

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

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the September 2, 2004 Workshop Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:31 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present

Roger Lamont
John Steckling
Paul Rabaut
Chris Moore
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioner(s) Absent

Dean Baker
Gail Mann-Bowser
Staff Present
Leon Genre

Consultants Present

Dick Carlisle
Randy Ford

Approval of Minutes: None

Approval of Agenda:

Chairperson Lamont noted that Item #2 under Unfinished Business should be removed from the agenda because the report is not ready from Supervisor Walls yet.

Chairperson Lamont asked to add as Item #2 under Other Business, a discussion regarding Site Plan discussions at Workshop Meetings.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Baker and Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

Public Comment: None

Public Hearing None

Unfinished Business:

1. Office Services C1 and C2

Mr. Dick Carlisle commented that we did not get through the entire draft at the last Workshop meeting and did not complete the review of the final revisions to the OS District. He suggested that the Planning Commission read this latest study, summarize it and be prepared to fully

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of September 2, 2004

discuss it at the next available Workshop Meeting, and begin the discussion with the C-2 Districts.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to move the Office Services, C1 and C2 discussion to the next Workshop Meeting and review it as discussed. Commissioner Moore supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Moore and Hines; No: none; Absent: Baker and Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Stoneworks Addition (Steelcor) - Final

Mr. Dick Carlisle summarized Carlisle/Wortman's review of August 20, 2004. He noted that there are several of items that just need clarification from the applicant. The plans as required have no proposed grading shown on the plans. There is also no limits of grading shown on the plans. The relocation of some good-size beech trees is shown on the plans, and it was not evident during the site visit if they actually still exist. Mr. Hand of Steelcor Corporation said they are not beech trees, they are cottonwood trees. Mr. Carlisle said, that being the case, it doesn't matter if they are removed. Mr. Carlisle noted that regarding site access and circulation, he needs clarification of the proposed new loading area and whether it will be at grade or a truck well. He also needs clarification of the size and types of trucks delivering materials as some semi's may have a hard time maneuvering in this area. The applicant is providing more parking than what is normally required under the manufacturing standards, but there may be some unique aspect of the business that requires this additional parking. Mr. Carlisle suggests that pedestrian access requirements be waived. Barrier-free access does need to be shown on the sidewalks in relationship to the barrier-free parking spaces. Regarding the landscape plan, information is missing regarding parking lot screening requirements, plant materials and dumpster enclosure. Clarification of lighting detail needs to be provided. In regard to signs, the ordinance allows for one sign but there are currently two signs on the site. The plans must show designated fire lanes on the site. Mr. Carlisle said that he recommend that these items be clarified and/or added to the site plan before approval.

Mr. Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth & Clark summarized their review dated August 20, 2004. He has no issue with the proposed site improvements. He has the same concerns as Mr. Carlisle regarding the grading issues, but he thinks the eastern part of the site is more critical. In regard to drainage, the as-builts from the old development plans do verify that there is capacity allocated for this site and is more than adequate; but HRC still needs the actual design calculations for the storm sewer. The applicant did respond in a letter that all of this information would be provided. The re-routing of the sewer needs to be shown on the drawings and the ordinance requires a profile view also, which was not shown. In regard to site access, Mr. Ford said there is a fairly narrow width of the lane to the north, and he needs clarification that it is designated as one-way; but the applicant did indicate they would show that on the drawing, and it would be an egress only. The paving cross sections meet standards provided that the sub-soils are sandy in nature and the applicant has indicated they are. The septic is an existing system and the applicant did provide correspondence from the Health Department confirming that they did

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of September 2, 2004

review it and felt the existing septic system is adequate to accommodate the addition. However, the exact location of the septic is not clear and there is no indication if the well has been abandoned.

Mr. Hand said the grading has been re-done by the engineer and he will send it over to the engineer. In regard to drainage, he will provide the calculations. In regard to site access and drainage, Mr. Rogers, owner of Stoneworks, said he would have one or two semi's per month but could be as much as four to six per month, and that is why he proposed the size of parking that he did. Mr. Rogers said he does have a problem with the existing site plan in regard to the number of islands and trees shown in the parking area. In addition to the semi traffic and maneuvering, he does not want to encourage employees to be parking in the open area because he will have containers stored there from time to time. Those containers could be there as much as five or six consecutive days and there could be two or three at a time. In regard to exterior lighting, he said it is adequate but requested more lighting on the north side of the parking lot. The well is working and is occasionally used for backup. There is a water system inside the facility but he intends to put a new one in. Mr. Hand said there is no problem with truck circulation and the loading zone in the back is not a truck well, it is a surface loading zone for small trucks. Mr. Carlisle asked Mr. Rogers if he is actually proposing something different than is currently shown on the site plan? Mr. Rogers said yes, he has some changes he would like to make especially in regard to the trees and islands in the parking lot; he would like to eliminate those. Mr. Carlisle asked where the container storage is currently done? Mr. Rogers said the containers are parked in the open parking area and are only a few per year.

Mr. Hand explained that the north drive will be widened and will be marked as an exit only. The existing soil is all sand and gravel so he sees no problem with the soils. Regarding site utilities, he does not know exactly where the pipe is until they dig, and at that time they will do as-built drawings. Regarding landscaping along the east side of the lot, there is a large row of trees currently and he would like to leave it and asked if there is a need for more landscaping there? Regarding safety paths and sidewalks, two handicapped ramps will be added, the trash receptacle will be the same material as the block on the building. Lighting fixtures will be as shown on the plan. Mr. Rogers said the current signs are temporary and he will be seeking a permit to obtain permanent signs. Mr. Hand said the silt fence shown on the plan is the only area to be disturbed.

Commissioner Moore said he believes the applicant is proposing many changes from the plan submitted, and he would like to see a new plan.

Mr. Carlisle commented to the applicant that regarding parking, the Township would not require this much parking if it is not needed, he would recommend tabling this matter until a new plan could be provided. Commissioner Steckling commented that Ordinance 17.06, Outdoor Storage, requires screened.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he is not in favor of approving this plan, there are too many issues that have been raised that need to be included in the plan. He cannot support something he has not seen but would be happy to work it out with the applicant.

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of September 2, 2004

Commissioner Moore said he would concur with Commissioner Rabaut and would support tabling.

Commissioner Steckling commented that he has problems with the signs and the parking lot islands. He believes this is a work area and should be able to be used that way and feels the outside storage is compatible with this operation and should be fit in. If the parking requirements are met or exceeded, then there is room to do this. He would be in favor of tabling this matter until a new plan is provided that cleans up all these issues.

Commissioner Hines said she is concerned that the plan before the Commission is not what the applicant really wants and this is the only plan we have to review. She said she is not in favor of approving this plan.

Chairperson Lamont commented that the plan submitted has several ordinance and non-compliance and engineering issues that must be met. He cannot support this plan as is and believes the adjustments made must be seen. Chairperson Lamont said it is not a bad plan and has much possibility and merit.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to table the Harding Leasing & Equipment site plan to allow the applicant to address issues raised tonight by the Commissioners and the issues and concerns addressed in the Carlisle/Wortman letter of August 20, 2004 and the Hubbell, Roth & Clark letter of August 20, 2004. Some issues include storage areas on the site plan, two signs on the site, the fire lane, grading issues and the excess number of parking spots. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Moore and Hines; No: Steckling; Absent: Baker and Mann-Bowser. The motion carried by a 4 to 1 vote.**

2. Screening, Fences and Walls regarding lakefront lots - Leon Genre

Mr. Genre explained that he visited 9789 Norman Rd., as directed by the Planning Commission to inspect the fence issue. Mr. Genre said as the Ordinance stands at this moment, the fence is not in violation. He provided photos to the Planning Commission for their review. He believes we should look at other communities lakefront fence ordinances to see if we may want to implement parts of these into Springfield Township's fence ordinance.

Chairperson Lamont asked Dick Carlisle to put together a review of fence ordinances for the Commissioners review. Mr. Carlisle said he would.

Ms. Kathleen Paul, 9789 Norman Rd., said her property has depreciated 15%. She considers this an unsafe structure, her view of the lake has been eliminated and in some areas the fence, she believes is 10 feet tall. Ms. Paul said she has black mold growing on her property due to this fence as there is no air flowing through it.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that the Ordinance should be clear, unambiguous and enforceable. According to our Ordinance a fence is a partly obscuring structure as opposed to a wall which, is an obscuring structure. The Ordinance requires a fence to be of open-air type and

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - Minutes of September 2, 2004

permitting visibility through at least 80% of the area for 50 feet. The structure in question is not clear to him that it is a fence and not a wall. Ms. Paul said this fence is created like a tunnel. Commissioner Rabaut said we have ordinances to screen out undesirable views, so it would seem we should have ordinances to protect desirable views.

Chairperson Lamont noted that the Planning Commission will be reviewing this. However, we cannot make an ordinance retroactive and force people to make changes for a new ordinance. Ms. Paul said her health is being jeopardized. She would also like the Planning Commission to review the odor, noise and timeframe that a person can work on a construction project. Chairperson Lamont explained that the Planning Commission is not the enforcer of the ordinance and Ms. Paul would have to see the Township Supervisor.

Other Business:

1. Site Plans Discussion

Chairperson Lamont suggested that the Planning Commission make it a policy to not review plans at the Workshop Meetings as it takes away from the purpose of the Workshops. The Planning Commissioners unanimously agreed. ~~that.~~

2. Priority List

Office Services and C-1 and C-2 is set for October 7, 2004. Essential Services is to be deleted as it is complete. Landscape Ordinance is set for October 7th. Review Screening and fences are tentatively set for October 7th. Temporary Outdoor Sales is to be determined. Tree Preservation Plan is to be determined. Hamlet of Davisburg is to be determined. Proposal to rezone properties is set for the September 20th Business Meeting. Master Plan Update is to be deleted until further notice.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary