways happen to be located approximately on the property lines. So the Planning Commission requires cross assess easements with the north property owner and the south property owner and we are having some real tough problems trying to resolve that. We are getting in particular the north owner is not interested at all in signing that type of document. So I'm not sure what we are going to do I'll have to consult the Attorney's Office and try and move forward otherwise this may come back to the Planning Commission to resolve the issue.

And finally this is a real pleasure, it's my honor to inform the Planning Commission that Michelle Katopodes has obtained her

Mary Clark CER-6819  
June 20th, 2016

AICP that stands for the American Institute of Certified Planners. She is now a Certified Planner in the United States.

Commissioner Robinson – I have a question regarding the lofts that you mentioned is that going to be the north or south side of the Civic Center?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It will be the rear of City Hall behind it and then to the south. These are 3 to 4 story lofts that we are looking at.

Commissioner Robinson – Will they be before those older condos that are back there now right?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – It will be right abutting City Hall, so if you're looking out a south window from City Hall you're looking across the street at those and from the rear you'll be able to see them. We think that's going to enhance the area and improve our possibilities to get some developers who would be interested in finishing out the location.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Upon opening my packet I noticed that I did not have any site plan for the site for 6A, there were no plans in my packet. Upon talking to Counsel she said you should have saved it from last meeting I didn't do that and I didn't do that in the past and I didn't think it was necessary. Maybe I was the only one that didn't have one?

Chair Howard – No one had it.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – You will have newer site plans I spoke with Mr. Shango and he addressed many of the issues that are in the recommendation. I've got some major concerns and I'm glad it was tabled because I've got three drive thru's that I have to figure out with him and how they are all going to work and there are other aspects of that shopping center that I need to work further with him.

Vice Chair Kupiec – The reason I bring this up Ron is because I got my packet real late on Friday. I spent a better part of this hot weather sitting in that Thirteen Mile and Mound parking lot reading your recommendations and your findings trying to relate to these three different drive thru's.

Mr. Ron Wuerth – You have a great mind then if you were able to figure it out.

Vice Chair Kupiec – I couldn't without a plan. So when I came in tonight I asked for the plans so I'm not sure if I was the only one who didn't receive them.

Chair Howard – No you weren't.

Vice Chair Kupiec – For the future my suggestion is going to be this. When we have a tabled item that's going to be coming back to save paperwork and printing time in the office maybe we should pile our tabled site plans up and send them back to the Planning Department and when that plan comes up again they can give them back to us instead of printing new ones other than the revisions. It might save some paper and time it's just a thought.

Ms. Judy Hanna – Right now we don't give you another because we don't have that many plans to keep giving them each time it gets tabled that's why we ask you to hold them and bring them back. Petitioners only brings about 20 site plans and they also have to go to some other offices besides the Commission so that's why we don't have them for tabled items.

Vice Chair Kupiec – Are you saying then we should be holding our site plans personally?

Mr. Ron Wuerth – Yes, any tabled item.

13. CALENDAR OF PENDING MATTERS

Chair Howard – We did send our correspondence to Mr. Treppa and I did follow up with the City Attorney Ms. Caitlin Murphy regarding our progression with the RFP to make sure we could progress and I understand that Michelle has been in conversation with Craig. So we should have a document going forward real soon with this Master Plan so that we can send it out for bid and then the City Council in turn will speak to us in terms of who is going to be that other person as far as the Master Plan Committee. So we are moving forward with the Master Plan I'm very excited. So I want to thank Michelle and Ron for all their diligence in getting this forward.

Vice Chair Kupiec – In reference to the Master Plan do we have any plans for the future?

Chair Howard – Yes sir, at our last meeting with Mr. Treppa we did submit our recommendations based on the template that we had. Mr. Treppa is adding a few tweaks here and there along with some additions that Ron had in terms of the qualifications of our provider.

He's going to bring us a final document and then we are going to send it out to bid.

Vice Chair Kupiec – A couple previous meetings Councilwoman Colegio was there and she said that she was in charge of the funding, did she confirm that we do have the funding available?

Chair Howard – The last I heard Council President Cecil St. Pierre indicated that it was still in the budget so I have not received any push back that we don't have the funding, so we will proceed until someone tells me differently.

14. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION:

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

---

Jocelyn Howard, Chair

---

Warren Smith, Assistant Secretary

Meeting recorded and transcribed by  
Mary Clark - CER-6819

**E-mail: [maryclark130@gmail.com](mailto:maryclark130@gmail.com)**