

# **Springfield Township Planning Commission -- Business Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2008**

**Call to Order:** Chair John Steckling called the November 17, 2008 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**

Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Roger Lamont  
Bill Leddy  
Laura Moreau  
John Steckling

### **Commissioners Absent**

Frank Aiello

### **Staff Present**

Nancy Strole, Clerk  
Mike Trout, Supervisor Elect

### **Consultants Present**

Sally Elmiger  
Randall Ford

## **Approval of Agenda**

Chairman Steckling stated that there was a very full agenda and suggests moving Divine Mercy from New Business to No. 3 of Old Business right after The River Final Site Plan review. Then based on time, take some of the Ordinance amendments and push to the last and this was agreeable with the Commissioners.

- **Chairman Steckling moved to approve the Agenda as amended. Support by Commissioner Moreau. Vote on the motion: Yes: Baker, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Moreau and Steckling. No: none. Absent: Aiello. Motion carried.**

## **Public Comment:**

None.

## **Consent Agenda:**

Chairman Steckling stated that he received a note from Onalee the minutes of October 20, 2008, for additional revisions to be completed.

- c) Communications:  
None.

**Public Hearing: Amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 26 –  
Landscape Provisions**

**Public Hearing Opened at 7:33 p.m.**

Chairman Steckling explained the amendments are from Ordinance 26, Section 16.06.11, Natural Landscape lots. There is a provision already in the ordinance for this and amendments are to give examples of what constitutes Naturally Landscaped Lots in addition to the section dealing with prohibited plant species adding

additional items. These sections were published as required. Commissioner Steckling requested Public Comments at this time. No Public Comments

**Public Hearing Closed at 7:35 p.m.**

**Old Business:**

**1. Master Plan Update Phase II Final Review**

Chairman Steckling stated at last months meeting there were several landowners present and questioned the categories that were created and the lines drawn designating these categories. Nancy Strole, Clerk and Sally Elmiger were asked to advise us on how these were determined and report on this.

Sally Elmiger showed a map created for the Bordine Nursery property that was in question. This map gives a better idea of where the MNFI boundary lines meets the particular topographic and wetland features on the property. The original intention was to draw it along the top of the ridge. Sally indicated the line could be cleaned up in several small areas, but it does do as intended. Sally showed the area indicating the Generalized Wetland Boundaries data supplied from Oakland County, which is located primarily in the Bridge Valley area. Sally stated that she met with both Calvin and Cory Bordine approximately a week ago and they discussed the map. The Bordines then asked their engineer to survey the site and plot it on top of the map. Sally asked the Bordines if they had brought the information and they stated yes.

Chairman Steckling asked if any other area were researched. Sally Elmiger stated that the map shows the property owned by Dr. O'Neil indicating the topographic relief on that parcel and the Generalized Wetland Boundaries that Oakland Data shows us, this is the beginning of the Clinton River.

Commissioner Moreau asked Sally Elmiger to outline the property owned by Dr. O'Neil one more time and Sally did. Commissioner Moreau asked what road frontage was on the parcel. Sally indicated that access was off Lavon for that particular parcel.

Calvin Bordine, 9930 King and 8600 Dixie Highway. Calvin stated that he asked at the last meeting for Sally Elmiger to consider moving the line back to the wetland and explained that the trees that were on part of the highland were cut down and used for bio-mass fuel. Calvin Bordine supplied an aerial photo showing that area and stated that they paid to have a wetland specialist survey the site and plot it on a map, showing where the actual wetland is located and showing how much more usable land is available if the line is relocated. Calvin asked the Planning Commission to consider changing the line on the zoning back to the wetland line and he would like to see the zoning be consistent on both of our parcels.

Chairman Steckling clarified that this is not a zoning map but Future Land Use map used to define the use of the property in the future. Chairman Steckling clarified that at last months meeting they had discussed Plan Mixed Use, and asked if the Bordines prefer not to have mixed use and just a straight Commercial type of designation. Mr. Bordine agreed.

Chairman Steckling asked Sally if the line that Carlisle Wortman's is proposing is to be the delineation between the Planned Mixed Use and the Residential districts. Sally Elmiger yes it did and explained where the lines from the Future Land Use planning map were also located.

Chairman Steckling questioned the reason for the location of that line that leaves out the northern portion of the property. Sally stated that it is such a large parcel that as far as Future Land Use planning is concerned that Sally believed that the Planning Commission and the Township Board had thought it was wise to plan for the northern area to be residential. Sally explained that it was prudent to plan the whole area the same, as it is vastly different from the front to the back as far as natural features, and existing development. Planned Mixed Use in the front near Dixie Highway would allow for the greatest amount of flexibility in redevelopment of this parcel and that residential would be more similar to the medium density residential areas that were adjacent to the parcel at the north.

Chairman Steckling questioned the logic for taking the southern piece and breaking it into two different categories and uses when the top and bottom portions are divided by wetlands.

Sally stated that they were basing their line on the MNFI line and Calvin was correct in saying that the reason the area was identified as significant was because of the vegetation that was on it. Sally spoke with John Pascus at MNFI and asked if this vegetation was removed does this parcel retain any ecological value whatsoever, and he said; if the property was cleared and allowed to revegetate, it could maintain its ecological value, however, if it was completely cleared and something like turf grass was grown on it, it would probably lose most of its ecological value. Sally explained that the MNFI line gives you the idea where the ecologically sensitive areas are for the Natural Feature Overlay District. The Natural Feature Overlay District does not prohibit development within, but will require an ecological survey of anything north of the line be conducted to determine what is suitable for the development being proposed. As far as Master Planning is concerned it is not saying development south of the line is okay, but no development north of the line. It is saying is more intense development south of the line and less intense development north of the line.

Chairman Steckling stated if the property is Master Planned for Single Family Residential and the Bordines came in with a proposal for a Mixed or Commercial Use, then the Master Plan would be an obstacle.

Sally asked for clarification on the location Chairman Steckling was referring to. Chairman Steckling indicated the area below the wetlands.

Chairman Steckling stated that the Planning Commission would have stopped any commercial development because it would require a Special Land Use. Chairman Steckling drew a comparison to the proposed church asserting that there were three hurdles and two of them were impossible and the third was very subjective and that would be the effectiveness of drawing the line and dividing it.

Sally stated that residential is allowed in Planned Mix Use and you wouldn't want to have Commercial along that ecologically sensitive area even if it was Planned Mix Use. Sally stated that in her meeting with the Bordines, that they were very concerned about the northern portion of their property being ecologically preserved.

Chairman Steckling stated he would let the Bordines speak to that but they were the ones that were asking that the line be moved north.

Mr. Bordine would like the line moved north because he knows that is the whole envelope that is considered when you are looking at density and the farther south that line is the fewer acres that can be considered for the density. Mr. Bordine restated his desire to have the entire parcel designated the

same. He also restated his concern about consistency and said he believes all the property along Dixie Corridor should have the same designation. Mr. Bordine assured the Commissioners that it is his intent to preserve this area and stated he will have to come back to the Planning Commission with a site plan for approval.

Chairman Steckling asked the Commissioners if anyone had any other questions of Sally or Mr. Bordine.

Commissioner Moreau asked Mr. Bordine; if one of the factors that he believes now makes the ridge less important ecologically is that all the trees have been removed.

Mr. Bordine stated that, that line we see on the map is a historical line from 20 years ago. Mr. Bordine expressed that he does not believe the ridge exists any longer based on current topography.

Commissioner Moreau asked again about the trees and when were they removed.

Mr. Bordine stated that the trees were removed 16 months ago.

Commissioner Moreau asked Sally to confirm that the area considered significant by MNFI because of the stand of trees that have now been cleared.

Sally Elmiger stated yes.

Mr. Bordine stated; if you look at the entire map of that area that the MNFI, primarily is forestland.

Commissioner Moreau stated that the slope and trees are also a factor to preserve the wetlands. Commissioner Moreau the asked Mr. Bordine what aspect about the mixed uses future land use designation he was opposed to.

Mr. Bordine stated that it imposes more restrictions and that is what he is opposed to. Mixed Use has more restrictions, greater setbacks, and just more restrictions on the property from a commercial use. I am just making recommendations as a property owner of what I hope the Planning Commission will consider in making the decision.

Chairman Steckling agreed with Commissioner Moreau, the Planned Mix Use is a broader use and there are more options than straight General Cluster Commercial. He reminded Mr. Bordine that Planned Mixed Use is not a zoning category and it is just a concept that basically says you can do just about anything. Chairman Steckling stated that he felt that the Commission tried to give him the best use of the land for future Master Planning.

Mr. Bordine said okay.

Commissioner Baker restated Mixed Use is not zoning, and it is the broadest future use categorization that we have, as we have defined the map. As to the consistency of use, they are different. Developments will be based on matching zoning with an eye toward the future. We need to look at what is best for the Dixie Corridor and Springfield Township. Mixed Use is the broadest opportunity for use of that property in his opinion.

Commissioner Leddy stated that if we were to keep Mixed Use, it would make sense to him to include all of the property on the Dixie Highway side of the stream.

Chairman Steckling asked Clerk Strole what timing was required for this item to go to the Township Board, does it need to go out tonight or do we have more time?

Clerk Strole stated that the Master Plan does not have to go to the Township Board from this meeting. It could be tabled

Chairman Steckling stated the reason for asking was he had an opportunity to walk the Bordine property as well as Dr. O'Neil parcel and would encourage all Commissioners to avail themselves of that opportunity. He concurred with Commissioner Leddy that it didn't make sense not to include this part of the land. It is similar to the property in front and putting it in a different category doesn't make sense.

Commissioner Lamont wished to address Planned Mixed Use for the northern most portions. Commissioner Leddy said it best; if the line was moved back it would allow use for such as a retirement home in the back. He did walk and drive the property and it does have some very scenic vistas back there. Commissioner Lamont addressed the density by quoting, as written in the Draft proposed Master Plan; the Concept of Planned Mixed Use is to create a compatible mixture of uses that form an identifiable core of development. The category is proposed to create a dynamic environment in which activities may be mutually supportive. It is anticipated that the mix of permissible uses will include residential; commercial, office, business support services, industrial research, and public as appropriate. Commissioner Lamont summarized the Planned Mixed Use language and concluded that the designation covers most everything and would allow more intense development toward Dixie Highway and lesser intense development in the rear. If that were done, I could certainly see that line being looked at for review and agree with Chairman Steckling, suggesting the Commissioners have an opportunity to take a look at the property and make their own evaluations.

Commissioner Hines asked if Mr. Bordine is opposed to the whole Planned Mixed Use and asked if he wants to see the property Commercial to the wetland boundary?

Mr. Bordine stated yes, I am asking that you consider that but it sounds like the majority of the Commission would like to see it Mixed Use. That everything can be included in the Planned Mixed Use category so lets go forward with the Planned Mixed Use. Mr. Bordine stated that within the Master Planned area, there are zones, that you are visualizing, but you still need to be consistent. As it is, going down the red angled line, this follows the property line. Commission Lamont concurred it was the property line.

Sally Elmiger then asked if that particular area should be Planned Mixed Use? Commissioner Moreau and Mr. Bordine agreed.

Commissioner Lamont said if we make it Planned Mixed Use, then we have the General Cluster Commercial, which talks about Dixie Highway. General Cluster Commercial is intended as a cluster form of development along Dixie Highway to reduce the strip plaza environment. If we take away the large General Cluster Commercial parcel we might have to look at removing this paragraph from the future Master Plan.

Chairman Steckling pointed out if we let it stand as is, possibly under the Dixie Highway Overlay District include it, since there is some latitude there, but looking at the map it reflects the same line and we couldn't incorporate the back piece if it was separately categorized. He was looking for some flexibility but there wasn't any. We need to make the change if we're going to do it.

Betty Moen, 8930 Dixie Highway, 8970 & 8990 Dixie Highway stated the tiny little strip going through all of the Planned Mixed Use is another inconsistency, which creates limitations for that piece of property. She suggested that strip be removed and make it as you wish to Planned Mixed Use or if you wish Commercial, so that we do have a logical consistent environment that we can utilize on the Dixie Highway Corridor and still protect the riparian area and the wetlands.

Sally indicated that it does not make sense to take the driveway out. Chairman Steckling asked just the driveway or her whole piece? Sally was unsure as how to answer as part of the property has a home located on it and there is quite a bit of topography of the property and a portion is included in the MNFI boundary which includes the driveway and approximately  $\frac{2}{3}$ <sup>rd</sup> of the back portion of the parcel.

Commissioner Leddy asked if Mrs. Moen was asking for her home to be designated too?

Mrs. Moen responded the entire property because of the inconsistency of the line, which is why Mr. Bordine might be suggesting that we bring that line back a bit, we could get a good consistent flow with the actual topography. On the topography map you can see it more smoothly than 2-D.

Sally Elmiger said looking at the Topography Map it does show 2' contours indicating some wetland and relatively steep slopes, which was considered while doing the MNFI evaluation most likely.

Chairman Steckling asked for additional questions and comments. There were none.

The Planning Commission moved on to Dr. O'Neil property.

Sally Elmiger stated Dr. O'Neil's parcel on the Future Land Use map does not use the MNFI boundary and it is future Master Planned for Recreation/Conservation. There is a lot of topography on this parcel, there are uplands, and the wetlands are identified by Oakland County. Sally defined Recreation/Conservation future Land Use Designation. Sally believes that on the last Master Plan, it was Master planned for this as well. We are not proposing to change this.

Chairman Steckling asked what are the uses for Resource/Conservation. Commissioner Lamont summarized the permitted uses.

Commissioner Moreau asked about the acreage requirement in this category.

Sally Elmiger stated the property is zoned residential. She questioned Chairman Steckling if he felt if the property was Master Planned Recreation/Conservation that it should be zoned Resource Conservation.

Chairman Steckling replied if they come in with a Site Plan or a zoning change or some other proposal, we are going to look at the Master Plan and determine what is appropriate.

Sally Elmiger said the zoning is R-2, Single Family Residential and that is not the least intense. It is the middle density, 1-acre minimum.

Commissioner Lamont summarized the principal permitted uses in R-2 zoning and the permitted Special Land Uses.

Dr. O'Neil stated he has owned the property for 47 years and some people think it is a wetland but checking the topography it's not. He would propose Planned Mixed Use for the property and anything less degrades it and is the taking of property. I will not put anything there isn't wonderful, but if you don't include it the Overlay District and the Master Plan then no one is ever going to look at the property. Dr. O'Neil assured the Commission that he would not put anything on the property that was not beautiful but insisted that designating the property Recreational does not fit the scheme of what is happening along the area. He also stressed that if it is Mixed Residential then it will never be looked at by a developer and secondly I don't think will ever come to its best use for the Township in terms of convenience and taxable land.

Commissioner Baker clarified Dr. O'Neil's intent was the entire parcel be designated as a Mixed Use.

Dr. O'Neil stated that this was correct and that Saturn is adjacent and they were interested in obtaining part of their property swapping for an easement and would propose growth when the economy was better. I ask that you do the same as for Bordines.

Commissioner Baker; asked to clarify if the Bordine's desire was to move the existing line between the Planned Mixed Use and the medium density residential and not to reclassify the entire parcel but to realign the MNFI line closer to the wetland. Commissioner Baker again asked Dr. O'Neil for clarification. Is your suggestion to have the whole parcel considered for Mixed Use? Dr. O'Neil replied yes but stated he has no desire to put anything there commercial, but it would make sense, as it would go from Saturn straight through Bordines.

Commissioner Leddy stated it would make sense to bring the line consistently through and that more than likely isn't going to be a residential development off the freeway. Making the property Planned Mixed Use allows the latitude of doing a development possibly combined with the Bordines property at a future time. He would agree to the Planned Mixed Use.

Commissioner Lamont stated he would not be opposed to moving the line back closer to the edge of the wetlands to be consistent. He was not opposed to mixed use but had concerns regarding the access to this particular parcel. There are two access points it appears, one located on the stub road located in front of the car dealership and the other going through Lavon. If you put in something with a high use back there this could create a tremendous traffic impact on a very small residential street, so those are concerns that the Commission should evaluate before making a decision.

Commissioner Hines stated she concurred with the Planned Mixed Use for this property and doesn't feel Resource Conservation is the appropriate designation. She felt that it was a very valuable piece of property and Planned Mixed Use gives the Planning Commission a lot of latitude in what could go in there conforms to what is existing and that road access is sufficient, and to ensure the wetland area is protected.

Commissioner Moreau echoed the same thoughts, but doesn't feel that entire parcel should have that designation. I would be in favor of looking at the MNFI line again as Commissioners Lamont, Baker

and Hines suggested, bringing it closer to the wetlands after we have a chance to review that, but not designating the entire parcel as Mixed Use. This would also provide consistency throughout.

Chairman Steckling echoed the same thoughts and feels Mixed Use is a good designation for this property to allow flexibility and he doesn't care if it is the entire property or not.

Commission Moreau said she doesn't know how they could come up with a line looking at different colored lines. If we are looking at making this a Mixed Use designation and rethinking that line closer to the wetlands on both parcels, and asked Sally for direction.

Sally replied that there has been a lot of talk tonight about consistency across parcels. The reasons we identify different parcels differently is because they present different things to us. Their size, the natural features, their topography, their existing use, their access, all says different things to us and makes sense and then others, that seem very similar but really aren't in some important ways, require different land uses. She identified two parcels that have some similarities but the limitation of the access of Dr. O'Neil parcel is going to be hard, so she is not sure she would suggest Planned Mixed Use. Sally believed more of a retirement campus would make more sense but she didn't think commercial use is going to work here and this is supposed to be for future use.

Dr. O'Neil disagreed with Sally Elmiger comments and feels that would degrade the value of the property.

Sally Elmiger stated as your consultant I wanted to provide this information to the Commission and regarding where to put the line, I would recommend putting it at the top of the obvious ridge. I am more confident with the Bordine line, as they had it surveyed and it is field verified, where your MNFI wetland area has not been field verified and delineated. I would put it on the top of the ridge, and on the Bordine property I don't think you have a question about that.

Dr. O'Neil; how do you would define the top of the ridge? Sally indicated her proposal on the map. Dr. O'Neil asked why not move it just inside the wetland and stated that the map shows generalized wetland delineation and is not field verified. Bordines supplied the wetland delineation line and field verification. Some areas came out further than the originally indicated and other areas it went further back inside the line.

Dr. O'Neil asked why not leave it at the wetlands.

Sally Elmiger stated because the slopes are very environmentally significant and the woodlands along those slopes are very important to hold the soil onto the slope so they don't slide down and degrades the wetland.

Chairman Steckling interrupted saying a lot of information had been given this evening and he would recommend we table this item and let the Commissioner digest the information, have a chance to walk the property, and then maybe this will make more sense and easier for next month.

Clerk Strole said that the health of wetlands are significantly dependent upon the land surrounding it, so simply having an invisible line around the wetlands does not necessarily protect the health of that wetland. Sally indicated some slopes and those slopes are all different but depending upon the wetland topography and the woods beyond that line can have a significant impact on wetlands. That information came from MNFI and what Sally was indicating is that the slopes, the woodlands the



topography etc. surrounding the wetlands are a primary part of the sustainability of the wetlands itself. Dr. O'Neil agreed for purposes listed.

- **Chairman Steckling moved to table this item until next meeting and give the Commissioners a chance to view the property and then continue discussion. Support by Commissioner Leddy. Vote on the motion: Yes: Baker, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Moreau and Steckling. No: none. Absent: Aiello Motion carried.**

Chairman Lamont addressed Dr. O'Neil and the Bordines prior to departing this subject. Permission granted by Chairman Steckling. Chairman Lamont: "With your permission would you allow the Planning Commission to visit your sites and walk your properties". Dr. O'Neil stated: Absolutely. Mr. Bordine: I would encourage it.

Chairman Lamont: I believe it is important we respect your opinions as landowners. You know your property and in order to make the best decision for the landowners, the Township and all parties concerned, I would encourage Commissioners to visit the sites before the next meeting, to formulate an opinion on their own, and be able to discuss intelligently a proposed line that will protect the landowners, and Township environmental issues are preserved to the best of our ability.

Betty Moen stated you have very good access at Cedar Crest. It's the best access.

Commissioner Lamont said he is remiss for not asking permission from Ms. Moen.

## **2. The River – Final Site Plan**

Pastor Jim Combs introduced himself He was accompanied by the architects; engineers, and builder. Pastor Combs introduced Allan Howe, lead architect.

Chairman Steckling asked if he could interrupt.

Chairman Steckling asked Sally to leave her charts she had prepared. Sally agreed and stated she could e-mail pdf's, as well. She asked if Mr. Bordine could send his information as well. Mr. Bordine agreed.

Chairman Steckling apologized for the interruption. He explained that the Commission met with The River last month for a Concept Site Plan review. At that time we commented on items we thought needed to be addressed. The facility is existing in terms of the buildings, a fair amount of the landscaping is in, and the issues that were raised were the traffic ingress and egress and the effect it would have on the area, and screening and drainage in the new area used for parking and some other just mechanical items. Chairman Steckling confirmed Mr. Howe he had received the reviews from the consultants.

Allen Howe from BanahCorp, stated Bruce Wallace, Midwestern Consulting and Pastor Jim Combs were her to answer facility needs. Mr. Howe stated the main issue last month was traffic and whether a left hand turn would be needed but first I need to clarify that the correct numbers for services will be between 400-500, and not the 150 I indicated last month. We are looking for 600 to be at the facility for Phase I, so we completed a full Traffic Analysis, looked at the landscaping and other issues. I will let Mr. Wallace explain.

Mr. Wallace, Midwestern Consulting, Site Planning and Traffic Engineer stated they did a traffic study and traffic counts on Sunday during the times when the church was planning on having services, along with an extensive study of not only the church drive access to E. Holly road, but also the two off ramps and on ramps for I-75. The study indicated we did not need a left hand turn lane, and we do need a right turn lane, which we have as part of the existing driveway. Randy Ford summarized his questions. He asked about days and times of services and was told that the services will be on Sunday only. Two services one at 9:30a.m. and around 11:00 a.m. Thus there won't be evening impacts during the week for the church. The question asking the number of trips being generated for the site during an average peak hour, coming and going from the site were addressed by using two different methods and averaged them. Mr. Ford suggested we use the higher of the two numbers, which we did and remodeled the study and didn't find any significant changes to the traffic service levels or the q-lengths. The question related to the left hand turn warrant which means that point at which a left hand turn is warranted or required for the site. Road Commission for Oakland County, has jurisdiction over E. Holly Road, has a warrant graph that they use that is based on average daily traffic which is the total number of trips that happens in any given 24 hour period. We do have information on 24 hour ADT from SEMCOG, however, that information is based on weekday trips not weekend trips. We went out on Sunday morning and measured in 15 minutes intervals the total number of trips during the time church services would be held. Taking those results and applying some MDOT warrants, because the Road Commission for Oakland County warrants are based on 24 hour traffic, we determined that a left hand turn lane is not warranted for the Phase I of the church.

Chairman Steckling suggested that instead of addressing each individual item in the consultant's reviews that maybe we should address the unresolved items at this point.

Regarding the storm drainage, Mr. Wallace explained that their proposal is to pave some areas of the site that were indicated as deferred parking on the House of Denmark Site Plan. We are following the House of Denmark Site Plan indicating that those areas will now be paved for use by the church and very minor structural adjustments to the catch basin are necessary, and other than that it is just a simple matter of paving those areas indicated on the original plan as being paved. Randy has suggested an oil/water separator in one of the manholes prior to discharge into the detention pond, and is completely acceptable and happy to do that.

Mr. Wallace then addressed the Planners comments. The items generally related to landscaping, and the addition of a number of trees for screening from I-75 and E. Holly Road along with parking lot trees. We would ask the same consideration with respect to the landscaping as with the storm water and that we be required to provide the landscaping that was shown on the House of Denmark plan, which I believe is mostly done and could be confirmed, and not be required to plant another 50 or so trees. Knowing that this is Phase I, with future expansions plans we would do substantial changes to the site creating new parking areas and could add more landscaping then. Mainly we are using the site as is for the church and are not really proposing to do that many changes. We will be utilizing the existing lighting but possibly needing to move one pole to accommodate a pedestrian pathway from the office to the church.

Sally stated the architectural requirements still needed to be addressed. The ordinance has changed since the time the House of Denmark was built. The requirements currently require different types of materials on walls that are over 100 feet long. Sally will verify that the Planning Commission has the authority to waive any landscape requirements.

Chairman Steckling stated he knows they can waive the parking lot tree requirements but he is unsure about the rest of the requirements.

Mr. Wallace stated that they have added some proposed landscaping to the plan. He believes there are 18 or so trees being added to cover the new parking areas that they are paving.

Mr. Howe said we do have one wall over 100 feet long again hope is we can go into the building as is. We are looking at doing cleanup and some painting but we were not looking at tearing off facades and changing materials at this point.

Chairman Steckling asked if the 100 foot long wall was on the warehouse building. Mr. Howe stated, no it was located on the smaller building on the left along the length of the back, which faces the western line, which has a good landscape buffer between the property next door owned by the church.

Commissioner Lamont inquired about a retaining wall on the other side. Mr. Howe stated yes there was an existing 4-foot landscape wall.

Commissioner Lamont said even if the church didn't own the other property, the height of that wall isn't really that high, and you really couldn't see it and there are some evergreens, and that it is very aesthetic.

Chairman Steckling stated the screening appeared to be well spaced and staggered so it is made for a screen and wondered if it met our screening standards.

Sally said it met the intent of the ordinance even without the mix of the large and small trees that are required. I could do a field evaluation to ensure the 80 percent opacity requirement, but reviewing the plans it appears the number of trees and the types of trees probably meets the opacity.

Commissioner Hines stated this use to be a country western facility, and that screening of the property was addressed back then and that is how the property resulted in a pretty significant border being installed.

Sally Elmiger said she no other significant concerns, but regarding the landscaping the ordinance does allow the Planning Commission discretion with the parking lot trees and at it's discretion may approve alternate landscape plantings at the perimeter parking lots for landscaping within parking lots would be impractical due to the size or detrimental to safe and efficient flow of traffic. The Planning Commission can waive that requirement only.

Randy Ford wanted to address the follow-up report on the traffic study. Mr. Wallace went through the information secured and referenced traffic counts, and when our initial review was completed we had the originally submitted traffic impact study but the appendix's were not included so our report speaks to the left turn traffic warrant based on 24 hour traffic volume and there was information obtained indicated a Wednesday evening service, (which they clarified was not taking place), so we were concerned about the overlap with the peak hour traffic during the week and our reports it indicates the warrant might be met and even provided a threshold number based on a 24 hour count, if seating capacity was 422 that is where the warrant for a left turn lane would be required, but we also indicated that it wasn't based on Sunday morning traffic counts. The appendix's they provided have that data and we need to substantiate what is indicated, that if there are only services Sunday

mornings and the traffic volumes are low it would meet the warrant. I suggest a follow up on the information provide and then allow me to revise our report to reflect the data. Chairman Steckling agreed. Randy also mentioned the oil/water separator that something reason could be done, to try and capture some of the runoff contaminates from the parking lots, and then define the details as how it is to be handled and Randy indicated they had agreed to this. The last is a bookkeeping item, for Final Site Plan they need to provide evidence that all the required permits have been secured, including the Oakland County Environmental Health Department permit for the septic expansion.

Commissioner Moreau asked Randy, if no service is held on Wednesday and they are having two services on Sunday morning, as they have I can't believe that there will be 600 at each service, so will that be factored in. Pastor Combs responded the second service is for growth. We could sustain membership at one service, but we wanted to have opportunity for growth as well to be respectful of the traffic problems we might create. Commissioner Moreau said with that in mind, does that impact the study at all. Randy would like to go through the data and he might have questions as well. There will have to be dialogue to ensure everyone is in consensus. Mr. Wallace responded that their Traffic Study does anticipate two services with full seating capacity at each service.

Chairman Steckling; if we want to act on this, and HRC comes back and says we need a left hand turn lane, how would we deal with that. Randy said procedurally this doesn't have to go to the Township Board, and the person who did the review was unavailable last week and wasn't able to complete the revisions but it will only take a couple of days to complete.

Pastor Combs asked the Commission to consider two issues: 1.) Our lease. We are presently leasing the Holly High School and are on the border of loosing that lease. We are trying to comply with the Commissions wishes as quickly as possible. 2.) is the finishing of the financing. With the economic situation of today, we need to show the bank what we have been able to achieve up to now, so any help that would be appreciated. He understands Randy has a responsibility as Township engineer, and possibly it could be approved on contingency.

Randy asked Chairman Steckling what was expected in terms of phasing of the project. This is the initial phase and we could tie the approval into this phase. Randy stated if they wish to add on, then he would need to see an updated traffic study for the next phase. The Commission could approve contingent on verification, based on the maximum congregation size, then stipulate that in your motion, then we could base our review on that number with the understanding that if there is future expansion of the congregation, that the traffic study would have to be updated. Chairman Steckling said he was more concerned about our current situation and if we were to approve this, and we found with the current numbers, we needed that left turn lane then we are left hanging.

Commissioner Baker stated in the October 17<sup>th</sup> narrative referencing hazardous materials it states that any salt that is stored will be contained, are you proposing an outside structure. Mr. Howe replied no. The salt would be stored in the existing warehouse facility or storage bins in the smaller building. Commissioner Baker stated being the 100' western wall was not in front, he would not force an architectural break, but would like assurance the opacity between the neighboring property is appropriate. In the tree requirements if trees are called for, trees will be placed. I also would like confirmation of the left turn lane not being required, and any future growth that would take place, if it got to a certain level, would generate another traffic study.

Commission Leddy felt there was plenty of buffer from the neighboring property on the west, but did think trees were needed along the front to the east of the driveway and the property line where it

appears some have died and if no trees are going in the parking lot then I think trees should go in the front. I feel we could put the turn lane on a contingency basis providing the report was suitable to HRC.

Commissioner Lamont asked Randy to clarify that he had not studied the individual parameters to verify their traffic study and that he needed a few days to review. Randy agreed. They only had the front part of the study and didn't have the traffic counts from Sunday and they need to look at the data and get back to Commission.

Commissioner Hines commented that she would be in favor of waiving the requirement for trees planted in the middle of the parking lot in lieu of some additional plantings along the road way for screening, that the buffer along the western property line was sufficient and perhaps a field inspection by the consultants for verification of landscaping completion. She is favor of approving with the condition of verification by Randy of the traffic count and study and then adding a left turn lane in another phase of the development, if required.

Sally Elmiger said several Commissioners refer to the planting of additional trees at the front of the property instead of parking lot trees. The Ordinance does not allow trees to be placed on the edge of the parking lot in lieu of trees in the islands, and felt this needed to be clarified. Sally marked a couple of areas on her site plan she is proposing. Pastor Combs wanted to make sure that trees would not have to be moved again for future parking lots. Commissioner Hines concurred.

Commissioner Moreau concurs with Commissioner Hines that the 18 trees could go between the parking lot and E. Holly Road and around by the detention basin, as it doesn't appear that the parking lots would be expanded in those two directions. This would accomplish more screening with the road and would be a logical place to put the additional trees to meet the requirement. The landscaping along the western edge appears to have sufficient screening but it is over grown and hard to tell. She would like to see the outcome from the planner.

Pastor Combs stated he is not opposed to putting in more trees. He stated the dead trees needed to be replaced as well as adding others. We are excited about cleaning up the property.

Mike Trout asked if there was an alternate to the proposed sidewalk as it doesn't appear to go anywhere and is not located in a place where people will be walking, and I am not sure that it is a necessary expense at this time. Maybe an alternate connection of the two lots could be found, to direct traffic from the back parking lot toward the entrance of the building other than along the western edge of the property.

Chairman Steckling replied good point. Sally's only concern would be the barrier free access. You may want to switch the barrier free spaces or put some close to that walkway on the other side of the parking lot in the back area. This was agreeable.

Pastor Combs said the church is hoping to move in this winter, but on the proposed expanded parking lot requirement, with the paving companies closed, we don't know how to meet that need and are looking for the Commissions recommendation. It was recommend that a gravel base be placed for the winter, packed then brought back to acceptable levels and paved in the spring.

Chairman Steckling thanked the Commissioners for the good comments and he had nothing to add and if the Commission is comfortable with approving contingent upon the engineer being satisfied with the number he would entertain a motion.

Commissioner Lamont stated for clarification purposes that this is a Final Site Plan approval for a Use by Right. Final approval, if given, would be complete at this point.

**Commissioner Lamont stated that based upon the information received from the applicant reflected in the minutes of this meeting I believe that the Final Site Plan for The River Church, Phase I, plan date 11-07-08 by Springfield Township does meet the criteria contained in Section 18.07 of the ordinance and therefore move to recommend approval of the Final Site Plan for The River Church, Phase I, subject to the following conditions:**

- **All required permits are obtained and received by Springfield Township, including and especially the health permit for the septic change.**
- **Under the Carlisle Wortman's review: trees designated for parking lot islands be placed as agreed upon administratively by our Township Planner and the applicant. That the applicant replaces all failed landscape that currently exists on site.**
- **Under the HRC review: that the oil/water separator is installed as depicted in review.**
- **That Phase I, is contingent upon a satisfactory confirmation of the Traffic Survey warrant and review by HRC and reported back to the Township.**
- **For purposes of this approval Phase I shall be defined as: The River Church being limited to 600 active members.**
- **Phase I shall also be defined as: if additional services or different days are added, it would no longer qualify as Phase I;**
- **Or if additional uses to the site were added, it would no longer qualify as Phase I and therefore be required to come back to the Planning Commission for review what had been added.**
- **That the current existing westerly wall architectural break be waived as allowed by Commission right in the Ordinance.**
- **Relocate the sidewalk as agreed between the applicant and consulting with the Planner and other authorities in the Township.**
- **That the gravel parking base to suitable for parking until weather permits installation of asphalt as agreed to maintain the minimum number of sites as shown on the plan and that all temporary and/or permanent parking facilities provide a barrier free route. Supported by Commissioner Baker.** Discussion: Commissioner Baker addressed Commissioner Lamont stating that since Phase I would be based on 600 members; I think the words "attendees or actual seating count" would be more appropriate. **Commissioner Lamont** stated 600 attendees would be fine so **for clarification the definition of Phase I will read: if it exceeds 600 attendees per service** Commissioner Lamont then stated that was his original intent. Commissioner Baker inquired if on the waiver for the architectural break on the western wall, do you intend on asking the Planner to do a visual inspection of the screening to verify the opacity requirements are met.

**Commissioner Lamont amended his motion to include a visual inspection of the landscaping along the western wall to be handled administratively by the Township and the applicant.**

Point on the motion by Sally Elmiger: under Section 16.02 of the parking requirements of the Township Ordinance; the Township Body responsible for Site Plan approval has the discretion to waive certain hard surface parking requirements, so you are well within your purview of making that waiver.

Pastor Combs trying to understand, that in the motion that they are only allowed to have a function in the building on Sunday's not during the week. How can a church just function on Sunday even though the bulk of our ministry is on Sunday. Commissioner Lamont responded that his motion was based upon on comment review letters and the information submitted. This indicated that you would have two primary services on Sunday and at all other times you would have about 10 members, but if you are adding a daycare facility, a school or other functions Wednesday, Thursday and Friday afternoon etc., then most important factor is the traffic impact, which has yet be reviewed by HRC and that was my intent with the motion. If there are 2 or 3 people that is not an issue but holding a rally every Wednesday night, with a 1000 people, during rush hour is my concern. Pastor Combs replied we just want to function as a church such as having a baby shower or other functions, not have church services. Commissioner Moreau asked Commissioner Lamont if his intent was to allow regular functions as a church, youth groups coming in on a certain day and still functioning as a church, but not changing their main function. Commissioner Lamont responded that if additional services are added that might change the traffic warrants, in front of that church on weekdays, we need to have an opportunity as a Planning Commission to look at that, at that time and that is why I put that contingency is in that motion, to not allow the church to grow uncontrolled but to allow it, if it wants to grow, and when it goes to Phase II that we will have to look at that again. Commissioner Baker would like HRC to review weekday traffic to see the outcome for warrants. Sally responded that we don't want to make it too restrictive. Commissioner Lamont pointed out that in the HRC review letter that based on the SEMCOG data and the Road Commission for Oakland County road warrants for a left turn lane, that during the week a left turn lane would not be warranted until a seating capacity of 422 was met, so knowing that perhaps we could specify that the church could have activities during the week as long as those activities were of a certain number. Commissioner Lamont asked Randy Ford if he would be able to verify this information. Randy said they didn't do a traffic count during the week, but he felt fairly comfortable with the number of 422, based on the traffic volume, without doing an update traffic count during the afternoon rush hour. Commissioner Lamont asked Commissioner Baker if he was comfortable if the motion was amended to state "if additional services other than regular Sunday services are added beyond 400". **Commissioner Lamont stated he would amend his motion to read: if additional services beyond the typical two Sunday services, on different days of the week are held, in order to qualify for Phase I, they shall not exceed a count of 400". Commissioner Baker supported the amended motion.**

For clarification Chairman Steckling stated that the trees for the parking area be arranged between the applicant and the Sally on an administrative basis, and the other trees that are called for in the greenbelt, were not addressed in the motion, do you want that covered in the same context location based on future expansion they may have, and handle administratively. **Commissioner Lamont responded yes. Commissioner Lamont amend the Section that reads: the trees designated for parking lot islands to be placed as agreed on administratively by the Township Planner and other bodies of Township that want to be involved, to include the areas around the parking lot and the greenbelt area."** Supported by Commissioner Baker. **Vote on the Motion: Vote on the motion: Yes:**

**Baker, Hines, Leddy, Lamont, Moreau, Steckling; No: none; Absent: Aiello. Motion Carried.**

## NEW BUSINESS

### 1. Divine Mercy – Concept Plan Review

Commissioner Leddy requested to be excused from this item as he has a conflict of interest, as he is part of the Building Committee for Divine Mercy.

Chairman Lamont stated that he felt that he could sit and be involved but he should just remove himself from voting, if he wished. Commissioner Leddy agreed.

Sally Elmiger asked if she could cite the law. She stated that Commissioner Leddy did do the right thing stating his conflict of interest and that he should not be included in the discussion or the voting.

Commissioner Leddy was excused from the discussion and vote.

Commissioner Moreau wished to disclose that she is not on the Building Committee, but she is a member. Sally was asked if this excluded Commissioner Moreau as well. Sally responded if Commissioner Moreau didn't feel it is a conflict of interest and the Commissioners agree, then she could participate as a Planning Commissioner.

Commissioner Moreau asked Clerk Strole if she had any comment on the item. Clerk Strole responded that unless she has financial interest or has been directly involved in the planning Commissioner Moreau would not be excused.

Mike Donnellon along with Msgr. John Budde, Building Committee Chairs; Tom Mockeridge, Tom Sorrell, Ben Schneider, Mr. Gus Pappas, architect and Steve Sutton engineer were present for questions. Mr. Donnellon stated historically Divine Mercy has been in the community since 2003 and 2 years ago began a Master Plan process that was completed in 2007. During that time we identified Use Zones within the property for the development, multiple site meeting were held, and meetings with the Township for information and preliminary input. A neighborhood meeting was also held for input, the Archdiocese of Detroit had their input and final adoption was September 2007. Next to the highest priority of worship space this community has been focused on environmental sensitive design. We have reviewed the US Green Building Councils Standards for building and site design and hence of the aspects of our plans are based on that; storm water management, building systems, gray water recycling, reuse of storm, infiltration, bio swales etc. The Site I believe is consistent with the Township Master Plan as well as protecting the environment. Open for questions and comments.

Chairman Steckling requested Mr. Donnellon to define Phase I and address issues raised that are still unresolved. Mr. Donnellon stated that Phase I is the Parish Center, the other administration portions, worship center and school are identified are future phases. There are no time line phases. The landscape issues, particularly the buffering zones and use of the natural vegetation that exists on the site and through the design process we were being sensitive to the sight utilizing and maintaining existing trees rows and vegetation. The complex is located primarily on an area that is used for agriculture purposes. We are trying to save some oak trees within those tree rows, along with cherry, dead ash and dogwood. We could possibly use other trees from the site and transplant into the landscaping. We are 269 feet from the northern property well exceeding the setback requirements.



The natural vegetation in that area of about 230 feet and should be requirements. We are requesting that the Commission allow Sally to visit the site and confirm the opacity that is required by ordinance. We are doing a tree plant program through our Capitol Development Fund, allowing parishioners to grow trees at home and then at the Grand Opening we would be planting trees as part of greenbelts for future phases. Mr. Donnellon welcomed comments from Mr. Pappas and Mr. Sutton regarding architecture and engineering.

Mr. Pappas stated that on item 1; the grading of future administrative office area; to lessen the impact of the number of buildings on the site and offered an opportunity for a walkout building and therefore that is why we positioned the building in that location. When the building is erected, retaining walls will hold the soils rather than grading in that area. The other grading issues were worked out with the consultants. This is not part of Phase I.

Mr. Sutton stated we are proposing a detention pond, as a part of the overall drainage system, on an as needed basis. The calculations have not been finalized, that will be kept to a minimum and try to maintain as much of the storm water as possible using the green initiative. The septic field area has been looked at by the Oakland County Environmental Health Department and is the only areas that is percable, so we will be constructing an engineered field, which will be designed for Phase I, and the future administrative area. I believe that along with the traffic issues noted, the traffic situation that we looked at for Phase I, we feel confident that we can maintain service in that area without any detriment to what we are proposing. I would state that this is a very large site and we have pulled the complex into the middle of the site to hide as much of the building as possible and having a long road into the site, it is as far away as possible from adjoining residences versus being off of Davisburg Road.

Randy Ford stated that the applicants addressed the grading drainage issues quite thoroughly and the latest plans submitted have addressed those concerns for purposes of the concept plan review. Sally had echoed some of the grading issues on the slope in her report, and they have indicated that some of the contouring shown has been eliminated; in the administrative office area, and for Final Site approval they need to fine-tune those issues. If utilizing boulder retaining walls or other material, to try and minimize the grading impacts then that would demonstrate consistency with the Township ordinance. On the storm water management approach; there is no issue with that. The Design and Construction standards require a storm water detention based for a 25-year storm event. The original plan did not show this and the revised plan does show a 25-year basin, what we suggests is shifted up the slope adjacent to the parking lot in a flatter area, but again these are details that can be worked out on the final site and will keep grading to a minimum. The basin proper does not have to be sized for a 25 year storm event, and they should be credited for anything they do upland and we would encourage other features other than draining directly into a detention basin and then possibly that basin's size could be reduce from what is depicted. In our report based on the available traffic counts (as in The River project) based on mid-week, and the numbers and the distribution of the traffic it appears that Phase I might need a traffic warrant and again we did not have benefit of Sunday traffic counts so inclusion we would like to see them come back with an actual Sunday traffic count to verify they meet the warrant based on their Phase I project. They are aware that in the future when doing additional phases the warrant is probably going to be there but I would like to ensure for Phase I, that we make sure it meets the warrant, and the Sunday traffic counts would help us make that determination, as we indicated we think it may be warranted.

Sally Elmiger said her major comments had already been voiced and only would like to add a couple of details. Regarding the grading next to the administrative building, which is not on the site plan, by

placing the proposed building in the proposed location limits what they can do with that administrative building and where it is going, is my concern in this location, if they decide in the future they need a larger building they will not have alternatives and recommended the building be pushed back on the property. It might be less expensive to construct and function easier in a two-story building, and I appreciate that but that was my concern. The grading still may be an issue in the future, as we do not know what the administrative building is going to look like as well as looking at the septic locations for future use.

Mr. Sutton responded that Oakland County Environmental Health would have the parameters for the type of system that we are proposing and we could certainly get that information for a typical engineered field. Sally stated that was definitely heading in the right direction and Randy would know better than I. Randy said that one of the questions he had in his report was, I know it is proposed future and that it could change, but the proposed elementary school seems somewhat removed the balance of the campus, and if it ended up in that location would you be looking at alternate septic location rather than piping it all the way to this common field.

Mr. Sutton responded that he believe if the elementary school does get built they would be forced to look at septic near the school.

Sally Elmiger said changes to the storm water management has been made, however, I think you could do more. Sally felt with the size of the property and working with the Township Engineer there was enough natural vegetation, topography and other possibilities, perhaps a detention basin would not be needed. Mr. Donnellon stated that was his hope. Sally's only other concern was the length of the entry drive and access for emergency vehicles.

Chairman Steckling stated the Commission had two tasks to handle. One that the project substantially meets the standards set forth in Section 18.08.1 A – F, and whether they meet or do not meet the Special Land Use criteria. I will open the floor for questions or comments.

Commissioner Baker said the detention basin was within the setbacks and understood why Randy requested moving it earlier. Commissioner Baker asked where the cistern was showing and the size. Mr. Sutton stated it had not been sized yet and would be addressed with the storm water management issues. Commissioner Baker the proposed use the 8-foot wide pathway Mr. Sutton stated primarily as access along the main road. The Township Consultants had suggested/recommended connectivity between Davisburg Road and the parish center, so it was placed there for pedestrian access to the site. Commissioner Baker question if the parish would be able to keep the access maintained. Mr. Sutton stated they would not be plowing in the winter nor would there be regular maintenance, it would be more like walking through an open field. Commissioner Baker said the documents indicate connecting the rectory to the grounds. What is your intent. Mr. Sutton stated, in the future, a walkway pathway between the rectory and the church was intended so Father won't have to go out to Parker to Ormond and back in. This is not a road and we do not want additional vehicle access to the property. Commissioner Baker asked if the wetland issue had been addressed. Randy responded that it was in their report requesting confirmation and a copy of the Wetland Consultants report-verifying jurisdiction. Mr. Sutton said it would be forthcoming.

Commissioner Lamont asked the length of the entry drive and if they had consulted with the Fire Chief. Mr. Sutton stated he believe it was approximately 1800' and we have sent preliminary plans to the Chief, as of yet, he has not commented on the length of the road. Commissioner Lamont would look forward to the Chief's comments prior to final and his comments on the cul-de-sac turn around

and to ensure that it can accommodate all fire equipment. Commissioner Lamont asked if the plans indicated a dry hydrant on site and Mr. Sutton replied yes.

Commissioner Hines said with all the land, if you build a school, are there going to be soccer fields, ball fields or just corn fields, hay fields. Mr. Donnellon stated, we are going to use it for agriculture purposes. There may be sports near the activity center in the near future, but that is just a mowed area there is nothing formal. When we went through the Master Plan process we tried to identify all the uses that our community as well as the Archdiocese of Detroit had intended for the 144 acres of which the K-8 school was the only item that the Archdioceses was really interested in. When and how that would be implemented, we don't know. As far as formalized athletic fields you have the large agricultural fields that could be used, but that is really long term. Commissioner Hines stated there would be a road going through the farmland and would it be mowed so far on each side of the road. Mr. Donnellon said correct. Mr. Donnellon stated the Building Committee and the parishioners are intending, even when the activity center exists, that those field be farmed as agricultural. Commissioner Hines asked if there was a farmer that runs the property. Mr. Donnellon said that was correct.

Commissioner Moreau asked for Mr. Donnellon to clarify the pedestrian pathway between the rectory and the church, since it was not on the plan. Randy said that was the reason he had raised the original question as it was on the first plan he had seen and had been removed and just wanted to make sure it wasn't a road instead of just a pathway. This was clarified.

Commissioner Hines asked if wetlands were on the property. Mr. Donnellon replied there is a wetland that is delineated that jets off from the wooded wetland area. There is a low area on the neighboring property.

s

Commissioner Moreau felt the mowed path would be a great asset and in her subdivision, they have nature paths that are used year round. Clarifying the septic field area, you said it was the only place that perched, is that the only place anywhere or the only place in the general area where you wish to build. Mr. Sutton responded they checked four areas that worked with in the parish activity center; the other areas checked did not turn out to meet the requirements of the Oakland County Health Department and the one showing, only meets the requirements of an engineer field. The good thing about this location is we'll be able to service not only the parish center but also the future worship space via gravity. Commissioner Moreau then asked if he would be checking in to the wetland area and whether it was regulated or not. Mr. Sutton said yes they would.

Chairman Steckling said he knew the Concept Review but wanted to know how the parameter was going to meet the screening requirements? Sally Elmiger responded when she looked at the plan she was only considering screening some areas, which she indicated to the Commissioners, and her primary area is the northern property line where the parish center is going to be located. The other parcels are far enough away I don't believe the other areas should be issue, as those properties are already developed. Chairman Steckling asked if we had that latitude in the ordinance as with The River. Sally Elmiger stated that she would need to do a field inspection and see if the property meets the ordinance requirements and if it doesn't then they will have to put more in and will have to comply with our Schedules. for both the distance and the opacity.

Commissioner Lamont wants his HRC comments on the record: 1.) A wetland report should be submitted with the Final Site plan. 2.) Legal description for the property, need to be cleaned up. 3.) Site grading and drainage; it would be imperative that the plans reflect the limiting grading impacts to

the extent practical. It has to be on the plans. 4.) Detention calculations, especially if relocated, resized using best management practices showing they meet the 25-year storm event. I also concur that it should be moved out of the setback area and probably up a little higher so there is less grading. 5.) A report from the Fire Chief, verifying the 18 foot wide; 1800 + feet drive emergency access and vehicle service on a cul-de-sac for Phase I. 6.) Traffic Study to ensure Phase I doesn't grow beyond where Phase I should be, before a revisit or another structure is built. Under Carlisle Wortman's report: 7.) Administrative field check of the vegetation for screening. 8.) There have been multiple comments regarding the location of the administration building to make sure that it doesn't encroach, too much, into the hill, realizing you want to a walkout, but to make sure that you don't impact the hillside, as this one does not and that goes back to grading.

- **Commissioner Hines moved that based on the review of the Concept Plan Proposal, that the Commission recommends approval of the Special Land Use for Divine Mercy church to the Township Board. Supported by: Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes: Baker, Hines, Lamont, Moreau, Steckling; No: none. Absent: Aiello. Abstained: Leddy.**
- **Motion Carried.**

Chairman Steckling thanked Commissioner Moreau for her involvement on the Planning Commission and it happy she is going to be Township Clerk and to Nancy Stole, we are deeply indebted to you for all of your help, guidance and years of service.

#### **Public Comment:**

Mike Trout said he believed Onalee had left a proposed meeting schedule. Chairman Steckling said yes, he had missed it. Commissioner Lamont asked to have Onalee e-mail dates to Commissioners

**Commissioner Lamont moved to table the following items to next month; Wind Energy, Dixie Corridor Study, Downtown Davisburg, Amendments to Ordinance No. 26 and the Priority List. Supported by Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes; Baker, Hines, Leddy, Lamont, Moreau, Steckling. No: None. Absent: Aiello. Motion Carried.**

#### **Adjournment:**

- **Chairman Steckling moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:37 p.m. Support by Commissioner Lamont. Vote on the motion: Yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Lamont, Moreau, Steckling; No: Aiello. Absent: none. Motion Carried.**

---

Onalee M. Carnes, Recording Secretary