

MACOMB TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES AND PUBLIC HEARING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2016
PAGE 1 OF 5

LOCATION: MACOMB TOWNSHIP MEETING CHAMBERS
54111 BROUGHTON ROAD
MACOMB, MI 48042

PRESENT: CHARLES OLIVER, CHAIRMAN
JASPER SCIUTO, VICE CHAIRMAN
AARON TUCKFIELD, MEMBER
MICHAEL P. HARDY, MEMBER
NUNZIO PROVENZANO, MEMBER
ROGER KRZEMINSKI, MEMBER

ABSENT: JULIANA PLASTIRAS, SECRETARY

ALSO PRESENT: Thomas Esordi, Township Attorney
Patrick Meagher, Planning Consultant
(Additional attendance on file at the Clerk's Office)

Chairman OLIVER called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

ROLL CALL

1. Acting Planning Secretary TUCKFIELD called the roll and Secretary PLASTIRAS was absent and excused.

Chairman OLIVER stated Secretary PLASTIRAS called him to inform him that she would not be in attendance and there is a possibility that she may not be in attendance at the next meeting due to her schedule.

Chairman OLIVER called for a motion to approve the roll call.

MOTION by KRZEMINSKI seconded by PROVENZANO to approve the roll call.

MOTION carried.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

2. The agenda was reviewed and there were no additions, corrections or deletions.

MOTION by SCIUTO seconded by PROVENZANO to approve the agenda as read

MOTION carried.

APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

3. The minutes of the previous meeting held on August 16th, 2016 were reviewed and any additions, corrections or deletions were discussed and made.

MOTION by TUCKFIELD seconded by HARDY to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 16th, 2016 as presented.

MOTION carried.

AGENDA ITEMS:

4. **Extension of Time for Final Preliminary Plat; Twin Rivers Subdivision Phase III;** Located on the north side of Hall Road, approximately ¼ mile east of Romeo Plank Road; Section 33; Twin River Development, LTD, Petitioner. Permanent Parcel 08-33-376-018.

Patrick S. Meagher, Planning Consultant, informed the Commission that no new ordinance provisions had been adopted which would influence or impact the current approved site plan. Patrick Meagher also mentioned all the departments that responded had no objections to the extension request. Mr. Meagher stated they would be recommending an approval for one year.

Vincent DiLorenzo, 978 Knob Creek, Rochester, MI, Developer, was present to answer questions regarding this development project.

MOTION by PROVENZANO seconded by KRZEMINSKI to consider the findings of the Planning Commissioner and all departments who responded and had no objections to the extension and to recommend approval for a period of one year for the extension of time for the Final Preliminary Plat; Twin Rivers Subdivision Phase III; Located on the north side of Hall Road, approximately ¼ mile east of Romeo Plank Road; Section 33; Twin River Development, LTD, Petitioner; Permanent Parcel 08-33-376-018.

MOTION carried.

5. **Extension of Time Preliminary Plan; Sheffield Forest Site Condominiums;** Located on the west side of Fairchild Road, ½ mile north of 22 Mile Road; Section 24; Lombardo Homes, Petitioner. Permanent Parcel 08-24-401-005

Patrick S. Meagher, Planning Consultant, informed the Commission this would be the first extension and as with the last item there are no new ordinance provisions had been adopted which would influence or impact the design of the subdivision.

Patrick Meagher also mentioned all the departments that responded had no objections to the extension request, so they would be recommending approval at this time.

MOTION by KRZEMINSKI seconded by SCIUTO to recommend approval of a one year extension of time for the Preliminary Plan for Sheffield Forest Site Condominiums; Located on the west side of Fairchild Road, ½ mile north of 22 Mile Road; Section 24; Lombardo Homes, Petitioner. Permanent Parcel 08-24-401-005

MOTION carried.

(Open for Public Comments)

None.

PLANNING CONSULTANTS COMMENTS

Patrick Meagher, Planning Consultant, then provided a hand-out to all the Members and explained the concerns of the developers and builders. He further mentioned the reason for buildings with higher basement ceilings and asked Mr. Van Tiflin for his comments and referred any questions to him.

Member TUCKFIELD questioned the reason for the depth problem and Mr. Van Tiflin explained the issues involved with this item and further discussion then took place.

Member TUCKFIELD then inquired as to whether he expects this to be a problem that would continue. Mr. Van Tiflin then explained that it depends on the location in the township and further discussion ensued.

Member SCIUTO asked if the six foot would be standard in a subdivision once it's set up. Mr. Van Tiflin responded, the rule right now is the finished floor can't be higher than five feet above the lowest curb elevation at the street. Mr. Van Tiflin explained that more recently the builders get the height by placing the beam on the top of the basement wall and then they build a new wall around that to give them three additional eight inches instead of having the wall pocket where they used to put the beam in a wall pocket of the basement.

Mr. Van Tiflin then explained some of the problems builders encounter when building the beam on top.

Member TUCKFIELD then asked if Mr. Meagher could provide the addresses on a few of the houses in which the township denied their variances. Member

TUCKFIELD stated he had seen several during his time on the ZBA that were denied. Mr. Meagher agreed to provide these addresses.

Member PROVENZANO asked if the request to change from five to six feet would be enough for now. Mr. Van Tiflin replied that he thought this would be a reasonable extension of what the original ordinance language was trying to keep in mind, but also trying to give the builder and the homeowner some flexibility with what they do with their basement.

Member SCIUTO asked if it's changed to six can they still put a block on top and a pocket. Mr. Van Tiflin stated it depends on their construction technique; Mr. Van Tiflin stated they could do it, yes. Member SCIUTO stated they could then go from nine to ten feet. Mr. Van Tiflin replied they could go to seven or eight feet. Mr. Van Tiflin also stated they can't go any higher than six feet.

Patrick Meagher mentioned he would put together some information based on the discussion, and see if Mr. Maples has any thoughts on this with regards to future regulations on it.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Member SCIUTO stated he had two items he wanted to bring up at the meeting. First was to ask Mr. Meagher and Mr. Esordi about the difference between condo's and 1 & 2 bedroom apartments. He stated that the only difference is the sprinkler systems. Mr. Van Tiflin mentioned metering could be an issue unless the township required every unit to be metered regardless. Mr. Meagher mentioned to the Commission, when multi-family comes in whether it's R-1 or R-2 whatever the case is the township has no say in what the ownership of those units will be, the ownership can't be regulated through the township, so we do need to be careful when handing out multi-family zoning in certain areas where apartments and condominiums are a concern.

Member SCIUTO'S second question was regarding the three senior complexes that had been in the works for years. Member SCIUTO stated the township has had nothing filed regarding the senior complexes and questioned whether they can as a commission set up a meeting with them to discuss their concerns. Mr. Meagher stated that he and Mr. Van Tiflin had been told that the primary issue of these projects was private financing. Mr. Meagher stated this person said it is extremely hard to finance a senior development unless you are one of the major senior corporations that do this on a regular basis, and can self-finance. Mr. Meagher mentioned that Mr. Ruggeri a developer has approval for a senior complex by the church on 23 Mile and the West family also has approval for one in that area. Mr. Meagher mentioned that both developers and the Commission could have a meeting or simply give them a call, and that they could even do a conference call with each one individually with a committee of the Commission.

MACOMB TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES AND PUBLIC HEARING
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2016
PAGE 5 OF 5

Mr. Van Tiflin stated they have not received any feedback, nothing negative on what the township has asked them to do, He stated all we can do is try to help them through the process as much as we can.

Member KRZEMINSKI mentioned the developer of the senior complexes had a discussion with Sal DiCaro, who informed him that there would be a slight charge for the seniors to use the township facilities.

Patrick Meagher stated they heard from someone who is involved with a developer that they're looking for a sponsor for the assisted living portion of the building. Mr. Meagher mentioned that Mr. Ruggeri would be willing to call him because as Mr. Van Tiflin stated he has been very satisfied with the process. Patrick Meagher also informed the Commission that he doesn't think the issue has anything to do with the township. Mr. Meagher inquired if the Commission was interested in forming a committee, if so, then they can certainly sit down and make some calls to see if they can get the developers in or set up a conference call with them.

Chairman OLIVER gave the authorization for Patrick Meagher to start the conversation with the developers, and if they feel they want to discuss the issues, to bring them in because any one of the Commission would be happy to speak with them. Mr. Meagher responded with that's great, we'll see if they want to attend a meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by SCIUTO seconded by PROVENZANO to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 7:34 p.m.

MOTION carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Oliver, Chairman

Aaron Tuckfield
Acting Planning Commission Secretary