

# **CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

*REPORT OF MEETING*

*JANUARY 25, 2007*

**PRESENT:** Ken Pearl, Chairperson  
Kirkanne Moseley, Vice-Chairperson  
Denise C. Trombley, Secretary  
Stephen Charron  
Ron DiBartolomeo  
Fred Gibson  
Timothy Grajewski  
Ernest Hornung

**ABSENT:** Peter Henderson (Excused)

**STAFF:** Carlo Santia, Director  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Pearl called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Mr. Hornung, supported by Ms. Moseley, to approve the agenda as submitted.  
Motion carried.

**10.59 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST LINE OF GARFIELD ROAD,  
NORTH OF CANAL ROAD (SECTION 7)**

- **VENICE SQUARE SHOPPING CENTER**
  - **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF SITE  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**
- FILE #06-1208: PETITIONED BY ALFONSO & ANNA LIEGHIO  
REPRESENTED BY CHRIS BROWN**
- 

Pertinent correspondence was read and entered into the record.

Chris Brown, 701 South Huron Avenue, Mackinaw City, Michigan 49701, replied to inquiry that they will be putting a berm in the front along the Garfield Road frontage, and it will be shown on the site development plan before it is forwarded to the Township Board.

Mr. Hornung inquired as to whether the post office will be occupying most of the existing building.

Mr. Brown explained the location of the buildings on the plan in relation to the site as it is today. He anticipated that they will be starting Phase I immediately. They have a prospective tenant who is not quite sure at this time what configuration he wants for his tenant space, so depending on that, they will most likely be doing Phase II or Phase III simultaneously with Phase I.

Mr. Santia noted that the majority of the portion of the building destroyed by fire has been demolished. He clarified that they will be constructing buildings to the west of their previous location. He added that some of the proposed parking is situated where the building used to be.

Mr. Hornung inquired as to the setback from the residential property.

Mr. Santia replied that they are proposing a sixty-foot (60') setback from the residential property, and a 4-foot 8-inch masonry wall will be constructed as part of the development. He replied to further inquiry that there is no existing wall between the two parcels, but just a fence. He added that it was originally a separate parcel and the wall was not required. Mr. Santia replied to inquiry that the Township did not contact the neighbors to ask them whether they would prefer a berm in lieu of the required wall.

It was noted that the wall, as depicted on the site development plan, is 6-foot in height rather than the required 4-foot 8-inches.

Mr. Santia noted that the correct height should be indicated on the plan before it is submitted to the Township Board.

Mr. Trombley stated she was disappointed that there was no postal drop box on the site, where motorists could pull up and drop their mail in the box without having to get out of their cars. She pointed out that the former site was such a mess because there were people trying to park along the curb to drop off their mail, and they were pulling in and out at all different angles. She felt it was a safety hazard, and stressed she would like to see some type of drop-off point where it would be safer.

Mr. Brown replied that he was not sure that would be able to be worked into the plan. He informed that he is working with the federal government and trying to meet their requirements for this post office facility, and they have the jurisdiction over whether or not there would be a drop box.

Mr. Santia advised that any drop-off area, if designed as a drive-thru, would have to be incorporated on the site plan, so it could come back at a later date as a revised site plan.

Mr. Brown anticipated that there are a couple of items they will be revising so they will have to come back to the Planning Commission with a revised plan within sixty (60) days. He suggested that they could investigate the possibility of the drive-thru and revise the plan at that time to incorporate it.

Ms. Trombley would have preferred that it be included in this plan, and she expressed her disappointment that it was not.

Mr. Grajewski inquired as to whether the neighbors to the west were notified that the buildings will be closer to their property lines.

Mr. Santia replied to inquiry that, since setback requirements are still met, they were not required to notify the neighbors. He indicated that it would be a good idea, and stated he will notify them prior to it going to the Township Board.

Mr. Hornung felt that the two dumpsters are too close to the residential property. He stated that he lives close to The Brewery and hears the emptying of the dumpsters at 5:00 a.m. He pointed out to the petitioner an optional location for the dumpsters.

Mr. Santia observed the suggested location and felt the Department of Public Works would approve it.

Mr. Charron noted that the property to the north of the subject site has a concrete decorative screen wall. He inquired as to whether the petitioners intend to match that wall.

Mr. Brown replied to inquiry that they do not own the property to the north.

Mr. Santia explained that there is a wall on the abutting property to the north, and the petitioner's wall will need to tie into that wall. He felt it should be of a similar construction so that it will match. He added that it is a poured concrete wall.

Mr. Pearl felt that since they may be willing to reduce the height from the proposed 6-foot wall to the required 4-foot 8-inch wall, he inquired as to whether the petitioner would be willing to extend the wall south to Canal Road.

Mr. Santia suggested the wall extend south to the parcel the petitioner recently rezoned.

Mr. Brown explained they are currently working with a prospective purchaser of a portion of the property fronting Canal Road for a bank. Mr. Brown added that the owner of Venice Square is not going to want to spend money to extend the wall on a portion of property he is selling.

Mr. DiBartolomeo felt the petitioner should extend the wall to Canal at this time to maintain continuity. He recalled that the homeowners near the south end of Royal Lane expressed concern at the time the property was rezoned.

Mr. Brown inquired as to the Township's policy regarding installation of a wall when property is developed in phases. He asked whether other developers have been required to construct a wall along property they are not currently developing.

Mr. Santia replied that it has been done in the past.

Mr. Grajewski felt the wall being installed the entire length of the property at one time would be better.

The general consensus of the Planning Commission was that a 4-foot 8-inch masonry should extend the entire length of the property to the south end of Lot 125.

Mr. Brown summarized the Planning Commission's requests that they would like the dumpsters moved and the 4-foot 8-inch masonry wall to extend to the south end of Lot 125.

Mr. Charron felt the wall should remain six feet high, as indicated on the plan. He could not see where a 4-foot 8-inch wall would provide the neighbors much privacy. He added that a 6-foot wall would match the height of the wall along the rear of the property to the north of the subject site.

Mr. Santia clarified that if the Planning Commission desires, they can include that recommendation to the Board in their motion.

Mr. Brown replied to inquiry that the loading area is in the back, as required by ordinance. He pointed out, however, that there will be not truck wells but the area will be striped off so there is no parking in the loading/unloading zone.

Motion by Ms. Trombley, supported by Mr. Grajewski, with reference to File #06-1208 and application from Alfonso & Anna Liegghio, Venice Square Properties, 701 S. Huron

Avenue, Mackinaw City, Michigan 49701, as represented by Chris Brown, same address, concerning the proposed site development plan for Venice Square Shopping Center, located on 10.59 acres of land fronting the west line of Garfield Road, north of Canal Road (Section 7), that recommendation be forwarded to the Township Board for approval of the site development plan, subject to:

- 1) The dumpsters relocated further from the residential property, to be approved by the Department of Public Works;
- 2) A six-foot (6') wall along the western property line, with the wall to extend from the northern property south to the right-of-way of Canal Road; and
- 3) The petitioner has agreed to try to incorporate a drop-off for the post office.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Trombley, Grajewski, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Gibson, Hornung, Moseley, Pearl. Nays – None. Absent – Henderson. Motion carried.

## **REPORT OF MEETING**

### **-- APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 14, 2006 REPORT**

---

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Ms. Moseley, to approve the report of the December 14, 2006 Planning Commission meeting as written. Motion carried.

## **DISCUSSION ON NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

---

Mr. Santia advised that there are no anticipated items for the next Planning Commission Meeting, scheduled for Thursday, February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007, so the meeting will probably be canceled.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Motion by Mr. Hornung, supported by Mr. Grajewski, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise C. Trombley, Secretary  
CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:01/28/07