

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission –Workshop Meeting
Minutes of December 2, 2004**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the December 2, 2004 Workshop 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
Chris Moore
Dean Baker

Commissioner(s) Absent

Paul Rabaut
Ruth Ann Hines
Staff Present
Leon Genre

Consultants Present

Dick Carlisle
Randy Ford

Approval of Minutes: **None**

Approval of Agenda:

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as presented.

Public Comment: **None**

Public Hearing: **None**

Unfinished Business:

1. Screening Fences & Walls Regarding Lakefront Lots (Section 16.13)

Mr. Dick Carlisle said he revised the draft per Supervisor Walls' comments to him regarding fencing and per the last Planning Commission discussion. He did add a provision regarding materials to be used, maintenance provisions, and some definitions not currently in the ordinance. Mr. Carlisle said he did not get into the issue of landscaping because, at this point, he does not have a good way to deal with it without creating a huge enforcement responsibility on the part of the Township.

Commissioner Steckling commented that in the definition of screening, it talks about densely planted vegetation, and to him that would fit in all of the other regulations as far as the three-foot and the 80% opacity. Mr. Carlisle said he added the issue of screening but when the entire text refers to screening, it refers to something that is a structural measure. Commissioner Baker added that, we have views and vistas that are not strictly limited to lakefront lots and if we attempt to regulate the planting of trees, we take on the roll of referee in too many situations. He

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of December 2, 2004

said he agrees with Mr. Carlisle and does not see how we could begin to manage it. He would have to have the answer to that before we attempt to regulate it. Planning Director, Leon Genre noted that there is no maximum height for a fence anywhere and he thought we were going to discuss requiring a maximum height to be approximately six feet on any residential lot. He feels maybe we should get this in the ordinance somewhere.

Mr. Carlisle suggested perhaps deleting the definition to screening and just defining screening wall/screening structure, or in the definition of screening, eliminating the reference to the meanings. The screening definition would then read, "shall mean a method of visually shielding or obscuring an abutting or nearby structure or use from another." Screening Wall/Screening Structure would define a structural type of method. That would not define the means of screening; it would just simply define what screening means. Commissioner Moore said he would agree.

Chairperson Lamont said he likes the way Mr. Carlisle constructed the ordinance, it is simple and he would support having a maximum height of six feet for fencing in residential neighborhoods. If we do not include "residential neighborhood" it could conflict with some of the eight-foot requirements under C-1 and C-2 for auto repair facilities. In regard to natural vegetation and buffers, restricting those does not go with the natural harmony of what Springfield Township is about. Chairperson Lamont said we would have an ordinance to fall back on should something occur by malice or with intent for malice to block views. Regarding lakefront lots, since we have 80% visible through the fence and the decorative side of the fence will face the outside of the property; he could support four foot fencing.

Commissioner Moore said four foot fencing would be okay with the 80% opacity and he agrees with the comments by Chairperson Lamont. Commissioner Steckling said he likes the 3-foot fence because it is the same as the front yard. He asked Mr. Genre what would be wrong if we included vegetation in the same limitations and definition and enforced it the same way? Mr. Genre explained that it puts him in a bad situation because if he has someone do this under malice, as soon as he sited the resident, he would end up with a list of every other person on the lake that has a bush higher than three feet.

Chairperson Lamont said he agrees with Mr. Genre's concerns. He asked Mr. Genre how he feels about having a permit required for constructing a fence? Mr. Genre said, at this time, he does not see it as necessary because it isn't a problem currently. Commissioner Steckling said maybe the other approach would be to take a totally hands-off issue and be silent on fencing and leave it alone. He asked, "is it a health, safety and welfare issue?" Mr. Carlisle said it could be considered a welfare issue but he does not believe it to be a health and safety issue.

Mr. Genre said he does think that the maximum height of any fence should be addressed. Once they get to a certain point, they do become structurally unsound and do cause irreparable damage to the neighboring house because of mold, mildew, etc. Whether the height limit is 3-foot or 5-foot, he doesn't care as long as it is the type of structure that can be built safely and will not cause irreparable damage.

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of December 2, 2004

Commissioner Steckling said, what about non-lakefront properties, should we consider those too? Mr. Carlisle said in residential, no fence should exceed 6-feet in height.

Chairperson Lamont said he thinks this should be sent back to Carlisle/Wortman with the following items addressed: 1) 6-foot high in residential where not to conflict with any other areas of the ordinance, 2) changing the definition and avoiding talking about vegetation, 3) how high would we want an ornamental fence on a lakefront side of property, which, by our own ordinance is also front yard.

Commissioner Baker said he likes the idea of a fence limit and believes that 6-feet would work. He did verify that 3-foot chain link fencing is available but did not understand Supervisor Walls' note saying delete the sentence. He believes we should stay away from the vegetation issue. Commissioner Moore agreed. Commissioner Steckling agreed and said this discussion could be used for future use so people know there was a reason why we did it this way and intentionally did not include vegetation of the ordinance provisions.

Ordinance Amendments

1. Office Services (Article XI) and C-1 (Article IX) and C-2 (Article X) - Final

Commissioner Moore said on item #3, page 1, it sounds better to him if we put a period after boarding and put no outdoor exercise runs or pens are permitted. He suggested combining items 5 d and e on page three. Mr. Carlisle agreed. Commissioner Baker noted in item d, 500 should be spelled out to be consistent.

Chairperson Lamont asked regarding page 9, item b.2, at the time we talked about it previously, he recollects that Mr. Carlisle was going to perform a "fit test" to the Township to see if we could actually locate an adult business in Springfield Township. Mr. Carlisle said he did not do that but he would do so fairly quickly.

Commissioner Baker asked if the Township has a record of locations of licensed day care centers? Mr. Carlisle said he believes we do but if not, it would not be difficult to obtain.

Chairperson Lamont commented that Carlisle/Wortman did an outstanding job on these amendments.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved that the amendments to Office Service District including the Definitions and the C-1 and C-2 Amendments prepared by Carlisle/Wortman subject to the suggested changes and amendments proffered by the Commission have a Public Hearing at the earliest convenient time. Commissioner Moore supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker and Moore; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of December 2, 2004

2. Seasonal / Transient Sales

Commissioner Baker asked if it is our intent to cover products raised on the property such as farming? Mr. Genre said, no, the ordinance does allow for sales of products raised on that piece of property.

Chairperson Lamont said he likes everything in the revisions and it should serve the Township well. However, he does not care for the word "transient" and asked if it could be changed to "temporary?" Mr. Carlisle said it was intended to deal with traveling sales.

Commissioner Steckling said he would suggest defining transient. However, he would have inserted "transient" in the second line under Permit Requirements to read "...and the transient sale of any other..." Mr. Carlisle suggested redoing paragraph a to read "The outside sale of transient items include but not limited to items such as Christmas trees, flowers and plants, pumpkins and other such seasonal items, and the transient sale of any other merchandise shall require a permit from the Township Building Department Director, unless such outside sales have received site plan approval." The Planning Commissioners unanimously agreed to this revision.

Commissioner Steckling said, under Standards and Conditions, item b, "more than" should be inserted between the words "or" and "ten" on the second line. Commissioner Moore suggested reversing the words from seasonal and transient to transient and seasonal at the top title to keep it consistent.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to take the necessary steps to publish the Amendment to Section 16.24 Transient and Seasonal Display of Products or Materials Intended for Sale with the amendments recommended to Carlisle/Wortman to be published for Public Hearing at the next convenient date. Commissioner Moore supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Election of Officers

Chairperson

- **Commissioner Steckling moved that Roger Lamont be nominated to be Chairperson of the Planning Commission for the upcoming 2005 year. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of December 2, 2004

Vice Chairperson

- **Commissioner Moore moved to nominate Commissioner Steckling as the Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Secretary

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to nominate Commissioner Moore as the Secretary for 2005. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

2. Recommend Planning Commission Member to Zoning Board of Appeals

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to nominate Commissioner Baker to be the Planning Commission Member appointed to the Zoning Board of Appeals for 2005. Chairperson Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

3. Approval of 2005 PC Workshop and PC Business Meeting dates

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to adopt the proposed Planning Commission Workshop and Business Meeting dates as submitted on the draft for 2005 presented at the meeting. Commissioner Moore supported the motion.**
- **Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to include that the Workshop Meeting falls on the first Thursday of each month and the Business Meeting falls on the third Monday of each month. Commissioner Moore supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore and Baker; No: none; Absent: Hines and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Old Business:

1. Hamlet of Davisburg - Existing Conditions Report

Chairperson Lamont noted that a memo from Mary Blundy dated December 2, 2004 title "Revival Hamlet of Davisburg" was received.

Mr. Genre said, at this point, these meetings are strictly organizational meetings that the business owners are holding. The owners are making progress and more and more business owners are

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of December 2, 2004

coming around to the concept and understand that something needs to be done or the town will die. Mr. Genre said the owners are discussing the possibility of a "mini-master plan."

2. Priority List

Office Services, C-1 and C-2 and Definitions have been set for Public Hearing. Review Screening, Fences and Walls (Section 16.13) were set for Public Hearing. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales has been set for Public Hearing. Review Lakefront Structures is to be determined. Resource Conservation and Public Land Districts were added to the priority list as to be determined. Hamlet of Davisburg is work in progress. Buildout/Traffic Study is to be determined. Innovative Storm Water Management is to be determined. Proposal to rezone properties at Andersonville & Farley Roads from R-1 to PL is to be determined. Election of Officers is complete. Recommend PC Member to ZBA is complete.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary