

# **CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

## *REPORT OF MEETING*

*MARCH 8, 2007*

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

**ABSENT:** None

**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 Ms. Moseley, supported by Mr. Charron, to approve the agenda as submitted.  
Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Moseley, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Gibson, Grajewski, Henderson, Hornung, Pearl, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**0.89 ACRE OF LAND LOCATED EAST OF GROESBECK HIGHWAY, SOUTH OF METROPOLITAN PARKWAY**

- **SPECIAL LAND USE TO PERMIT OUTDOOR SALES AND STORAGE IN B-3 GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AND**
  - **SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR POOLTOWN SWIMMING POOLS AND SPAS**
  - **PUBLIC HEARING**
- FILE #06-6139-A: PETITIONED BY GRAHAM CLEMENTS  
REPRESENTED BY RON CLEMENTS**
- 

Pertinent correspondence was read and entered into the record. Ms. Trombley advised that notice of this hearing was issued by regular mail to 35 owners and/or occupants of the property in question, with one returned as undeliverable. She also read a letter of objection received from Steven Laffey, 1240 Laurel View Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, owner of property at 36160 Groesbeck Highway.

Ron Clements, 4396 Koffee Court, Troy, Michigan, stated they want to put a swimming pool display in front of the building.

Motion by Mr. Hornung, supported by Mr. Grajewski, to open the public hearing. Roll Call: Ayes – Hornung, Grajewski, Cannon, DiBartolomeo, Grajewski, Moseley, Pearl, Henderson, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

There were no public comments.

Motion by Mr. Henderson, supported by Ms. Moseley, to close the public hearing. Roll Call: Ayes – Hornung, Moseley, Cannon, DiBartolomeo, Gibson, Grajewski, Hornung, Pearl, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Clements explained that Groesbeck is on an angle and the view of their site by northbound motorists is blocked by the site immediately to their south. He replied to inquiry that the pools on display will be 48 inches to 52 inches in height, with 52 inches being the tallest. He replied to further inquiry that they will be putting in one to two pools, and they will remain there all year, although they will be covered in the winter. Mr. Clements explained that they are proposing a 6-foot aluminum fence that has the appearance of wrought iron. He compared it to the fence at Evergreen Lawn & Garden Center.

Mr. Hornung inquired as to whether the petitioner considered putting the pool display in the rear.

Mr. Clements replied that they are trying to “dress up” their building with an attractive pool and landscaping display. Mr. Clements replied to inquiry that they are proposing a six-foot fence around the pool display; however, if the Ordinance requires more, there is a pool fencing that can be added around the top of each pool. He assured there will be no

decks around the display pools. He replied to further inquiry that he will be adding Maple trees, but the plan does not specify how tall they will be at the time of planting.

Mr. Henderson noted that there are already several Maple trees in front of the subject site, and he inquired as to whether these will cover up the display.

Mr. Clements replied that they are mostly off to the side. They are looking for smaller trees to dress up the berm area.

Ms. Trombley cautioned that there is no outdoor storage allowed, and she inquired as to whether the pools in front will be limited to display only.

Mr. Clements replied that they will dress up the front so that people can visualize how the pools could look in their backyards. He felt it would be an inconvenience for people to see the display in the back because they would have to walk all the way around the building.

Mr. DiBartolomeo inquired as to whether it is necessary to have pools up all year round. He could understand having a couple of pools on display during the summer months but he could not see the necessity for having them up all winter. He inquired as to whether the petitioner would be willing to take them down in September.

Mr. Clements replied to inquiry that their “pool season” is from April through September of each year, and if they are required to remove them from September through March, they will; however, he emphasized that they would like them to remain. He replied to further inquiry that the display area will not be sodded. The pools will sit on cement and will have brick and mulch accents.

Mr. Charron mentioned that he lives in this area and often drives past the subject site. He inquired as to whether the display area could be located on the south side of the property. Customers would still have easy access to look at the pools.

Mr. Clements felt they would not have access to the rear of their property if the display was placed on the south side. He also noted that this building has been vacant for a couple of years and the businesses on both sides have been using that drive as a thoroughfare for their own properties.

Further discussion ensued as to possible alternatives for the pool display location.

Mr. Clements stressed that the reason for the pool display in the front is to let people know they sell pools, yet at the same time to create an attractive front yard for their site.

Ms. Trombley felt if they could see renderings, it may help them to visualize what the petitioner has in mind with the display area.

Mr. Hornung commented that he has a picture in his mind, and he is afraid it will look like the Swim Shoppe in Fraser. He pointed out that there was a lot of “junk” in front, and expressed concern that this may become the same if the petitioner is granted approval for a display area in front.

Mr. Clements assured that they would not be able to have a successful business if they display “junk” in front, and he was confident the proposed display area will be attractive and an asset to the site.

Mr. Hornung felt the dumpster should be relocated because of its close proximity to the abutting residential properties.

Mr. Santia noted that the Department of Public Works suggested this location because it would be easy access for the trucks.

Mr. Clements stated willingness to relocate the dumpster.

Mr. Hornung stressed his opinion that the display area should be located to the rear of the building.

Mr. Clements emphasized that it would not benefit their company to have a “shoddy-looking” display area, so he felt the front is still the best location.

Mr. Santia replied to inquiry that if the sale of pools is allowed through Special Land Use approval, that use goes with the land and if there is a change of ownership, they would still be able to sell and display pools at this location.

Mr. DiBartolomeo inquired as to whether they could grant a yearly permit for display of the pools, with the option to renew or deny the permit request each year.

Mr. Santia replied that a yearly permit is not an option under the Special Land Use; however, he noted that the Planning Commission can make recommendation for approval of a site development plan but deny a request for Special Land Use to allow a display area.

Mr. Clements replied to inquiry that not being able to display pools in front would not be “the deal breaker”; however, he emphasized that they would like to have a small attractive display in the front to help their business and to make the site attractive.

Motion by Mr. Hornung, supported by Ms. Trombley, with reference to File #06-6139-A and application from Graham Clements, Pooltown LLC, 12125 Dixie, Redford, Michigan 48239, as represented by Ron Clements, same address, concerning the proposed Special Land Use of outdoor sales and storage in the B-3 General Business District and the proposed site development plan for Pooltown Swimming Pools and Spas, to be located on 0.89 acre of land located east of Groesbeck, south of Metropolitan Parkway (Section 28), that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for denial of the

Special Land Use as proposed because of the display being in the front of the building. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Santia explained that the Planning Commission would have the option of recommending denial of the Special Land Use and the site development plan presented, and postpone further discussion so the petitioner can submit revised plans showing the front without the display area. He replied to inquiry that the site development plan as submitted meets ordinance requirements; however, they could relocate the dumpster, and they would need to redesign the front where the display area was previously proposed.

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

Mr. Clements stated he needs to know where the dumpster can be placed.

Mr. Hornung suggested that the dumpster could be located along the north property line, but away from the abutting residential properties.

Mr. Pearl suggested Mr. Clements contact the Planning Department and they can help him determine the best location for the dumpster.

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Mr. Hornung, with reference to File #06-6139-A and application from Graham Clements, Pooltown LLC, 12125 Dixie, Redford, Michigan 48239, as represented by Ron Clements, same address, concerning the proposed site development plan for Pooltown Swimming Pools and Spas, to be located on 0.89 acre of land located east of Groesbeck, south of Metropolitan Parkway (Section 28), that further consideration be postponed so the petitioner has an opportunity to redesign the site plan, showing the relocation of the dumpster and plans for the area originally proposed for a pool display area in front. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Charron, Hornung, DiBartolomeo, Gibson, Grajewski, Moseley, Pearl, Henderson, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

**5.282 ACRES (PRIVATE CLAIM 546) FRONTING THE NORTH LINE OF  
CLINTON RIVER ROAD, EAST OF BRYLOR COURT (SECTION 16)**  
- **LAKESHORE ESTATES (FKA ALUIA RESIDENCES)**  
-- **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF REVISED  
SITE DEVELOPMENT**  
**FILE #06-5830-A: PETITIONED BY JOHN ALUIA**  
**REPRESENTED BY WILLIAM J. THOMPSON**

---

William Thompson, Lehner Associates, 17001 Nineteen Mile Road, Suite #3, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, explained they submitted a revised site development plan for six units, and that plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission; however, it was denied by the Township Board. He indicated this plan has been cut back to five units and they are seeking approval of this revised plan.

Mr. Santia clarified that the original site development plan indicated four units and was approved by the Township Board. A revised plan showing six units was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission but was ultimately denied by the Township Board.

Mr. Hornung commented that it is a small lot, and he felt they should stay with the four lots as originally approved.

Mr. Charron stated having a problem believing anyone could develop four lots, let alone five or six. He felt the site would be more suited to three units.

Mr. Grajewski inquired as to whether the proposed revised site development plan meets all Township ordinances.

Mr. Santia replied that the proposed plan meets the ordinances, and he added that even if this plan is not approved, the petitioner has approval to construct four units.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the lots are 80 feet wide, which are ten feet wider than required by ordinance, and exceed the width of the lots behind them. He clarified that they originally proposed four lots because they would be able to split the property into four parcels without submitting a site plan. The associated costs for development of the property were higher than Mr. Aluia anticipated, and that is when he proposed six units. Mr. Thompson stated that if there are four homes constructed, they could each be 35 feet from the lot lines; however, if there are five units, it would be considered site condominiums and they would be required to be set back 50 to 55 feet from the perimeter property lines. There would be a larger building envelope on each of the four lots, but the houses would be the same. They would be maintained separately, whereas five lots would result in a condominium association and a more uniform maintenance of the property.

Mr. Pearl stated he is not thrilled with the proposed development and cannot see how they will sell. He pointed out that there will be a road in their backyards.

Mr. Thompson stated there would be a road regardless of whether there are four, five or six units. He noted that the gas company wants to go along the north curb, but they will not go in until the first house is built. Once they complete their work, he assured the landscaping would take place.

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Mr. Charron, with reference to File #06-5830-A and application from John Aluia, 21356 Raven, Eastpointe, Michigan 48021, as represented by William J. Thompson, Lehner Associates, Inc., 17001 Nineteen Mile Road, Suite 3, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, concerning the proposed revised site development plans for Lakeshore Estates (fka Aluia Residences), located on 5.282 acres of land fronting the north line of Clinton River Road, east of Brylor Court (Section 16/Private Claim 546), that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township

Board for denial of the revised plans as submitted, based on the opinion that the petitioner is currently approved to construct four (4) homes and any additional units would create a condition that is not harmonious with the surrounding area due to the odd configuration of the site. Roll Call Votes: Ayes – DiBartolomeo, Cannon, Hornung, Pearl, Trombley. Nays – Gibson, Grajewski, Henderson, Moseley. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley was excused from the meeting at 7:14 p.m.

**0.7518 ACRE OF LAND FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF HARPER AVENUE,  
WEST OF KLIX ROAD (SECTION 25)**

- **LEONARDO HARPER RETAIL CENTER**
  - **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF SITE  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**
- FILE #06-6184: PETITIONED BY NICHOLAS LAVDAS  
REPRESENTED BY MICHAEL GORDON**
- 

Robert Cliff, MGA Architects, 818 West Eleven Mile Road, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067, explained they are proposing a 7,600 square foot retail center. They obtained variances from the Board of Appeals on February 21<sup>st</sup> for their setbacks from both Klix and Harper. He stated it will be a nice brick structure, and they have provided landscaping as per ordinance requirements. He replied to inquiry that there will be new trees going in.

Ms. Trombley felt it will be an attractive development.

Mr. Cliff replied to inquiry that they are currently negotiating with a couple of prospective tenants for a coffee shop and another business, and are close to getting the lease finalized.

Motion by Mr. Gibson, supported by Mr. Grajewski, with reference to File #06-6184 and application from Nicholas Lavdas, Leonardo Harper L.L.C., 3671 Twelve Mile Road, Warren, Michigan 48092, as represented by Michael Gordon, MGA Architects, 818 W. Eleven Mile Road, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067, concerning the proposed site development plans for Leonardo Harper Retail Center, to be located on 0.7518 acre of land fronting the east line of Harper Avenue, west of Klix Road, that, in consideration of grant of variance by the Board of Appeals, recommendation be submitted to the Clinton Township Board for approval of the site development plans as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Gibson, Grajewski, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Henderson, Hornung, Pearl, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Moseley. Motion carried.

**REPORTS OF MEETINGS**

-- **APPROVAL OF JANUARY 25, 2007 REPORT**

-- **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 11, 2007 REPORT**

---

Motion by Mr. Hornung, supported by Mr. Grajewski, to approve the reports of the January 25, 2007 and February 11, 2007 Planning Commission meetings, as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Hornung, Grajewski, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Gibson, Henderson, Pearl, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Moseley. Motion carried.

**DISCUSSION ON NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

---

Mr. Santia advised that the following item is anticipated to be on the next Planning Commission agenda, scheduled for Thursday, March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2007:

- City Limit Wholesale, which is a Site Plan/Special Land Use Application for used car sales on the site of the former Viscount Pools, located on the east side of Groesbeck Highway, just south of Kerry.

Mr. Hornung and Mr. DiBartolomeo both requested to be excused from the next Planning Commission meeting due to previous commitments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Mr. Gibson, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise C. Trombley, Secretary  
CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:03/11/07

ces:03/26/07