

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission -- Business Meeting
Minutes of May 19, 2008**

Call to Order: Chair Roger Lamont called the May 19, 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

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

Commissioners Absent

Staff Present

Collin Walls
Nancy Strole

Consultants Present

Dick Carlisle
Sally Elmiger

Approval of Agenda:

Chair Lamont asked that Item 1 under New Business 'Holly Greens Storage Site Plan Addition' be moved to Item 2 under Old Business.

There was no objection to this change.

Public Comment:

None.

Consent Agenda:

- **Chairperson Lamont moved to approve the Consent Agenda, tabling approval of minutes until the next scheduled meeting. Support by Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Lamont, Leddy, Moreau, Steckling. No: none. Absent: none. Motion carried.**
 - a) Approval of Minutes, April 21, 2008 and May 1, 2008: Tabled until next scheduled meeting.
 - b) Communications: None

Old Business:

1. Commercial Market Analysis

Dick Carlisle discussed with Commissioners the Commercial Market Analysis section of the Master Plan and the chart data provided in the section.

Mr. Carlisle stated the data in the chart is by no means definitive. He feels it gives legitimacy to the Commercial Market Analysis as it shows a clear relationship between households and household spending and the amount of commercial development the Township can support.

He stated there have been concerns with the accuracy of the data by the Planning Commission. He stated when census data is used, it is not as detailed as if a market analysis was commissioned, which is extremely expensive. The benefit of using census data is that it is a comparison tool between geographical areas. What he wanted to demonstrate with the data is to be able to see trends in similar areas (Springfield, White Lake, and Independence) and to show contrasts in different areas (i.e. Springfield Township and Auburn Hills). He stated the data provided is the only information readily available and if more detailed market surveys are wanted, someone would have to be hired that does that on a full time basis.

He noted the Retail Trends listed on page 129 are the trends he sees in literature and research and are the trends right now. He feels these are the types of things that will be happening in the next ten years. E-commerce will be a challenge to retail, precision shopping will become prevalent and, to attract customers, something other than the retail component needs to be available. He feels these concepts can be used in formulating commercial policies pursued by the Township.

He provided to Commissioners copies of two publications pertaining to Commercial Development Planning.

Commissioner Leddy questioned Table 10 – Commercial Land Demand on page 123. The table shows a projected increase in households of about 30% between now and 2035 but shows an increase in Commercial Acre Demand around 250%.

Sally Elmiger stated the number of households changed from the last draft primarily because SEMCOG came up with an adjusted figure for 2035. She redid the numbers, but stated it is difficult to get numbers for the future. She stated she will look at the numbers and come up with more reasonable data.

Commissioner Leddy stated patterns he sees in other cities and townships are that they create new commercial property on previously undeveloped green space instead of building on old commercial property which has become decrepit and needs to be redeveloped.

Commissioner Aiello asked if there was another piece of data that is used to come up with the Commercial Acre Demand listed in Table 10 and, if so, thinks it would be useful to include in the table.

Dick Carlisle responded that all the detail was not included, just the bottom line. He stated more data could be listed that provides a better explanation of the figures in the table.

Commissioner Aiello stated that the data in the Background Summaries reflects that Commercial Acreage Demand could be as much as 216 acres if the goal was to capture every possible retail dollar but that the Township has different feelings on what that data instructs the Township to do in the future. He feels this needs to be explicitly stated in the Master Plan.

Supervisor Walls stated he does not feel the information in Table 10 is helpful. It does not provide any insight; it only states that Springfield Township can currently support 82 acres of commercial land. He stated a few months ago there was a proposal to change 35 acres from residential to commercial but it was in contrast to statements in Policy 20. There is nothing else added in the Commercial Market Analysis that would help with those decisions or determinations. Currently, there are more than 82 acres of commercial land now, so why should the Township consider rezoning. He stated there is no recognition of the I-75/Dixie Highway area and that Policy 20 is not always going to work. He further stated the data provided will not help make future decisions. The data shows that Township has more commercial land than it needs, which can lead to denying rezoning requests that should not be denied.

Commissioner Steckling referred to Table 12 on page 125, stating he does not feel the data reflects current conditions and that the information is not useful.

Dick Carlisle stated there is no more current data available. He asked what the Commission would find more useful.

Commissioner Steckling stated he finds the trend information Mr. Carlisle spoke about earlier to be more useful, rather than historical data.

Commissioner Baker stated he would find it helpful to have information included about how commercial acreage should be broken up. If 216 commercial acres are projected in 2035, how would they be situated.

Clerk Strole stated there is a benchmark of 82 commercial acres needed based on market demand. However, the areas now zoned commercial (275 acres) may not match up with locations proposed in the Master Plan.

Chair Lamont stated that the Commission has never talked about how Policy 20 impacts the Commercial Market Analysis.

Dick Carlisle asked if the Commission is looking for the Commercial Market Analysis to justify an already decided-upon goal or looking for guidance for an additional goal or policy.

Chair Lamont stated he thinks the Policy 20 goal is adequately worded and he is clear on the trade area, but that Policy 20 states the Township has to meet the needs of residents.

Dick Carlisle stated, even though Commissioners question some of the figures being used, this analysis does provide justification for Policy 20.

Commissioner Moreau stated she looked over the Commercial Market Analysis and is comfortable with it. She stated the first paragraph (page 122) is somewhat of a disclaimer. The only thing she would like to see is an analysis of what commercially zoned land already exists, where it is, and how much of it is in the areas being identified as planned for commercial.

Dick Carlisle clarified that what the Commission wants, as the output of this analysis, are findings that are significant to Springfield Township. Chair Lamont said the Commission should also make sure that Policy 20 aligns with the Commercial Market Analysis. He would personally like the numbers double checked.

Dick Carlisle clarified that what is absent from the analysis are findings that principally support Policy 20 but provide sufficient guidance to make some differentiation towards the area of I-75 and Dixie Highway and in what context should those changes be given consideration.

Commissioner Hines stated the Commission may want to evaluate pages 50 and 51 and maybe not have 200+ acres planned for commercial.

Commissioner Aiello suggested re-evaluating the exact verbiage of Policy 20.

Janet Demanaco, 6813 Deer Hill Drive (Independence Township) referred to a comment Dick Carlisle made earlier that corresponds to the increase in commercial land use. Commercial and retail has evolved such that more land is needed to create an environment that people want to go to and that part of the increase in land is due to the amenities that surround the buildings that make it attractive to visitors.

Dick Carlisle asked what the Commission wants to do with Table 12.

Commissioner Aiello stated that Table 12 is the substantiation of information in the paragraph that precedes the table. The information relates to the retail per household number which establishes, comparatively, that Springfield Township is

in line with the other communities listed in the table. He suggested that number be included in the table.

Consensus was to remove Table 12 from the Commercial Market Analysis and to change the paragraphs immediately following the table to remove references to Table 12.

Sally Elmiger stated she will also revise the Background Studies chapter that refers to the Commercial Market Analysis.

2. Holly Greens Storage Site Plan Addition

Chair Lamont stated Commissioners received in their packets blueprints, reviews from Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. and Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc. [**Copies of which are on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township**] and an application for site plan review.

Sally Elmiger summarized the Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. Final Plan Review report dated May 6, 2008. She would recommend Final Site Plan Approval, but that there are items that need to be addressed, and she recommended giving the applicant additional time to address them. She stated the items needing to be addressed are relatively minor, such as proposed building height, soil suitability, circulation pattern, whether the front parking area will be striped and indicated as parking, and to make sure landscaping conforms with ordinance requirements. The biggest item to address is storm water management.

Commissioner Leddy asked Sally Elmiger to elaborate on any façade changes being suggested.

Sally Elmiger stated façade changes were based on Section 16.23, architectural and site design standards. Those requirements discuss uninterrupted building facades of over one-hundred feet in length. The proposed building is one hundred twelve feet and she did not see any changes on the elevations. She also did not see any changes in color, textures, or materials on the façade and thinks that needs to be addressed.

Commissioner Leddy agreed that the storm water management needs to be corrected before a building is built and thinks that should be indicated on the plan.

Chair Lamont recapped that what is before the Planning Commission tonight is an addition to an already existing building on Enterprise Drive. The addition is proposed in two phases; Phase I being 1,920 square feet and Phase II being 3,808 square feet.

John Steckling, representing Holly Greens Storage, presented the Site Plan Addition to Commissioners. He stated page 3 of the plans by Kieft Engineering, Inc. shows a composite of what is proposed. Phase I will be an addition onto the

end of the existing building and Phase II will be a building perpendicular to the existing building. The addition will have overhead doors, with an adjacent entry door. There will not be curbs which will allow barrier free access to the building. The Phase II addition will be a structure similar to the existing building.

He stated parking up front will be minimal and the plan does not indicate striped or designated parking. He stated areas in front of the doors would not be parking except for the tenant. The building caters to tenants that have large equipment or vehicles, and that is primarily what the area behind the gate will be used for. He stated he has no objections to the changes suggested tonight but did not have time to address them and revise the plans before tonight's meeting.

The buildings will conform to the ordinance and will utilize color changes, stucco, etc. to give them some architectural interest.

He asked that the Commission waive the requirement of having trees in parking areas because the parking area up front is minimal. He will restore the lawn after construction is completed and with the exception of one, existing trees will stay intact. He will also not use nitrogen fertilizers. He stated light fixtures will be largely screened and will not impact adjacent properties.

Mr. Steckling asked that approval be for two years as he does not know when he will build Phase II. He also stated the proposed building height is twenty-one feet, which is below the twenty-five feet required by the ordinance.

Chair Lamont clarified the intent is to match the existing building height. Mr. Steckling responded it was.

Commissioner Baker inquired about handicap parking spots that are indicated at the back of the building and asked where someone would enter the building if parked there. Mr. Steckling responded it depends what tenant is being visited, but all the entrances are on the back wall.

Commissioner Baker asked, if a tenant in Phase II was being visited, would they enter in the same area. Mr. Steckling responded they would enter in front because that is the only entrance for Phase II. Commissioner Baker asked if additional handicap parking would be provided in Phase II. Mr. Steckling responded he would add handicap parking in the front.

Commissioner Baker asked if outside parking will be in the fenced area at the back of the building. Mr. Steckling responded yes.

Commissioner Moreau stated she would like to see façade details shown on the plan and if approving Phase II, would like to see where the handicap parking would be.

Commissioner Baker stated he would like to see options regarding the façade. He does not want to create a large façade expense for the applicant, but because Phase II may not be built in a timely manner, he would like to see some options. He would also like to see where the additional handicap parking would be that allows access to the front of the building. He would also like Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth & Clark to be provided with storm sewer calculations as indicated in his review.

- **Commissioner Aiello moved to table the application for site plan review to next month to allow the applicant to address the concerns the Commission identified tonight and proposed façade improvements. Supported by Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Leddy, Lamont, Moreau; No: none; Absent: none; Abstain: Steckling. Motion Carried.**

Chair Lamont departed at 9:40 p.m., Commissioner Steckling took over as meeting Chair.

3. Master Plan Update Final Review

Sally Elmiger asked if Commissioners wanted to change or modify any section of the Plan (other than the Commercial Market Analysis) before it is distributed.

Minor language and formatting changes were made to pages 8, 11, 20, 21, 38, 41, 42, 49, 50, 52, 57, 58, 60, 154 and 159. Elmiger will make the changes.

Sally Elmiger stated the Master Plan has to be in the mail to adjoining communities no later than June 13, 2008. Clerk Strole stated some communities would like to receive the plan electronically.

Sally Elmiger stated the Township Board has to approve the Plan for distribution. Supervisor Walls stated the Plan has to be received for the Township Board packets by June 3rd.

- **Commissioner Aiello moved that the Master Plan as presented, with the modifications proposed this evening be presented to the Township Board for approval for distribution to neighboring communities. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Leddy, Moreau, Steckling; No: none; Absent: Lamont. Motion Carried.**

New Business:

1. Adult Business Analysis Presentation

Postponed until the June 16, 2008 meeting.

Other Business:

1. Capital Improvement Plan Update

Supervisor Walls stated at the last Township Board meeting, the Board asked Carlisle Wortman to present a work plan and a budget. The Township Board approved an update to the current plan.

2. Downtown Davisburg Plan – Appoint Representative

Supervisor Walls stated, the Township Board has asked the Planning Commission to appoint a representative to work on the Downtown Davisburg Plan. The Plan is to begin with a kick-off meeting with downtown property owners and hold a visioning session to find out the wants and needs of owners. A target meeting date has not been determined yet, but will either be in late June or early July.

- **Commissioner Hines moved to appoint John Steckling as the Planning Commission representative to work on the Downtown Davisburg Plan with Laura Moreau serving as alternate. Support by Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Leddy, Moreau, Steckling; No: none; Absent: Lamont. Motion Carried.**

3. Dixie Corridor Study Update – Appoint Representative

Supervisor Walls stated the target date for meeting with property owners is July 7th.

- **Commissioner Hines moved to appoint Roger Lamont as the Planning Commission representative to work on the Dixie Corridor Study Update, with Bill Leddy serving as alternate. Support by Commissioner Baker. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Leddy, Moreau, Steckling; No: none; Absent: Lamont. Motion Carried.**

Commissioner Aiello asked that the Planning Commission be informed of meeting dates

4. Priority List

Commissioner Aiello stated the Planning Commission is charged with presenting the Master Plan Revision to the Township Board and that the Commission has serious and material concerns about the Commercial Market Analysis. He does not feel comfortable sending this on to the Township Board for approval and distributing it to neighboring communities without the Planning Commission having another chance to review the draft. He suggested two options, 1) is to provide the Plan to the Township Board and neighboring communities with a

qualifier that serious discussion is continuing regarding the Commercial Market Analysis and there may be material revisions or 2) push back the process.

Sally Elmiger suggested putting off the distribution. Commissioner Aiello asked if the distribution is statutorily required. Sally Elmiger stated the distribution timeline is driven by trying to complete the process before Supervisor Walls and Clerk Strole leave office.

Clerk Strole stated if the Commission reviews the final draft of the Master Plan at the June 16th meeting and if waiting to send it to the Township Board at their July meeting would be too late, the Township Board could hold a special meeting if necessary.

Commissioners reviewed the priority list and moved the following items to the June 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

Commercial Market Analysis

Master Plan Update – Final Draft for Review

Adult Business Analysis

5. June 5th Workshop, if needed Consensus was that a June 5th workshop was not needed.

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

- **Commissioner Aiello moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 p.m. Support by Commissioner Moreau. Vote on the motion: Yes: Aiello, Baker, Hines, Leddy, Lamont, Moreau, Steckling; No: none; Absent: none. Motion Carried.**

Renee Wilson, Recording Secretary