

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of September 20, 2004**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the September 20, 2004 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present

Roger Lamont
John Steckling (arrived 7:49 p.m.)
Paul Rabaut
Dean Baker
Chris Moore
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioner(s) Absent

Gail Mann-Bowser

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Collin Walls
Leon Genre

Approval of Minutes: July 19, 2004 Business Meeting
August 16, 2004 Business Meeting

- **Commissioner Baker moved to approve the minutes of July 19, 2004 and August 16, 2004 as presented. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Baker, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Steckling and Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

Chairperson Lamont noted that **Saturn North should be added as Item #1** under Unfinished Business and **Steelcor Final Site Plan should be changed to become Item #2** under Unfinished Business.

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as amended.

Public Comment: None

Public Hearing:

1. **Saturn North Properties**

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.

Unfinished Business:

1. Saturn North Properties

Ms. Sally Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman summarized their review dated September 8, 2004 that followed previous comments by the Planning Commission. Ms. Elmiger said in regard to the new berm, the size and height does conform with the existing berm. She is concerned with the amount of vegetation on the berm and what the berm will be made of. She recommends augmenting the proposed landscaping in areas where the berm does not meet the six-foot height to ensure that it meets the 80% opacity requirement. She recommends changing the Austrian Pine to another evergreen. In regard to the lighting plan, the applicant will be requesting a variance from the standard but Carlisle/Wortman's opinion regarding the proposed lighting, is that the applicant wants to use the same lights they currently have on the rest of the development and Carlisle/Wortman would recommend that this be done. New asphalt areas were proposed and she feels existing conditions screen the roadway and Dixie Highway. Ms. Elmiger commented that the PUD changes are acceptable and recommends approval.

Mr. Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth & Clark said he found that their previous comments were addressed by the applicant. The applicant is seeking variances from Design and Construction Standards as they were caught in the transition of the adoption of new standards. In regard to the thickness of the pavement, the new standards require four inches total of asphalt over ten inches of aggregate base and the applicant is requesting three inches over eight inches. HRC has no issue with this since it is a parking area and not a road. In regard to storm water detention, the applicant is requesting to proceed under the old standard and has provided calculations showing the existing detention basin has adequate volume to handle the parking lot addition. Mr. Ford said HRC has no issues with this and would recommend approval.

Mr. Delke of Saturn North said he has no problems with the planner and engineer's recommendations.

Commissioner Hines asked Ms. Elmiger how many more plants they are recommending. Ms. Elmiger said perhaps two or three more trees as it is just a spacing issue. Commissioner Moore asked about the Austrian pine? Mr. Delke said he has no problem replacing this. Ms. Elmiger said it is just a suggestion and if the pine dies the applicant would be required to replace it anyway under the 80% opacity requirement.

Commissioner Rabaut asked if there is any issue with the lights causing glare or other issues? Mr. Delke said the lighting plan submitted shows zero lumines about ten feet beyond and would not affect the residents.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

Commissioner Baker said he is comfortable with the new plan and the reviews with regard to foliage. He has no problem with the changes in regard to the parking lot asphalt depth, nor the storm water, nor the lighting.

Chairperson Lamont commented that the depth of the asphalt does not concern him since it is a private parking lot. In regard to lighting, although the applicant does exceed ordinance, he is zero at the property lines and believes that is important. The drainage and design standard is acceptable as per HRC's review.

[Commissioner Steckling arrived 7:49 p.m.]

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the Township Board approval of the Saturn North PUD parking addition amendment subject to the following conditions: 1) the opacity on the berms be augmented to reach 80%; 2) that more plants are added to make up for the slow growth of the proposed plants; 3) that these landscape conditions be approved by Carlisle/Wortman for implementation, in addition that we recommend that the following variances be approved by the Board: 1) a request for a change in the lighting standard; 2) the variance for the thickness of the pavement section and 3) the variance for the storm water detention volume. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

2. Steelcor (Stoneworks) - Final

Mr. Ford of HRC explained that in regard to the updated plans and grading and drainage, the detention for the site has been provided across Clawson Tank Drive. The requested additional storm sewer profiles and calculations have been provided. The applicant has addressed the section of storm sewer where the new office addition is proposed on the updated plans. The applicant has not addressed the additional catch basin structure details in the plans but that could be handled administratively. The grading plan is now fine. The applicant has clarified other previous requests. The site utilities are ok as the Health Department issued a letter in that regard. The applicant has clarified their intentions with the existing well and that it would be used for emergency backup purposes only. The soil erosion permit has been received by HRC.

Ms. Elmiger noted that regarding natural resources, the location of the silt fence on the landscape plan and the site plan are in two different locations and she would like to make sure the site plan is the accurate one. Under site access and parking, the applicant has reduced parking by seven spaces and moved the outdoor storage off the parking area. The applicant indicated the parking provides more space than needed so Carlisle/Wortman is still questioning the need for the amount of proposed parking. Previous landscape notations have not been addressed. In regard to lighting, the previous review still needs to be addressed. The landscape plan and the site plan are inconsistent in showing the proposed number of signs.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

Mr. Chuck Hand of Harding Leading & Equipment, said the seven extra parking spaces can be eliminated but he does not want to remove any blacktop. In regard to ground signs, there will only be one new ground sign and the two existing will be removed.

Commissioner Hines commented that she would be inclined to approve the plan conditioned on HRC working out the required details that were requested. In terms of the parking area, she does not think it makes sense to have an oddly configured parking lot just to remove four more spaces. She is in agreement with the parking lot islands being removed and the storage areas being screened. Commissioner Hines said it needs to be made clear on the site plan that there will be one sign that meets the ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Steckling said he would concur with Commissioner Hines' comments and believes the outstanding issues could be handled administratively. Commissioner Moore said he also concurs with the comments of Commissioner Hines and would be in favor of the plan if the details are handled administratively.

Commissioner Rabaut thanked the applicant for his quick response to the concerns raised at the last meeting. He believes reducing the parking lot by four spaces will not have a significant impact on runoff and he is inclined to go with the plan the applicant presented tonight as long as the details can be cleaned up.

Commissioner Baker said he would concur with those comments and agrees with the storm structure detail being handled administratively and is content in moving this plan forward.

Chairperson Lamont commented that this is the first plan reviewed that we really did not have one comment on the structure itself. He said the applicant has done a nice job in regard to the comments made at the last meeting and before he could support any motion to approve, it should include conditions to include the sign and structure details as well as the wall-pack issues.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the site plan for Harding Leasing and Steelcor based on the plan submitted to the Township date stamped received September 7, 2004 subject to plan revisions as required and requested by the Township Engineer and Planner as set forth in the letter from the Engineer on September 10, 2004 reviewing the plans and from the planner dated September 13, 2004. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Springfield Tech Center -- Final

Ms. Elmiger commented that she suggests that the pedestrian access be waived. She is deferring the review of utility services to the Township engineer. In regard to landscaping, there was discussion previously regarding screening on the east side and now that this building will be built, that screening will help screen the outdoor storage area. She suggested waiting until the

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

building is built and then see how the building screens the area and then if additional screening is necessary they will devise a practical solution.

Mr. Ford of HRC, commented that one concern with the proposed elevation of the building, it is a slight increase of what was submitted with the Phase I drawings. Although slight, it does create some issues particularly in the back. There is fairly good slope from the rear of the building to the existing catch basins which is slightly over the maximum 6% by Ordinance. In the southwest corner of the building, the applicant must do something because the existing driveway that comes down will end up splitting between the two buildings and there is a real steep grade that, if maintained, will end up meeting the driveway and will be too steep. Well and septic have been addressed. No proposal has been made with regard to the drive approach to Andersonville. Mr. Ford suggested that the applicant beef up the rear parking lot to match the current standards.

Mr. Mark Schafer of Shonsheck, Inc., commented that regarding to screening on the east side of the property, there is a pronounced drop-off and he believes the recommendation of Carlisle/Wortman is fine. Regarding the grades pointed out by Mr. Ford, they are too steep for access and the overhead doors on the south side of the building are not docks or wells, they are overhead doors. The applicant would maintain a 3 to 4% slope in those areas. When the grading is done there will not be any slope issues on that side of the building.

Commissioner Rabaut asked if the banked parking would be asphalted? Mr. Schafer said it would be grass.

Commissioner Moore asked what the asphalt thickness would be? Mr. Ford said the Phase I drawings showed 3 over 8 in front and 4 over 10 in back because that's where the heavier traffic and storage is. This plan does not reflect the heavier cross-section and Mr. Ford said he suggests they use that. Mr. Ken Carnwath, said the main access drive and the areas of the south portions of the building is where the heaviest use will be and he believes 4 over 10 is appropriate in that area. However, the pedestrian vehicle area he is proposing the 3 over 8.

Commissioner Steckling asked the applicant if he would be willing to work with Carlisle/Wortman on the landscaping after the building is built? Mr. Schafer said yes, certainly.

Commissioner Baker commented that he would not have a problem supporting the proposed paving with the 4 over 10 being maintained in the heavy traffic area and the 3 over 8 in the front. He feels the screening issues could be dealt with administratively.

Commissioner Rabaut said we have a pathway plan on Andersonville Rd. and perhaps it would make sense to have the sidewalk. He suggested waiving the sidewalk but designate it on the plan as reserved for a pathway for future use. Ms. Elmiger said we could but generally safety paths are in the right-of-way of the road. Commissioner Rabaut said he would support approving this plan as long as we can get the outstanding issues handled by the planner and engineer.

Commissioner Steckling said he likes the proposed plan. Commissioner Hines said she would agree.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

Chairperson Lamont commented that this was previously approved in 2001 and then changes were made. The applicant seems very flexible and willing to adjust the height back to the previous site so we do not encounter a slope problem. Chairperson Lamont said he has no issues with the building itself and no landscaping issues.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the plan for Springfield Tech Center as received by the Township date stamped July 1, 2004 subject to the outdoor screening being determined and decided after the buildings are concluded upon review by the Township planner and the Planning Director to make a determination as to what would be required and to be implemented prior to issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy and subject to include a four inch over ten inch ~~erust~~ [crushed] concrete in all paved areas as required by Township standards and subject to the elevation of the new structure being lowered six to nine inches to take care of the grade disparities shown on the existing plan and with the explicit stipulation that the pedestrian access required by the Ordinance is to be waived. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Other Business:

1. Proposal to Rezone Properties

Ms. Elmiger said she understood that in regard to area 25, Supervisor Walls and Leon Genre have additional information regarding soils. Supervisor Walls said the area in question was proposed for plats many years ago and the soils were not conducive except for the one subdivision plat that is closer to Big Lake. Chairperson Lamont asked if the actual condition of the soils themselves would serve to limit the development in this area no matter what the zoning is? Supervisor Walls said that used to be a general rule, although not a good one. In this particular case we've already seen the Health Department deny more intense development as a result of soil conditions.

Mr. Richard Minard, Andersonville Rd., said it was his understanding that some of the property was plattable. He does not want this property changed and just wants to have his parcels in the front as he showed the Commissioners on the drawings. Mr. Minard said the Commissioners previously stated that this change goes along with the Master Plan and thought it would be nice to have a transition from park to subdivision. He believes the Planning Commission does not have the same view as the Board when it comes to this property.

Chairperson Lamont read the Master Plan designation of Area 25; to the north is low-density residential, to the south is medium-density, to the east is medium-density and to the west is Recreation/Conservation. The actual zonings were; to the north is one-acre, to the south is one-acre R-2 and to the east R-2 one acre and to the west is Resource/Conservation. Based on a

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

planner review was a transitional area between resource/conservation and the open lands. Much of this information was based on the soil surveys from Oakland County.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he was inclined to feel this should be low-density because of the site conditions as outlined in the planner's report. It seems to him that this site is appropriately zoned. It is predominantly a medium-density area and the only low-density is just to the north. He believes the only reason for a rezoning was because the site conditions would not support medium density. Commissioner Rabaut said, after looking at this again, he does not have the basis to believe this should be R-1A and believes it should be left as is.

Commissioner Baker commented that he sees this property as having an innate, inherent set of restrictions that apply at this time. He feels there are checks and balances in place at this time that would leave him to believe this parcel should be left unchanged.

Commissioner Moore said he would agree it should remain unchanged and concurs with the comments made by Commissioner's Baker and Rabaut.

Commissioner Steckling said he is inclined to leave this parcel as is. However, this results in a discrepancy between the Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Hines said she does not see the necessity to rezone this parcel. Chairperson Lamont said he also would agree to leave this area as is.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to retain the existing R-2 zoning on the area known as #25 of the rezoning report on the basis that it is consistent with the zoning and its surrounding area and the land use in the surrounding area and further the Master Plan should be amended as soon as practical to change the recommendations in the Master Plan to correspond with the existing R-2 zoning. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

2. Priority List

Office Services and C-1 and C-2 is set for the October 7th Workshop. Landscape Ordinance is tentatively set for the October 7th Workshop. Review Screening, Fences and Walls for Lakefront Lots is set for October 7th Workshop. Temporary Outdoor Sales discussion is set for October 7th Workshop. Tree Preservation Plan is deleted. Hamlet of Davisburg is To Be Determined. Proposal to rezone properties is To Be Determined.

Public Comment:

Mr. Minard said he appreciates the Planning Commission's time in looking at the individual parcels for rezoning.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of September 20, 2004

Chairperson Lamont commented that he would like to thank the Planning Commission because with a heavy workload tonight and three site plans, the homework and research done by everyone is amazing.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary