

Present: Chairperson Ostrowski; Vice Chair Westerlund; Members: Abboud, Borowski, Freedman and Ruprich

Absent: Jensen, Peddie and Stempien

Also Present: Village Manager, Chris Wilson
Planning Consultant, Brian Borden

Chairperson Ostrowski called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. in the Village of Beverly Hills municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

APPROVE/AMEND AGENDA

Motion by Borowski, second by Westerlund, to approve the agenda as published.

Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF A PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD JANUARY 22, 2014

Motion by Borowski, second by Westerlund, that the minutes of a regular Planning Commission meeting held January 22, 2014 be approved as submitted.

Motion passed.

REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF A COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 12, 2014

A correction was made on page 5, under “Discuss Establishment of Tree Protection Ordinance”, first paragraph. The last sentence was changed to read as follows: “The intent of the tree protection ordinance would be: 1) to protect existing trees on site; 2) to replace trees removed on site; and 3) to establish a tree fund whereby payment could be made when trees cannot be accommodated on site.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Ruprich, that the minutes of a Council/Planning Commission meeting held February 12, 2014 be approved as amended.

Motion passed.

LAND DIVISION APPLICATION FOR 18414 AND 18450 WARWICK

Planning consultant Brian Borden outlined a land division application proposing a simultaneous land division and combination between two adjacent properties. This request could be described as a lot reconfiguration rather than a lot split. The properties are located on the north side of Warwick between Bedford Road and Hillcrest Boulevard in an R-2B zoned district.

The two existing parcels exceed minimum dimensional standards for lots in the R-2B zone district. The proposal entails the shifting of the common side lot line by 10 feet to the east, thus conveying 1,300 square feet of lot area from 18414 Warwick to 18450 Warwick. The rationale

for the request stems from a surveying error, which was uncovered as part of the proposal to expand the residence at 18450 Warwick. Specifically, a 13.1-foot discrepancy was found, which would have resulted in the proposed addition encroaching onto the adjacent property (18414 Warwick). The proposed lot reconfiguration would rectify this situation as well as clarify the boundary line for fencing and landscaping purposes. It was noted that the existing fence line was always thought to be the property line and was landscaped and maintained accordingly.

The proposal was reviewed by LSL Planning in accordance with the standards of Section 23.16 of the Village Subdivision Regulations. The Village is in receipt of the February 17, 2104 review letter from LSL Planning. Borden's only comment was that any issues raised by the Village Department of Public Services or Village Engineer must be addressed. It has been determined that tax payments are current on the two parcels in question. Council will conduct the required public hearing on this land division application in order to meet ordinance requirements for timing.

Mark and Amy Farmer of 18450 Warwick were present along with Sarah May of 18414 Warwick and the builder. Mark Farmer stated that extensive surveying was done to confirm and stake the boundary lines; there is a new legal description. The applicants request approval for the land division.

Westerlund referred to the survey drawing and indicated that the 18450 address is labeled as the existing house; it should be labeled as a proposed structure. Farmer concurred and will make that change.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Borowski, that the Planning Commission recommend Council approval of the land division application for 18414 and 18450 Warwick conditioned on addressing comments from the DPS and/or Village Engineer. Further, the Grant Ward survey drawing should be changed to reflect that the 18450 Warwick address should be noted as a proposed house.

Roll Call Vote:
Motion passed (6 – 0).

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING DETROIT COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL REQUEST FOR SPECIAL USE APPROVAL FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO ACCOMMODATE UPGRADES TO EXISTING MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES OPERATIONS AT THE UPPER SCHOOL

Planning consultant Borden referred to the LSL Planning review letter dated February 17, 2014 addressing the Detroit Country Day School special use and site plan review. Borden has reviewed the proposal from Detroit Country Day to construct an approximately 4,900 square foot addition on the north side of the Upper School building. The addition is intended to improve mechanical and operational infrastructure for the campus. The project includes these primary functions:

- Relocation and replacement of the existing building mechanical infrastructure;
- Relocation and segregation of the existing shipping area; and
- Construction of a multi-purpose area for current functions (staging, scene storage, set fabrication, etc.)

Private schools and their accessory components are permitted after special approval in the R-1 district. In accordance with Ordinance Section 22.08.300, expansion of a principal building for a use permitted after special approval requires a new special use approval. Site plan review and approval is also required for the project.

Borden first addressed the standards being considered in the special use review. Special land uses primarily address the compatibility with adjacent uses and zoning of land. The application is for a relatively small building addition. Borden stated that any concerns raised by the Village Engineer and/or Director of Public Services should be addressed as part of the review process. Based on the site plan, it is recommended that the applicant relocate or replace the 10 trees that will be removed to accommodate the project. There are areas on the 13 Mile side of the campus that are not as wooded as other areas.

Sam Ashley with Cunningham-Limp Construction Company stated that he was there on behalf of Detroit Country Day School. The need for this proposal came out of an overall facilities assessment. Many of the mechanical components and infrastructure currently housed at this location are approaching the end of their life cycle. In evaluating that along with facility needs, it was decided to replace specific mechanical infrastructure with more efficient systems and to segregate shipping and receiving space from student space. The other portion of the project involves a multi-use area to accommodate existing functions that take place adjacent to the performing arts center.

With regard to the comments that were listed for special land use, Cunningham-Limp responded to open items listed by LSL Planning. DCDS will be able to relocate about 50% of the trees there now; the other half will be replaced. Ashley had drawings available if there were questions.

Chairman Ostrowski declared the public hearing open at 7:56 pm to hear comments on the request from Detroit Country Day for special use approval.

Don MacDonald of 31208 Foxboro Way, vice-president of the area homeowners association, thought that the Village should not allow Detroit Country Day to make any changes or additions to the property on the basis that they are terrible neighbors. MacDonald related examples of rudeness and unsafe driving exhibited by students and parents who attend the school as well as neglect by DCDS administration and their lack of contributions to the community.

No one else wished to be heard. The public hearing was closed at 8:00 pm.

In response to an inquiry on special land use considerations, Borden stated that the special land use addresses whether the site can accommodate the proposed building expansion in terms of the use as presented. It takes into account whether the proposal has an adverse impact on infrastructure, environment, and surrounding properties.

Ostrowski noted that a traffic study was submitted as part of the proposal. It demonstrated no additional traffic issues. He asked if the school anticipates additional truck traffic with the addition above what is currently generated. Ashley responded that there will be no additional truck traffic. The school is not adding resources that require more traffic counts and no additional faculty or students. This is simply accommodating existing needs. Ashley clarified that the project will be relocating the existing overhead door.

Motion by Freedman, second by Borowski, that the Planning Commission recommend Council approval of the special use application from Detroit Country Day School for a building addition to accommodate upgrades to existing mechanical equipment and facilities operations at the Upper School.

Westerlund asked for clarification on the use of the proposed addition, particularly relative to the multi-use area. Ashley responded that there are three components to the addition: 1) the existing mechanical courtyard that will be relocated with replacement and upgrade of all mechanical systems; 2) the segregation and addition of the shipping area; and 3) the multi use space. The current set shop is adjacent to the multi-use space for the performing arts center. That space will function as a support area to the performing arts center. A mechanical room upstairs is the location for a new boiler. The control room supplements the control system within the performing arts center. Ashley provided additional plan details relative to the construction and function of the proposed project. In response to an inquiry on the duration of the project, Ashley stated that the project could be completed within 4-5 months.

Tim Casai from TMP Architecture commented that the Performing Arts Center was built 18 years ago under a different building code. The International Building Code has restrictions on fire area square footage. Casai provided an explanation of construction that must take place to meet current fire wall restrictions.

Roll Call Vote:

Westerlund - yes
Abboud - yes
Borowski - no
Freedman - yes
Ostrowski - yes
Ruprich - yes

Motion passed (5 – 1).

REVIEW AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING DETROIT COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL REQUEST FOR BUILDING ADDITION TO ACCOMMODATE UPGRADES TO EXISTING MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES OPERATIONS AT THE UPPER SCHOOL

Planning consultant Borden referred to his review letter dated February 17, 2014 to discuss the site plan submitted by Detroit Country Day School for a building addition to accommodate upgrades to existing mechanical equipment and facilities operations at the Upper School. The project requires the removal of 10 trees. LSL Planning recommends that these trees be relocated if possible or replaced elsewhere on the property. He noted that there are gaps in plantings along 13 Mile Road and adjacent to residential uses.

Building elevation drawings identify the use of brick and limestone panels to match the existing building. Elevation views are provided for the north and east sides of the addition although a portion of the addition also appears to extend into the west elevation. Borden said that the Commission may wish to request an elevation view of the westerly façade. LSL recommends that the applicant provide a color rendering and/or material samples for the Commission's consideration.

Sam Ashley with Cunningham-Limp Construction Company representing Detroit Country Day School displayed a drawing to show that the approximately 20 linear feet of wall that extends into the west elevation conforms to the entire façade of the proposed addition and maintains the brick and limestone profile of the existing building. He and Architect Tim Casai displayed samples of the façade materials including brick and stone accents, which will match the existing building.

A letter submitted from Village Engineer Tom Meszler indicated that he has no objections to the proposed grading. Ostrowski questioned the lack of grading notations in the proposal. Ashley addressed the elevation differences on the plan.

Westerlund had a number of questions related to the accuracy of the site plan submitted. The existing plans show a portion of the building that has not been constructed, specifically the lobby at the east end of the addition. Ashley responded that the lobby shown on the plan has been site plan approved and permitted for construction. Construction will take place when funding becomes available.

Westerlund stated that the plan should delineate what elements are proposed but not constructed. He is reluctant to proceed without knowing the phasing for improvements and what elements have been permitted but not completed. He added that there are additional trees on the property that are not shown on the site plan.

Freedman recalled that, when the Planning Commission considered a previous addition, Detroit Country Day explained that they develop a plan and obtain a permit in order to solicit funding for a project. Ashley affirmed that the school has to have entitlements in place in order to obtain funding and begin construction. No one will commit to something that is not likely to be built. Going through the site plan approval process is the first step of reaching a point of funding the project.

Tim Casai related that Detroit Country Day School appeared before the Planning Commission some years ago and presented a phased construction plan for the athletic campus at the school. It was made clear and written into approvals that this would be phased construction over several years and that it would be contingent upon fund raising. The piece being discussed is the last of the phases that have not been built. It was approved by the Planning Commission and Council with the understanding that it would be phased construction based on fund raising. The overall plan was carefully analyzed for impact on all the issues that surround the site plan. Currently, there is an interface between the last phase and the mechanical yard. The purpose of this mechanical yard is to replace mechanical equipment that can no longer be supported. It is important from an environmental and cost standpoint to replace that equipment.

Ostrowski reiterated that the objection is that the applicant is presenting what appears to be a master plan as the site plan for a specific project. The plan should include a note indicating that a building shown is not yet constructed. Casai responded that the applicant would be happy to add that note. He questioned whether the petitioner would have been criticized for not showing the final phase in the interface between what is being requested and the final phase of the previous approval.

Motion by Freedman, second by Abboud, that the Planning Commission recommends Council approval of the Detroit Country Day School site plan for building addition to accommodate upgrades to existing mechanical equipment and facilities operations at the Upper School contingent on: 1) adding notes to the site plan to indicate previously approved but unconstructed elements on the plan, and 2) DCDS agreement to replace trees that cannot be transplanted.

There followed a discussion on how the Planning Commission should proceed. The opinion was expressed by members that this site plan was incomplete and not ready for approval.

Roll Call Vote:

Abboud	- yes
Borowski	- no
Freedman	- yes
Ostrowski	- yes
Ruprich	- no
Westerlund	- no

Motion failed (3 – 3).

Ostrowski commented that the plan as submitted meets with site plan criteria with the exception of an accurate depiction of what is built and what is not built. The applicant was requested to update the drawings to provide the accuracy discussed.

Wilson stated that there will be no recommendation going to forward to Council on the failed motion. The petitioner is free to resubmit a plan for consideration by the Planning Commission. It is clear from the comments made that the issues have to do with the site plan drawings presented.

SIGN REQUEST FROM BIGGBY COFFEE, 31201 SOUTHFIELD ROAD

Planning consultant Brian Borden stated that LSL Planning has reviewed an application requesting three new signs for Biggby Coffee at 31201 Southfield Road, formerly the Starbucks location in the Market Fresh building. The submittal proposed a new wall sign as well as two sign faces on two existing ground signs – a pole sign along Southfield Road and a monument style sign along 13 Mile Road.

An item that needs to be addressed by the applicant is whether or not Biggby Coffee constitutes a “business” as defined in Section 22.32.020. The ordinance states *although contained in the same building as another business and may or may not be owned by the same person, an activity may be treated as a separate business only if the following exists:*

- 1. The businesses are physically separated from each other in a manner that complies with the Village adopted building code for fire separation between business uses.*
- 2. Each business provides distinctly different services*
- 3. Has a separate business address*

Borden affirmed that the businesses have separate addresses, and they provide different services. Wilson will confirm with the public safety fire marshal or the Royal Oak building department as

to whether the standard is being met for separation between the two businesses in a manner that complies with the building code for fire separation.

Wilson commented that the current space is being modified. He asked LSL to look at the previous site plan approved for that store and what is being proposed in this build out for Biggby Coffee to determine if it meets with Village site plan requirements. He questioned whether this project should have gone through a site plan review process before it was permitted for construction.

There is a 30 square foot wall sign proposed. The new sign ordinance permits up to 30% of the sign to be internally lit. Borden requested additional detail from the applicant documenting the proposed type/extent of illumination. There are two ground sign components that are complicated by the fact that they are both on nonconforming sign structures. There is a 15.8 square foot sign face on the existing pole sign and a 3.5 square foot sign on the existing monument sign.

Another issue relates to whether the applicant is entitled to three signs. The question is whether Biggby has two street frontages. Ostrowski questioned whether this application should go forward based on lack of sufficient information and the outstanding questions.

Business owner Jim Stewart stated that they have gone through permitting to do the remodeling of the current space and to enlarge that space. One of the permit approvals was to add to and separate the fire suppression system. The gate and entrance that was there previously has been closed. The building department expected the owner to make the stores completely separate, and that has been done. He will submit plan details to the Village.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Ruprich, to table the sign request from Biggby Coffee at 31201 Southfield Road in order to receive additional information regarding: the wall sign and illumination of the wall sign in conformance with the ordinance; confirmation that the businesses are physically separated in a manner that complies with the building code for fire separation between business uses, and; details for one ground sign.

Motion passed.

SIGN REQUEST FROM NORTHBROOK PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 22055 W. 14 MILE ROAD

Manager Wilson stated that this applicant was informed by Administration that changeable electronic message signs are not allowed under the Sign Ordinance. The petitioner applied to the Village Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance from the ordinance to replace their current sign with a changeable electronic message sign. The existing sign is in a state of disrepair; it is a changeable message sign whereby letters are changed manually. The Zoning Board of Appeals heard the case but tabled any action pending instruction or review by the Planning Commission. ZBA members questioned the allowable nature of electronic message signs if the message is static and stays in place for a long period of time.

Planning consultant Brian Borden added that there are two sections of the ordinance that are applicable to this discussion. Section 22.32.020 contains the definition of a changeable message sign. Section 22.32.091 Prohibited Signs includes changeable electronic message signs.

Paul Deters with Metro Detroit Signs was present with George Marsh and Brian Long representing Northbrook Church. They sought direction relative to the options and procedures that the applicant may have for consideration of this type of signage. The church is trying to display a simple message that will be changed only once or twice a week. The existing sign is a static sign in need of replacement; the intent is upgrade to an electronic version that will be a static message sign that is easier to change and maintain. Deters remarked that technology is changing, and all signs will eventually be digital.

Deters displayed day and night time pictures of a sign his company erected at another church in the area. He stated that the sign is not a distraction to traffic nor has it diminished property values. Deters commented that neighbors in attendance at the Zoning Board meeting with concerns about electronic signs were more favorable towards the proposal after hearing an explanation of the proposed sign.

Deters understood that the Planning Commission recently updated the Village sign ordinance. He thought there was room to revisit regulations relative to changeable electronic signs. Deters added that it was within the rights of the Village to monitor the frequency at which messages change and the intensity of the illumination. Under those circumstances, Deters contends an electronic message sign is a better option for the community than an internally illuminated fluorescent sign.

Commission members reviewed the proposed sign from Northbrook Church. The following topics were discussed: concern with uncontrolled signs in the Village; color limitations; frequency of the message; limit on hours of illumination; and measurable and continuing definitions and controls that could be included in the ordinance. Ostrowski commented that the Village does not have the staff to monitor how often signs are changed and the duration of the message.

Westerlund stated that the Planning Commission was concerned about electronic message signs with a video display. The Village finds signs with flashing lights, video, and scrolling messages objectionable. An electronic static message sign may require further definition that the Planning Commission can consider. It was suggested that the church may want to hold off on replacement of its sign until this can be reviewed. Other members supported the suggestion to revisit this aspect of the sign ordinance.

Borden remarked that this sign is not permissible under the current sign ordinance regulations. The only way to allow this sign would be for the ZBA to grant a variance or for the Village Council to amend the sign ordinance. Borden commented that a number of communities do permit changeable electronic message signs including prohibitions on scrolling, moving, flashing, etc.; limitations on the time frame for changing the sign; limiting the changeable message area to a percentage of a sign; and other protections to limit the downside of these types of signs. It is within the discretion of the Planning Commission and Council to amend the ordinance. If the Planning Commission wants to continue the discussion, Borden can provide members with sample ordinances.

Ostrowski concurred that the section of the sign ordinance addressing changeable electronic signs could be reconsidered. He suggested that this matter be discussed by the Commission when the entire membership is present before proceeding.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Freedman, that the request for a sign permit by Northbrook Presbyterian Church at 22055 W. 14 Mile Road to erect a changeable electronic message sign be denied for the reason that this type of sign is prohibited by the Village Sign Ordinance. Amendments to the sign ordinance may be considered in the near future based on Planning Commission discussion.

Roll Call Vote:

Borowski	- yes
Freedman	- yes
Ostrowski	- yes
Ruprich	- yes
Westerlund	- yes
Abboud	- no

Motion passed (5 – 1).

LAND DIVISION APPLICATION FOR 31805 EVERGREEN ROAD

Planning consultant Borden referred to his review letter dated February 17, 2014 regarding a land division application proposing the division of property at 31805 Evergreen Road into four separate parcels along a proposed private roadway. Land divisions are regulated by Section 23.16 of Village Subdivision Regulations; it was noted that the private roadway is subject to the review process outlined in Section 23.17 of Village Subdivision Regulations.

The existing parcel provides a lot area of 5.596 acres and contains an existing residence towards the rear (westerly) portion of the site. The proposal is to divide the parcel into four new parcels, one of which would maintain the existing residence. The other three parcels would be new buildable sites, all situated on a private roadway off of Evergreen Road. Borden remarked that the survey drawing needs to be updated to show the existing residence in accordance with the ordinance.

The site is located on the west side of Evergreen Road north of Ronsdale Road. The site and adjacent properties are primarily zoned R-1 Single Family Residential District, while one property to the north and another farther south are zoned PP Public Property. He noted that all four of the parcels are much larger than surrounding parcels.

The proposal has been reviewed in accordance with the standards of Section 23.16(e) of the Subdivision Regulations. LSL Planning defers to the Village Engineer and Public Services Director for comments related to easements for public utilities and disruption of flow of water. The submittal does not include written confirmation from the Village Engineer or RCOO demonstrating compliance with accessibility to a public road. Borden noted a few errors on the surrounding development lot size study that should be corrected.

Borden stated that his biggest concern with this proposal is tied to the site lines and suitability of vehicular access with respect to the proposed private road. The ordinance requires written

confirmation from the Village Engineer on this topic. If the private road is designed and located in accordance with the Village Engineer, Borden does not see any issues with the request from a planning and zoning standpoint.

Manager Wilson stated that the Village's consulting engineering firm Hubbell, Roth & Clark has received a set of these plans as well as Public Services Director Tom Meszler. The site line issue will be the biggest item. There will be other engineering issues because the applicant is proposing a water and sewer service down this road. Wilson concurred that this project is relatively straightforward relative to the planning and zoning aspect. When we get to the site plan review, there are some grading and site distance issues regarding access on Evergreen Road.

Planning Commission members discussed this request for approval of a land division proposal. This is not a site plan review application at this point. Engineering questions would come back during site plan review. At this time, members are considering whether the proposed lots are suitable in terms of zoning and planning.

Developer John Mentag stated that he is representing the property owners Julie and Ted Willett in terms of building and restoration of the existing house. He talked about how the property will be redeveloped. The Willetts are not proposing cluster zoning options or more intense zoning. The ordinance requires at least a 16,000 sq. ft. lot size; the proposed lots are about 35,000-40,000 sq. ft. The property owners are requesting approval of the land division application. The next step is to review the site plan and private road.

Planning Commission members discussed the proposal. Topics of discussion included the scope of the study to evaluate the character of the surrounding development; lot area of the proposed parcels as indicated on the plans; computation of lot size; consistency of buildable lots with neighboring areas; and unresolved issues of accessibility from the private road to Evergreen Road.

Motion by Abboud, second by Borowski, to refer the land division application for 31805 Evergreen Road to Council for approval with the following conditions: 1) the existing residence needs to be added to the survey drawing; 2) correct errors in the lot area study to comply with criterion #8 of the LSL Planning review letter dated 2/17/14; 3) address any comments from the Public Services Director and Village Engineer, particularly regarding criterion #10 with respect to accessibility.

Roll Call Vote:

Freedman - no
Ostrowski - yes
Ruprich - yes
Westerlund - no
Abboud - yes
Borowski - yes
Motion passed (4 – 2).

Council will hold a public hearing on this lot split request. A resident on Ronsdale was present and asked to speak on this topic. Alan Sefton of 20205 Ronsdale Drive, current president of the Ronsdale neighborhood association, commented that there was a meeting held over the weekend

to address concerns by area residents regarding this land division. The three homeowners whose property abuts the proposed development were concerned about the proximity of the private road, the effect on the value of their property due to the private road, and privacy and screening issues. Developer John Mentag stated that he would be happy to meet with those abutting residents.

REQUEST FROM BEVERLY HILLS LITTLE LEAGUE TO PLACE STORAGE BUILDING IN BEVERLY PARK

Manager Wilson stated that the proposal from the Beverly Hills Little League to construct a storage shed in Beverly Park has been before the Parks and Recreation Board and the Village Council. The Parks and Recreation Board recommended Council approval to construct the storage shed. Council referred the site plan request submitted by the BHLL to the Planning Commission for review. Council also passed a motion to refer the funding for the storage shed in Beverly Park for use by the BHLL to the Village Attorney for review and opinion. Attorney Ryan indicated that the Village can fund the shed if it chooses. Wilson added that the funding will be determined by the Village Council at a later date.

This project is before the Planning Commission for review of an accessory building being constructed on Village property. Before the Commission for consideration is a written proposal from the Beverly Hills Little League and a review letter from LSL Planning dated 2/17/14. Wilson related that the BHLL is proposing to build a storage shed near the ball diamond that they use and maintain; it will house equipment used by the League.

Accessory buildings customarily incidental to a permitted principal use are permitted by right in the Public Property District. In this instance, the principal use is a Village park, playground, and playfield. Wilson stated that Council is looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission on the appropriateness of locating this accessory building within Beverly Park as well as the size and architectural components on the structure.

Freedman had a concern with building a shed in the park that is for the exclusive use of the Beverly Hills Little League. Wilson responded that Council was concerned with whether it was appropriate to pay for a structure for the sole use of the Little League. Attorney Ryan indicated that original deed restrictions for Dodge Park give the Little League, among other organizations, the exclusive right to use the park. Any structure built in the park is at the discretion of the Village Council. The Council will decide on the funding and use of the shed.

Paul Turner, representing the Beverly Hills Little League, was present to address questions from the Planning Commission. In response to an inquiry, he stated that the existing storage boxes would be placed against the south face of the storage building on a cement slab. One of the boxes belongs to the Men's Softball League. Turner addressed questions from the members on plans for the shed and its use.

Commission members discussed the location and size of the building. The proposed 192 square foot building is proposed to be 16' x 12'. The suggestion was made to locate the shed between the two ball fields. Turner responded that this was discussed by the Parks and Recreation Board, who suggested a location where the foliage would block the shed from view by Allerton residents. The doors face west.

With regard to the exterior of the shed, it was mentioned that an all-brick building would be desirable, but may be cost prohibitive. Westerlund proposed brick construction of about 2.5 ft. around the perimeter of the building to be compatible with the brick on the pavilion with Hardie Plank siding above the brick. He expressed the view that brick veneer or panel brick does not wear well. The suggestion was made to obtain costs for a full brick building.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Ruprich, that the Planning Commission recommend to Council that the storage building for use by the Beverly Hills Little League go forward at the location as presented and agreed upon by the Parks and Recreation Board; with the building being 16' x 12' or smaller; extension of the slab 3' - 4' beyond on the south side of the building to accommodate storage bins; a minimum of 2'-8" of actual brick around the perimeter of the building with Hardie Plank above to be consistent with the park pavilion. The building should be screened to the extent possible by existing foliage along Allerton Drive as indicated on the site plan.

Roll Call Vote:

Ostrowski - yes
Ruprich - yes
Westerlund - yes
Abboud - yes
Borowski - yes
Freedman - no

Motion passed (5 – 1).

PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Ruprich suggested that discussion of the sign ordinance be placed on a future Planning Commission agenda in order to revisit the electronic sign issue.

Westerlund commented that, as a matter of procedure, the professionals who submit proposals to the Planning Commission should be required to present accurate documentation.

Abboud suggested that, if the Village were to amend the sign ordinance to allow changeable electronic message signs, any new restrictions should be imposed on existing electronic message signs in the community.

Abboud reported on the Silver Key Coalition, a group of individuals and organizations committed to supporting the desire of older adults with a disability to remain living independently in their own home as long as possible. The Coalition goal is to make Michigan a "no wait state" for in-home services.

Freedman supported the suggestion to consider sign ordinance amendments adding restrictions regarding electronic signs.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS

Wilson informed the Commission members that the Village will be changing over its building department services to the City of Royal Oak within the next couple of weeks. Village staff is receiving training on new financial accounting software for the building department. There will

be a complete merger of the Village's data base with the Royal Oak data base, which would allow Royal Oak to begin accepting permit applications and issuing permits for the Village in early March.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

Motion by Freedman, second by Ruprich, to adjourn the meeting at 10:42 pm

Motion passed.

George Ostrowski
Planning Commission Chairman

Ellen E. Marshall
Village Clerk

Susan Bernard
Recording Secretary