# Springfield Township Planning Commission – Business Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2004

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the May 17, 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 Commissioner(s) Absent Consultants Present

Roger Lamont Gail Mann-Bowser Randy Ford
John Steckling Dick Carlisle

Paul Rabaut

Dean Baker
Chris Moore

Staff Present
Leon Genre

Ruth Ann Hines

**Approval of Minutes**: April 19, 2004

Commissioner Steckling moved to defer the approval of the April 19, 2004 minutes as they were not distributed to Commissioners in advance. Commissioner Moore 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.

# **Approval of Agenda:**

There was unanimous approval of the agenda for May 17, 2004.

**Public Comment:** None

# **Public Hearing:**

1. Article VI, Section 15.01

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 p.m.

There were no public comments.

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

#### 2. Article VI, Section 16.06

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:37 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:38 p.m.

**Unfinished Business:** None

#### **New Business:**

### 1. Leddy's Woods

Mr. Jim Scharl of Kieft Engineering explained that Leddy's Woods received conceptual approval some time ago. Subject to some administrative comments, the applicant feels the plan is ready for a recommendation to the Township Board for final approval.

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC summarized their review of Leddy's Woods. He explained that with respect to site grading, the soil erosion plans are clear that the site will not be mass graded but will be cleared in the right of ways enough to construct the roadways and drainage facilities. The applicant did a good job of minimizing disruption and maximizing preservation of the natural resources. In regard to storm drainage, the improved site runoff will be directed to the wetlands on the property. On site detention and/or retention is required by the Township; however, HRC feels that in this instance, the net rise in wetland levels is very minimal and they do not feel on site detention is warranted. HRC does recommend approval of the plan.

Mr. Dick Carlisle of Carlisle/Wortman noted that because this site is within a resource protection overlay zone, a site investigation report is required. That report has been completed and provided. The report did indicate that, regarding lots 10 and 11, both lots are located in the highest quality upland. If lots 10 and 11 are moved closer to lot 9, it would move lot 11 out of the area that is higher preservation. The response from the applicant is that they do not want to do that so that they may preserve the access area to the open space. Mr. Carlisle said there is a lot of area available for that. The cul-de-sac length is sufficient to Carlisle/Wortman, but it will require a variance from the ordinance requirement. Carlisle/Wortman agrees with the applicant in their request not to submit a separate landscape plan. There should be specific provisions in the Master Deed and ByLaws to ensure protection of the natural areas. Regarding the delineation of the wetland and the natural area marker areas, Carlisle/Wortman does have

specific requests and noted those in their review. On page 13 of the plan sheet, there are some details regarding landscaping and Carlisle/Wortman has some specific comments that they feel should be addressed. Mr. Carlisle said this plan is a model example of open space preservation and they do recommend final approval.

Commissioner Hines commented, regarding the moving of lots 10 and 11 closer to lot 9, it appears there is adequate access to the park areas. She asked the applicant what the problem is against moving those lots? Mr. Scharl said there are several reasons. In the initial site evaluation the limits between lots 7 and 9 were not shown and that has now been clarified by a letter of March 29th indicating that the greatest percentage of the area of lot 7 is being preserved. He also noted that unit 11 is where the test well was drilled and it has been evaluated by the Oakland County Health Department. That well was used to approve the entire site. Additionally, the only portion of unit 11 that perks is the extreme southern portion and lot 10 only perks on the extreme northern portion. Mr. Leddy noted that the area between lots 9 and 8 is a steep hill and it is not conducive to a path.

Commissioner Steckling asked regarding open-space management, what does the planner want to see and what has the applicant proposed? Mr. Scharl said they are currently working on the preparation of the Master Deed and ByLaws and those will be submitted once a draft is complete. Mr. Leddy explained that there would be open space for playground equipment and a ball diamond and picnic areas. There would also be wooded trails.

Commissioner Rabaut asked how many feet would be acquired if the applicant slid lots 10 and 11 closer to lot 9? Mr. Scharl said he cannot move the line. Commissioner Rabaut said he does not have any grading plans in his plans, therefore, he does not feel comfortable approving something he has not seen. The Planning Commissioners determined that the planner and engineer had the plans but the Planning Commissioners did not. Mr. Scharl apologized and said he would get them to the Township.

Commissioner Baker said if the applicant tried to move lots 10 and 11, they would need additional roadway surface and more grading. He feels comfortable where the lots are located now. Regarding markers, he asked the applicant if they would put markers along the boundary and not along the wetland. Mr. Scharl said yes.

Commissioner Baker commented that this plan is an outstanding effort to preserve property and create a design that works for today.

Commissioner Rabaut said he believes this will be a quality improvement to Springfield Township and is ready to move forward with the plan.

Commissioner Moore agreed with both comments made. Commissioner Steckling agreed with comments presented. Commissioner Hines also agreed.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he would echo the comments made by the rest of the Planning Commissioners and believes that the efforts to make this a workable plan are good. Preservation of the natural resources is good.

Commissioner Steckling moved to recommend approval by the Township Board final site plan of Leddy's Woods according to the plans date stamped received May 5, 2004. Further recommend that the requirement for storm water detention/retention basin be waived, the appropriate variance be granted for the cul-de-sac length as shown on the plans; subject to appropriate Master Deed language be satisfactory to the Township attorney that would ensure that the open space depicted on the plan would be treated as a general common element, further subject to the administrative review by the Township engineers of the revised road designs to change the grades and transitions for the drainage purposes on the road. A recommendation to the Board that it be approved with existing vegetation and the requirement for any further screening be waived and the maintenance and entryway planting and roadside vegetation also be handled in the Master Deed and ByLaws. Commissioner Hines supported the motion.

Commissioner Rabaut said he is concerned with the missing pages that we are approving a set of plans that we do not have. Commissioner Steckling said he is comfortable with the fact that both the planner and engineer have received a full set of plans and are comfortable with them.

- > Commissioner Rabaut moved to amend the motion that sheets five, six and seven, dealing with grading and drainage plans were not included in the packet or reviewed by the Planning Commission but have been assured by the engineer and planner that they meet Township standards. Commissioner Hines supported the amended motion.
- ➤ Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Man-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.
- ➤ Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

#### 2. McCulloch Collision Center

Mr. Dave Lally, representing McCulloch Collision Center, explained that there have been numerous revisions to the site plan. He is asking for more time because no one has been able to review this plan yet. Mr. Lally explained that they are moving into an existing building to perform vehicle bodywork and paintwork. Mr. Carlisle said he could have the revised plans reviewed and ready for the June 3rd Workshop meeting. Commissioner Steckling said he would like to review the plan tonight anyway to get started. The Planning Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Carlisle explained that this will be used as a body shop and use a portion to display and sell vehicles. There is no detrimental use and the cars being worked on will be adequately screened.

He asked the applicant if there are adequate loading and unloading areas? Mr. Lally said, yes. Mr. Carlisle asked how parking would be allocated? Mr. Lally said there would be four parking spots per six service stalls. Mr. Carlisle said there is existing landscaping and asked if there would be additional signage? Mr. Lally said one sign is proposed. Mr. Carlisle said fire lanes must be shown on the plans.

> Commissioner Rabaut moved to table the McCulloch Collision Center proposal to provide the applicant the opportunity to address the recommendations in the Carlisle/Wortman letter of April 30th and the comments of the Commissioners. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion.

Chairperson Lamont suggested amending the motion to be reviewed at the June Workshop meeting or the regular Business Meeting.

- > Commissioner Rabaut moved to amend the motion to include that the applicant should endeavor to have their revisions made by the June Workshop or the June Business Meeting. Commissioner Steckling supported the amended motion.
- ➤ Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.
- 3. Article XV, Section 15.01.1k (1) & (2)
- Commissioner Hines moved to recommend adoption of the Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Section 15.01 extractive district as published and in accordance with the Public Hearing held this evening. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

- 4. Article XV, Setion 16.06: Landscaping, Greenbelts and Buffers and Screening
- 5. Article XV, Section 16.06.3: Screening Between Land Uses
- 6. Article XV, Section 16.06.9: Minimum Size and Minimum Spacing Requirements
- Commissioner Rabaut moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the township Board approval of Ordinance Amendments 16.06, 16.06.3 and 16.06.9 as published for Public Hearing. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

#### **Priority List** 1.

Section 16.06 has been completed. Office Services and C-1, C-2 is set for discussion at the June 3rd Workshop meeting. Zoning Review by sub-area is set for June 3rd Workshop. Tree Preservation Plan is To Be Determined. Hamlet of Davisburg is set for June; no specific meeting date set. McCulloch Collision is set for the June 3rd Workshop meeting.

Adj	our	nm	ent:

Aujouriment:
Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 9:16 p.m.
Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary