

# CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

*REPORT OF MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2018*

**PRESENT:** Kirkanne Moseley, Chairperson  
Ronald DiBartolomeo, Vice-Chairperson  
Denise C. Trombley, Secretary  
George Brumbaugh  
Stephen Charron  
Katherine Cherry  
Lawrence Opalewski Jr.  
Daniel Spatafora  
Joie West

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Stephen N. Cassin, AICP  
Clinton Township Planning Consultant  
Carlisle/Wortman Associates

Ms. Moseley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Mr. Spatafora, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the agenda as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Spatafora, Opalewski, Brumbaugh, Charron, Cherry, Moseley, West, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo. Motion carried.

**LOTS 505 THROUGH 509, INGLESIDE FARMS #3 SUBDIVISION, BEING 6.215 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE WEST SIDE OF GROESBECK HIGHWAY, NORTH OF ULRICH (PARCEL #16-11-22-176-042) (SECTIONS 15/22)**

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: PAHOA EXPRESS (FKA GRUCZ CEMENT)**
- **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL  
FILE #18-4089: PETITIONED BY MR. PAUL MCGILLIVRAY,  
DAGGAR DEVELOPMENT  
REPRESENTED BY MR. JOHN VESPER, VESPER CONSTRUCTION**

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from Mr. Stephen N. Cassin, Planning Consultant for Clinton Township. She advised that notice of this item on tonight's agenda was sent to 33 property owners located

within 300 feet of the property in question, with 1 of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. John Vesper, 42100 Garfield, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, petitioner's representative, offered to answer questions. He explained Pahoa Express is a trucking company that has been operating on this site for a while. They have an existing building on the south side of the property but need additional space, so they are proposing a 100-foot by 240-foot building on the north side of the property. At that time, the entire site will be asphalted. He indicated the building will contain a bathroom and whatever else the company needs. He understood the Fire Department issued concerns to make sure the fire hydrants are in the right locations. He assured they will meet those requirements.

Ms. West questioned whether this is the site where they moved their existing trucks to store them.

Mr. Cassin clarified they moved their trucks temporarily, and those will be moved back once the site is complete.

Mr. Vesper stated they have provided temporary parking to the south while they are constructing this building.

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, supported by Ms. Trombley, with reference to File #18-4089 and application from Mr. Paul R. McGillivray, of Daggar Development, 29205 Ryan Road, Warren, Michigan 48092, as represented by Mr. John Vesper, of Vesper Construction, 42100 Garfield Road, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for approval of the Site Development Plan for Pahoa Express (fka Grucz Cement), located on Lots 505 through 509, Ingleside Farms #3 Subdivision, being 6.215 acres of land fronting the west line of Groesbeck Highway, north of Ulrich (Sections 15/22), as presented, subject to compliance with the Fire Department's concerns being met. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Brumbaugh, Trombley, Charron, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, West. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and this recommendation will be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for their final consideration. She advised that 24 copies of the Site Development Plan and Landscaping Plans will need to be delivered to the Planning Department, at which time they will advise the date of the Township Board Meeting on which this item will be placed for consideration.

**4.97 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED NORTH OF 15 MILE ROAD, WEST OF FORTON COURT, ADDRESSED AS 23203 15 MILE ROAD (PARCEL #16-11-26-451-001) AND 23233 15 MILE ROAD (PARCEL #16-11-26-451-002)**

- **PROPOSED REZONING: R-5 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL**

-- **PUBLIC HEARING**

**FILE #18-6851: PETITIONED BY MR. ANTHONY FANELLI,  
MEMBER OF GLEN ARBOR DEVELOPMENT  
REPRESENTED BY MR. LARRY VANDE VREDE, ESQ.,  
VANDE VREDE & LAVIGNE, P.C.**

---

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from Mr. Stephen N. Cassin, Planning Consultant for Clinton Township. She advised that notice public hearing was issued by regular mail to 114 owners and/or occupants within 300 feet of the land in question, with 3 of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Larry Vande Vrede, 21231 Cass Avenue, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, and his client, Mr. Anthony Fanelli, offered to answer questions.

Mr. Anthony Fanelli, 50466 Heatherwood Lane, Shelby Township, Michigan 48315, explained that the proposed zoning matches the pattern set in the area, noting they are in the middle of an industrially-zoned area.

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Ms. West, to open the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Charron, West, Brumbaugh, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Mr. Spatafora, to close the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: DiBartolomeo, Spatafora, Brumbaugh, Charron, Cherry, Moseley, Opalewski, West, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Charron inquired as to what buffer will be between the subject property and the adjacent residential property.

Mr. Cassin replied that would be at the discretion of the Planning Commission as to whether they want to recommend the required 4-foot 8-inch masonry wall or landscaping in lieu of the wall. He stated his recommendation would be landscaping in lieu of the wall.

Mr. Fanelli explained they already have two concrete walls, one on the east and one on the west.

Ms. West stated the property appears long and somewhat narrow, with a lot of trees. She inquired as to whether the trees are all coming down.

Mr. Fanelli explained that the majority of the trees on the property are poplar, so their value is minimal.

Ms. West felt that is a lot of trees to remove, and trees are good for the environment. She commented that is the only foliage for the adjacent nursing facility, and she added she tends to worry about removing so many trees. She understood the proposed use is congruent with the area.

Mr. Spatafora noted that the Notice of Public Hearing refers to the parcel as being east of Forton Court. He questioned whether that was a typo and commented it appears as though the property is west of Forton Court.

Mr. Fanelli stated it is west of Forton Court because of the way Forton Court loops around.

[Editors note: The subject property **is** east of Forton Court, but west of Grandy Court]

Mr. DiBartolomeo commented that this is a rezoning, so they are only considering that request at this time. He questioned whether they will have to come back with site development plans if this is approved.

Mr. Vande Vrede replied affirmatively and replied to further inquiry that they can discuss foliage at that time.

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Mr. DiBartolomeo, with reference to File #18-6851 and application from Mr. Anthony Fanelli, a member of Glen Arbor Development, LLC, 1418 Inwoods, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48302, as represented by Mr. Larry D. Vande Vrede, Esq., Vande Vrede & Lavigne, P.C., 21231 Cass Avenue, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, concerning the proposed rezoning of 4.97 acres of land located north of 15 Mile Road, east of Forton Court, addressed as 23203 15 Mile Road and 23233 15 Mile Road, from R-5 One-Family Residential to I-1 Light Industrial, that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for approval of the rezoning as requested. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Charron, DiBartolomeo, Brumbaugh, Cherry, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – West. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and this recommendation will be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for their final consideration at their meeting scheduled for Monday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.

**LOTS 7 THROUGH 21, INCLUSIVE, SUPERHIGHWAY CITY SUBDIVISION, BEING 0.69 ACRE OF LAND FRONTING THE SOUTH SIDE OF MORAVIAN DRIVE, EAST OF UTICA ROAD (PARCELS #16-11-30-328-011 THROUGH - 025) (SECTION 30)**

- **PROPOSED REZONING: R-3 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (7,800-SQUARE-FOOT MINIMUM LOT SIZE) TO R-5 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (9,600-SQUARE-FOOT MINIMUM LOT SIZE)**

-- **PUBLIC HEARING**

**FILE #18-6827: PETITIONED BY MR. DALE REESE AND  
MS. JUDITH VARNEY  
REPRESENTED BY MR. THOMAS W. KELLOGG,  
LEHNER ASSOCIATES, INC.**

---

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from Mr. Stephen N. Cassin, Planning Consultant for Clinton Township. She advised that notice public hearing was issued by regular mail to 211 owners and/or occupants within 300 feet of the land in question, with 1 of those returned as undeliverable. She indicated that the original notice sent out was received back from Mr. Lawrence Kuniecki, indicating “no, no, no”, and a letter opposing the proposed rezoning was received from Mr. Mark Sosnoski dated September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018.

Mr. Dale Reece, 23465 Lakewood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, explained that he has been paying fifteen tax statements for ten years on land that was placed into two different names. He explained he has been a business owner and resident in this Township. He was advised by an attorney to go with 40-foot lots, adding that he could go to circuit court. He did not want to do that, so he met with Mr. Santia and asked what could be done. He claimed Mr. Santia had recommended duplexes, where he could build four two-family dwellings; however, when he came to the last meeting, he met with opposition to the request to rezone for duplexes. He explained he came up with a compromise to go with four single-family residential units. He stated the homes behind the subject property are 900-square-foot homes on 40-foot lots. He pointed out to be profitable when building three homes on that property, he would have to build a \$400,000 to \$500,000 home on each of the lots. There are condos across the street and small homes behind, so he stressed the large homes would not fit into the area, whereas the smaller homes would be a good compromise for everyone. He pointed out there is a 20-foot alley in the back of the property, so a lot of the abutting residents behind this property built fences, absorbing that 20 feet into their yards. Mr. Reece stated he talked with Mr. Santia, who he claimed advised him that that the alley should be split, so Mr. Reece would be entitled to ten feet of that alley; however, some of the abutting neighbors do not want to move their fences. He felt that is why some of the residents are complaining, adding it does not make sense to him that they would be complaining about child safety concerns when they live on the next street.

Mr. Reece recalled that at the last meeting when this was discussed, there was a resident on Moravian who got up and spoke, stating she always wanted to live on Moravian from the time she was young because it is a historical road. He pointed out, however, that a 7-Eleven, gas station, liquor store and a condominium complex are all located within 300 feet from her home, so he did not consider that specific area to be “historic”. He pointed out that if he split the property into three 100-foot lots, it would not be financially feasible, and the area is not conducive to \$400,000 to \$500,000 homes. He felt if they can get one more lot, it will fit the neighborhood, and the one additional home is not going to have an impact on traffic in the area. He is aware other builders have come before the Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning Commission years ago for this same property. He felt the residents in the area want to see the property remain vacant, but he is trying to compromise by coming up with a reasonable request, which is why he is proposing single-family homes.

Motion by Mr. Spatafora, supported by Ms. Cherry, to open the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Spatafora, Cherry, Brumbaugh, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, West, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained how the public hearing will take place, and cautioned that once the public hearing is closed, the residents will not be allowed to make additional comments.

Mr. Jerry Bonanno, President of Steeplechase Condominium Association, 36351 Appaloosa Court, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated their condominium association had a traffic study done over an 18-hour period. It was done on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday in the morning for 3 hours and afternoon for 3 hours, and 304 cars entered their complex during those times. He questioned whether Mr. Reece can deviate from four homes if the rezoning is approved from R-3 to R-5.

Mr. Cassin replied that the zoning would not allow it. A rezoning to R-5 would allow a maximum of four homes for the size of the parcel, and that would be contingent upon him obtaining a variance for the depth of the properties.

Mr. Bonanno noted the vacant property on the west side of Utica Road, north of Huron Academy, is being developed. That will create more traffic, and they still have a problem with people entering Steeplechase to cut through. He stated he is concerned about property values. He noted there was no value given to the homes that would be constructed on the subject property, and the residents of Steeplechase would want to consider that. He claimed they have no objections to the petitioner putting three homes on the property because that is the way it is zoned, stressing there is no R-5 zoning in that area. He claimed the majority of the people

in the audience this evening are residents of Steeplechase, and he claimed half of the residents of Steeplechase signed a petition in opposition to the requested rezoning.

Mr. Charron inquired as to Mr. Bonanno's objection to have one more house on the property.

Mr. Bonanno replied they are concerned their property values will decrease. He felt it will be dangerous getting three cars out of the driveways, and four will make it even more dangerous.

Mr. Charron pointed out that they do not yet know the value of the homes that would be going on this property, so he could not see how the residents can assume their property values will go down.

Mr. Bonanno stressed that there is no other property zoned R-5 in the area. He added that he would like to know the value of the homes that Mr. Reece has in mind to build.

Mr. Dennis Jablonski, 15891 Bridle Path, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, claimed the owner of the subject property has a right to build homes on the property, but he does not have the right to change the zoning. He pointed out that there is a bypass lane directly in front of the subject property, because it is located across the street from the entrance to Steeplechase, and he anticipate that will be a problem when residents try to back out of their driveways onto Moravian. He questioned where the parking will be for the homes on the subject property. He urged the Planning Commissioners to consider the impact of this rezoning and to keep the property zoned R-3.

Mr. Reece estimated that any home they build on that property will sell for at least \$250,000 to \$300,000. He pointed out the residents of Steeplechase are fortunate because they have exits onto both Moravian and Utica Roads. He claimed development is taking place as far north as 26 Mile Road and beyond, and new developments often have one entrance for three times the amount of people in Steeplechase. He admitted the traffic gets heavy in the Metro Parkway/Utica Road intersection, but he pointed out the residents of Steeplechase have the option of exiting onto Moravian Drive. Mr. Reece calculated that to build a house on a 40-foot lot, it will still cost about \$100,000 to construct for a 1,300- to 1,400-square-foot home. He pointed out the way he is proposing to split the property, the houses will each be on 75-foot lots; however, he stressed there is no money to be made at all if he is forced to divide the property into 100-foot lots. He claimed if he listens to his attorney and takes the matter to court to prove his payment on lots of record, he could build seven homes on 40-foot lots.

Mr. Donald Hinkle, 15631 Quarter Horse Court, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, explained he tries to exit Steeplechase onto Moravian every morning, and he complained the traffic is backed up to Miami. He noted that other people are trying to back out of their properties and have a difficult time with all of the traffic. He suggested if they approve three homes, they could each provide an adequate turnaround.

Mr. Rod Burnette, 36000 Moravian, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, stated he lives on Moravian along with people who enjoy large treed lots. He stated his wife is the woman who relayed the story at the last meeting about how she always said one day she would live on Moravian. They moved there twenty years ago because they love this street with its fascinating history, including it being a historical route for Thomas Edison when travelling between Port Huron and Detroit. He felt this request is not about any of the other streets in the area, and it is not about Steeplechase, but it is about Moravian. He claimed the developer is “trying to put a square peg into a round hole”, and he felt what the building should be doing is constructing one home on the entire lot that would be “the crown jewel” of his company. He complained this builder is trying to get as much money as he can, and he questioned why the residents of this beautiful road should have to “pay for the mistakes of these people who buy these properties and have consequences”. He claimed that every builder since the early 1900’s has considered the beauty of Moravian when building, including the developer of Steeplechase, who somewhat masked the higher density of the development along Moravian with berms and increased landscaping. He anticipated changing the zoning will not fix the problems the developer is facing, and he will need multiple variances to continue to build. He implored the Planning Commission to “do the right thing” and uphold the integrity of what he claimed is the Township’s oldest street in the process. Mr. Burnette felt the builder should be constructing something for which he is proud.

Ms. Kimberly Burnette, 36000 Moravian, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, claimed if this property is rezoned to allow 75-foot-wide lots and the development of four homes, it does not meet the bulk and density requirement of the surrounding area. She claimed her home is appraised at over \$300,000, and there is another home at the corner of Venice and Moravian that is valued at \$240,000. She distributed packets of photos to each of the Commissioners, showing the subject property. She also included photos of a recent accident that occurred directly in front of the subject parcel, which is at the point of the bypass lane for those turning left into Steeplechase, which is across the street. She felt it is important for residents to be able to pull out onto Moravian and not have to back out onto that road, but she claimed they will not have room for circle driveways if the lots are smaller. She commented that being located

closer to the intersection does not mean that space is not the same as the rest of the road east of them.

Ms. Brenda Finley, 35956 Moravian, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, homeowner of property at the corner of Venice and Moravian, stated she lives two doors away from the Burnette's. She indicated there is a dental office across the street from her house, and that backs up to a party store. She claimed Moravian is crazy with traffic, and police are always ticketing people there. She referred to the developer's claim that if he puts four houses there, they will be close to \$300,000 in value. She claimed she has a newer brick colonial-style home, purchased it for \$210,000, and put some money into finishing the basement, redoing the kitchen, along with additional landscaping, and it is barely back to a value of \$220,000. She felt four of her houses will not bring him \$300,000 each. She is from the Upper Peninsula, where homes are further apart, and she specifically chose Moravian because of the large lots. She indicated that, although her house faces pavement, she is still on a dirt road, with dirt roads behind her, so this is an area where she feels she has beauty on one side, and rustic on the other. She stated she is in favor of two or three houses but is opposed to four houses on that property.

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to close the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Charron, Opalewski, Brumbaugh, Cherry, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Spatafora, West, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Mr. Brumbaugh stated he is aware that an R-5 One-Family Residential zoning district requires a minimum 65-foot width lot, with a total land area of no less than 7,800 square feet. He inquired as to the requirements for the R-3 district.

Mr. Cassin replied the R-3 One-Family Residential zoning district requires a minimum 80-foot lot width, and land area of at least 9,600 square feet.

Mr. Brumbaugh inquired as to whether there was a waiver granted in the past to allow the 40-foot lots in the R-3 district.

Mr. Cassin replied there was no waiver given, but most likely the land was platted prior to the ordinance being adopted.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the access to these lots off of Moravian Drive, and whether they will be straight driveways where cars will have to back onto Moravian, or whether they will have circular driveways.

Mr. Reece replied that a turn-around would fit nicely on a 75-foot-wide lot. He stated he lives on Lakewood and built four homes there, noting that one of those

sold for \$285,000. He acknowledged that circle drives are nice and that would be a consideration.

Mr. Spatafora questioned why it would not be economically viable to develop the property under the requirements of the R-3 One-Family Residential zoning district, and why he needs to include a fourth home.

Mr. Reece replied that, prior to 2008, he teamed up with another builder and they constructed economical single-family homes. He explained his friend passed away, and he has been trying to sell this property for ten years. Everyone interested in buying the property did not go through with it because they indicated that building three homes on the subject property would not be at all profitable. He explained that bigger lots can accommodate bigger homes, which generally would bring in a higher price; however, this would hold true along Moravian if it were closer to Millar. He felt in this particular area, which has smaller homes behind the property, and condominiums across the street, he would not be able to get the higher price that would be required with a larger home.

Mr. Spatafora noted they are looking at a difference of 15 feet in lot width and 1,800 square feet in lot size, and he questioned how that would make a difference in what he could develop.

Mr. Reece explained the property is 300 feet, so dividing that into three lots would result in 80-foot-wide lots with 60 feet left over.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether Mr. Reece ever visualized what he could do with 100-foot-wide lots, possibly with architecture and landscaping, to command a higher price for a larger home. He noted the economy is better now than it was over the last several years.

Mr. Reece stated if he was going to build a home and had \$400,000, he would not buy a home in that area that has much smaller homes directly behind the property. He also pointed out that his understanding is that he is entitled to an additional 10 feet of the 20-foot alley behind the property. He noted that many of the owners on Venice Street have absorbed the full 20 feet for sheds.

Mr. Spatafora encouraged Mr. Reece to “think outside the box” and be creative and questioned whether he could possibly capitalize on the historic nature of Moravian Road to develop something that could be creative and profitable. He suggested he may be able to be creative enough to develop the three lots, and it could be “a win-win” all the way around.

Mr. Reece did not feel creativity will be enough to make it profitable. He agreed that if the property was located close to Millar, with the deep lots and all residential, it may be possible. He reminded that the residents who are claiming this is a “historical” road are located 300 feet from a 7-Eleven and a gas station,

with a liquor store across the street, and they are also located directly across the street from a condominium complex, so he did not feel it makes sense to construct \$400,000 homes at this location. He stated he was trying to come up with a compromise, noting he has 20-foot-lots and has been paying taxes for each of those lots, that could go to circuit court, and he may be able to develop on 40-foot lots to match what is behind this property. He stressed he is trying to be fair by offering a compromise.

Ms. West thanked Mr. Reece for being present tonight. She questioned whether each of the 75-foot lots would be 100-foot in depth.

Mr. Reece replied affirmatively, but reminded they have to take into consideration 10 feet of the alley which is his share, and that will meet the minimum lot sizes for the R-3 District. He acknowledged that some of the homeowners on Venice Street put their fence incorporated 10 feet of that alley into their lot, but others have extended their yards by the full 20 feet and have put up fences and sheds. He indicated 10 feet of that is technically to be included with his property.

Ms. West calculated that 3.97 houses could be built on this property. She expressed concern about the turn-around. She questioned why the petitioner is not going with larger lots, because this does not make sense. She stressed she is concerned about this development and the turnaround. She recalled the main reason she voted against the last request is that the residents would have to back out because they did not have sufficient room to turn their car around.

Ms. Judith Varney, co-owner of the subject property, stated they are on 75-foot lots on Lakewood, and they have circular drives up and down the street. She added they are beautiful homes in that area.

Ms. West felt the houses are “crammed in” and she did not feel she would want to spend \$250,000 to \$300,000 for one of these houses.

Ms. Varney stressed they are trying to be reasonable by asking for only one more house. She pointed out they have been paying the taxes on this property and have been maintaining it but keeping the grass cut, but she felt the neighbors are opposed to anything going up on that property. She explained they want to do something where they can make a little profit, and she is aware everyone loves Moravian and thinks of it as historic. She added that if she and Mr. Reece were millionaires, they would keep it as vacant land for the neighbors to enjoy. She noted that Mr. Santia, former Planning Department Director, had come up with the idea of duplexes, which is something they had never thought of; however, the residents were extremely opposed to that proposal.

Ms. Moseley understood the concerns being expressed, but she reminded that this is a petition to rezone. She emphasized they do not have a site development plan, nor do they know the sizes of the homes at this time.

Ms. West noted there is only 30,000 square feet available on this property and the petitioner is indicating he intends to construct four homes, so she does not know how they will fit. She indicated she will be voting no on this request. She agreed, however, that Ms. Moseley is correct when stating that a specific site plan cannot be considered at the time a rezoning of the property is requested.

Ms. Moseley cautioned that once a rezoning goes through, the petitioners can change their minds as to the layout on the site, so she compared it to “putting the cart before the horse”. She assured she is not trying to make any bad judgments and assured they will have to look at the plans in detail, but they are not yet at that point.

Ms. West stated that, while she appreciates the process, she has a problem with having a fourth home on the property.

Ms. Cherry questioned whether they should consider the infrastructure of Moravian when making this decision.

Mr. Cassin stated they can look at traffic counts, and there have been occasions when a request to rezone has been postponed so they can go to the Macomb County Department of Roads for their review. He assured it is within the Planning Commission’s prerogative to consider the impact on roads.

Mr. Brumbaugh commented that Mr. Cassin has been doing what he does for a long time, and he is recommending approval of the rezoning as requested. He did not feel this is a bad use of the property, so he is in favor of the proposed rezoning.

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, supported by Mr. Charron, with reference to File #18-6827 and application from Mr. Dale Reece and Ms. Judith Varney, 23465 Lakewood Street, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, as represented by Mr. Tom Kellogg, P.E., P.S., Lehner Associates, Inc., 17001 19 Mile Road, Suite 3, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, concerning the proposed rezoning from R-3 One-Family Residential (9,600-square-foot minimum lot size) to R-5 One-Family Residential (7,800-square-foot minimum lot size) for the purpose of constructing single-family homes on Lots 7 through 21, inclusive, Superhighway City Subdivision, being vacant land located south of Moravian, east of Miami (Section 30), that recommendation be forwarded to the Township Board for approval of the rezoning as requested. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Brumbaugh, Charron, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – Cherry, West. Absent – None. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and this recommendation will be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for

their final consideration at their meeting scheduled for Monday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.

## **REPORTS OF MEETINGS**

### **-- APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2018 REPORT**

---

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the report of the Planning Commission Meeting held on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018, as submitted. Motion carried (Mr. DiBartolomeo abstained).

## **PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

### **-- NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2018**

---

Mr. Cassin stated the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018. He indicated there will only be one item on the agenda, and that will be a proposed rezoning from B-3 to I-1 for a truck operation on Gratiot, near Joy Boulevard. They have been operating their trucking business in the B-3 District, but they require an I-1 zoning for that use.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Charron, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Denise C. Trombley*

Denise C. Trombley, Secretary

CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:10/9/18

ces:10/10/18

*Approved 10/11/18*