

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission – Business Meeting  
Minutes January 21, 2013

Call to Order: Chairman Baker called the January 21, 2013 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Dave Hopper  
Bill Leddy  
Kevin Sclesky  
Linda Whiting  
Neil Willson

Commissioners Absent

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann, Planner  
Randy Ford, Engineer

Approval of Agenda:

**Commissioner Willson moved to approve the agenda as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Public Comment:     None

Consent Agenda:

**1. Minutes of the December 17, 2012 meeting**

**Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2012 meeting as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

**Amendments to Springfield Township Code of Ordinances Chapter 40:**

- 1.     Add a new Section 40-650 Recycling Facility. Add new definitions to Section 40-2. Amend Permitted Uses in the M-1 Zoning District Section 40-455. Amend permitted uses in the M-2 Zoning District Section 40-485.**

**Public Hearing was OPENED at 7:32 PM.**

No public comment was received.

**Public Hearing was CLOSED at 7:33 PM.**

**2. Amend Section 40-35 Performance Guarantees. Amend Section 40-593 Condominium Project Regulations.**

**Public Hearing was OPENED at 7:34 PM.**

No public comment was received.

**Public Hearing was CLOSED at 7:35 PM.**

**3. Add a new Section 40-597 Mineral Mining to Article IV. Special Development Standards.**

**Public Hearing was OPENED at 7:36 PM.**

Mr. Richard Zanotti, Property Development Engineer for Edward C. Levy Company and the Burroughs Company introduced himself to the Commission and stated that he only received this notice approximately one week ago and he wished he had more time to review it and evaluate how it would affect the current projects. He stated that the operating hours are very generic and don't state exact hours. He stated that the current Holly Road mining operation operates between the hours of 6:00 AM and 10:30 PM Monday through Saturday. The language that is proposed is unworkable. Mr. Zanotti also expressed a problem with the section where they have immediate access to right of ways of 120 feet. Mr. Zanotti stated that the third problem they have is the stipulation on the maximum mining area which at no time exceeds 70 acres or 40% whichever is greater. This is unworkable and unrealistic because the mining materials are not homogeneous throughout the property. The sentence defining the mining locations where the mineral exists is also a problem. The minerals exist where they are deposited, not in predesigned locations that are more advantageous to one use or another. They would like to see some of this language clarified. They would like more time to review them more formally and to be allowed to address the revisions. They operate two operations; one at Holly Road and one at the old Valentine property.

**Public Hearing was CLOSED at 7:41 PM.**

**4. Amend the E-1 Extractive District regulations.**

**Public Hearing was OPENED at 7:42 PM.**

Mr. Zanotti stated that the proposed date of January 1, 2014 was unrealistic. A number of projects have been in operation for decades and a date of January 1, 2015 would be acceptable.

**Public Hearing was CLOSED at 7:43 PM.**

New Business:

**Amendments to Springfield Township Code of Ordinances Chapter 40:**

- 1. Add a new Section 40-650 Recycling Facility. Add new definitions to Section 40-2. Amend Permitted Uses in the M-1 Zoning District Section 40-455. Amend permitted uses in the M-2 Zoning District Section 40-485**

**Commissioner Hopper moved to forward to the Township Board an amendment to the Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Chapter 40, Zoning by adding a new section 40-650 Recycling Facility to Article 5 Supplemental Regulations, adding new definitions to Section 40-2 and by amending permitted use in the M-1 Zoning District Section 40-455 and permitted uses in the M-2 Zoning District Section 40-485; the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on this amendment on January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013 at their regular meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

- 2. Amend Section 40-35 Performance Guarantees. Amend Section 40-593 Condominium Project Regulations**

**Commissioner Hopper moved to forward to the Township Board an amendment to the Springfield Township Code of Ordinances Chapter 40 Zoning by amending Section 40-35, Performance Guarantees and by amending Section 40-593 Condominium Project Regulations, Article 4, Special Development Standards; the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on this amendment on January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013. Seconded by Commissioner Willson. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

- 3. Add a new Section 40-597 Mineral Mining to Article IV. Special Development Standards**

Chairperson Baker stated that they received comment from Mr. Zanotti regarding this item. Mr. Zanotti had issues with the Operating Hours outlined in the proposed new section.

Commissioner Whiting stated that there seemed to be a concern that the Township could restrict the hours later.

Chairperson Baker stated that the two operations are in two distinct places in the Township. The old Valentine's site is surrounded by houses and the Holly Road site is

entirely different in character. If the hours were placed on one; the other area would not necessarily be the same as what they are operating right now.

Mr. Zanotti stated that the Holly Road operating hours are dictated by Consent Judgment. The hours that he quoted are in the Consent Judgment.

Commissioner Hines asked what the hours were at the Valentine property.

Mr. Zanotti replied he didn't know.

Commissioner Hopper asked if both were operating under Consent Judgment.

Mr. Zanotti answered that he only knew that the Holly Road property was operating under Consent Judgment; he has no knowledge of a Consent Judgment for the Valentine property.

Supervisor Walls answered that the Valentine property is not operating according to Consent Judgment to the best of his knowledge.

Chairperson Baker stated that that the intention is to connect the mining operation with the usual and customary use of the land and the surrounding areas. These are two very different locations. The Holly Road hours are set by Consent Judgment and they will continue. The language is workable and allows discussion between the Township and property owner. He suggested that the hours for Andersonville Road should be something like 8 am to 5 pm.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the current Ordinance limits the hours of operation from 6 am to 7 pm and extended to 8 pm during daylight savings time and prohibited on Sunday. This new proposed language gives the Township opportunity for discussion so it does not become a 24 hour operation.

Commissioner Hines concurred.

Chairperson Baker stated that another item mentioned by Mr. Zanotti was the direct access to roadways and the language that would give the Township some input in determining the haul routes that are used. He suggested that Oakland County has jurisdiction over the roads.

Supervisor Walls suggested that Mr. Zanotti had an earlier draft.

Mr. Zanotti stated that the current Ordinance is 120 feet road right of way of direct access and the new language changes that to be determined by the Special Use process and eventually involves the Oakland County Road Commission. The Special Land Use process would propose the routing.

Chairperson Baker confirmed that this Special Land Use would be ultimately decided by the Township Board.

Mr. Zanotti stated that the jurisdiction of the roads and weight of roads is the Road Commission.

Chairperson Baker stated that what they were trying to mitigate was the impact that the hauling operations would have if they would transport their products through residential districts as a means of expediting travel and limiting the impact of this travel. This would be under Section #2, under f. and this is the intent of the language. Another item that was mentioned concerned the total area of land being mined which has not been reclaimed shall not exceed the lesser of 75 acres and 40% of the entire parcel approved as a Special Land Use. Mr. Zanotti felt that this area was too small due to the lack of homogeneous deposition of the native aggregate.

Commissioner Hines asked for the explanation as to how they came to those numbers.

Mr. Oppmann stated that these were the same numbers contained in the current Ordinance and it was just copied over.

Commissioners concurred that they did not discuss these values and this is the current language.

Mr. Oppmann suggested that Mr. Zanotti comment on how much of the parcel is active before it is reclaimed.

Mr. Zanotti stated that they do not get credit for reclaiming the lake and these specific sites have variations in the deposits and they have a tendency to stratify. It becomes necessary to mine around clay and other materials. Sometimes it is much greater than 40% of the site and how this works from an operational standpoint is very difficult. They need to look at the location of the material and the best way to mine it including the evaluation of sloping areas. Because of the Consent Judgment, Holly Road operates differently but he is concerned about the future and he suspects that this guideline has not been researched in terms of viability.

Mr. Ford stated that his office has been involved in mining operations in surrounding communities and typically they put a reclamation bond in place. This will cover reclaiming the property and they work with the landowner on trying to focus the reclamation area on the perimeter side slopes. There are things that they could focus on to help address the concerns including doing inspections every six months.

Mr. Zanotti supported this idea; they have surety bonds established in several operations.

Mr. Ford stated that once a year they would provide aerials and come up with a reclamation plan and these are things that could be incorporated into the ordinance.

Commissioner Hines stated that they need some more work on this.

Chairperson Baker stated that Mr. Zanotti also commented on the mining location.

Mr. Zanotti clarified that this comment is regarding the E-1 Extractive District, which is the next agenda item.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they will review and bring back corrections next month on this item.

**Commissioner Hines moved to TABLE the amendment to Section 40-597 Mineral Mining for input from the Township Planner regarding reclamation of mining operation property. Seconded by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: Hopper. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Supervisor Walls suggested setting up a meeting with Mr. Zanotti, Mr. Ford and Mr. Oppmann to offer suggestions. Commissioners concurred. Mr. Zanotti agreed.

#### **4. Amend the E-1 Extractive District regulations**

Chairperson Baker stated that Mr. Zanotti was opposed to the date of January 1, 2014; Mr. Zanotti felt this date was too soon and proposed January 1, 2015 as more realistic.

Commissioner Hopper stated he has no issue with January 1, 2015.

Commissioner Hines concurred.

Mr. Zanotti stated that he didn't understand the intent and it seemed like they were dealing with gravel locations that existed prior to the enactment of this section and since gravel existed before the existence of the Township, were they limiting the location of gravel that could be extracted.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the intent was to prevent people coming in and stockpiling materials and then calling it a mining operation. If gravel is there, it predates the Township and if it is there, you are allowed to extract it.

Mr. Oppmann stated that there is a zoning district in place that is supposed to address mining operations and they are taking the approval process and turning it into a Special Land Use. They needed to do something with the properties that are currently zoned E-1, but in the future there will not be any property zoned E-1. If a new operator comes in, they will have to get a Special Land Use. He clarified that E-1 would always be the zoning on the two current operations that exist.

Supervisor Walls suggested inserting, "the existing mineral mining locations" as additional language and it would also include correcting the rest of the sentence.

Chairperson Baker clarified that the section 40-553 Intent would read, “but at the same time allow for the extraction of minerals in existing mineral mining locations that presently exist” and this would reference the two operations that currently exist in the Township.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this could be sent to the Board with this change.

**Commissioner Hopper moved to forward to the Springfield Township Board an amendment to the Springfield Township Code of Ordinances Chapter 40 Zoning by amending the E-1 Extractive District Regulation in Section 40-553 Intent and Section 40-554 Principal Use permitted as presented with two changes. The first change is in Section 40-553, the insertion of the words “the existing” between the words “minerals in” and “mineral” in the first sentence and changing the effective date until January 1, 2015. Seconded by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

**5. AT & T Final Site Plan and Special Land Use– Parcel ID# 07-20-100-021**

Mr. Anthony Amine introduced himself to the Commission. AT & T mobility has determined that the coverage for Springfield Township is inadequate and the engineers have determined that they need to develop a new tower. They located a property at 12870 Scott Road, Davisburg. They have worked with the Supervisor and Planner to try to locate the tower in a suitable area and they have proposed this location. It will be a 190 foot tower located in a farming area. They will lease the property from the property owner and it will not impact the current farming operation. They are proposing a fenced area with natural screening. The pole will be a utility grey in color.

Mr. Oppmann summarized his review dated January 8, 2013 that was provided to the Commission. The parcel requires Special Land Use because it is residential and because of the change in State Law, this is a Final Site Plan approval that they are considering. The applicant has had multiple locations that they have considered in the Township and this site is a more desirable location. It will have less affect on the view in this area. He asked the applicant to provide a number of materials describing why this tower could not be located in other areas. The applicant looked at collocation on the water tower in Springfield Oaks but there were still coverage gaps with that option. There was no information on whether or not they contacted the County about any other County property and they are looking for clarification on that. In regards to the site plan, Mr. Oppmann stated that the ordinance requires more screening but the applicant has asked the Township to waive the landscape screening requirements on the north and the east sides of the compound near the wetland area. The applicant feels like there is enough natural vegetation in this area to warrant waiving the requirement. The applicant would also like to waive portions of the south and the west side; they have requested waiver

from that requirement too. The waivers would be required. However, this site is workable provided the information required is provided.

Mr. Ford summarized his review report dated January 5, 2013. The applicant should identify an adequate fall zone based on the requirements. The applicant also provided a letter sealed by a State Licensed professional saying that the tower was designed appropriately in case of failure. The applicant made corrections to the drive portion of the plan providing a T-shaped turn around as recommended. The wetlands will be protected by the applicant by providing a continuous silt fence during construction. There are no water or sanitary services proposed by the applicant.

Chairperson Baker asked how tall the tower is.

Mr. Amine answered 190 feet tall.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the footing shown on page C-6 is shown at 3 foot and it is supposed to be 3 foot 6 inches. He stated he never received any information about waiving the landscaping requirements on the south side. He understands that it is low impact and located far back from the road.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the request to waive the landscaping requirement came by email.

Commissioner Hines asked if the landscape plan that the Commission was provided was the proposed plan.

Mr. Amine answered yes.

Commissioner Sclesky concurred with Mr. Oppmann that this location was much less intrusive than previously proposed locations.

Commissioner Hopper agreed that it is appropriate and much needed.

Mr. Amine asked for the landscape variance and apologized for not having proper documentation to show that they are asking for the landscape waiver. They are also proposing an additional layer on the Southeast corner since it has the most impact. The other concern that they have is the more they plant, the more they have to maintain and it is a site that is far back into the property and will be difficult to maintain properly.

Chairperson Baker stated that they have a request from the applicant to approve the landscape plan that was submitted which admittedly does not meet ordinance. The applicant indicated that on the north and east side there is existing vegetation and wetlands which will provide screening and on the south and west side they are proposing the planned screening.



Mr. Amine stated that they are also asking for a waiver from the ordinance requirement of a 30 foot wide area for landscaping. If they conform to that 30 feet, they would have to move the road. They feel that there would be less disruption in the area if they use the existing road. They will maintain the existing road and share it with the property owner.

Commissioner Leddy asked about other carriers using the tower for collocation.

Mr. Amine responded that the tower was built for collocation and they would gladly rent the space to another carrier.

Mr. Amine stated that they did receive the request to look at County property. The County provided some alternate locations and the AT & T looked at these locations. The engineers at AT & T concluded that to consider these locations, the tower would be have to be over 200 feet and it would be necessary to have it lit; they did not think this was appropriate.

Chairperson Baker asked if they could have a copy of this documentation.

Mr. Amine agreed to share this document as it proceeds further.

**Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend Special Land Use and Final Site Plan Approval to the Springfield Township Board for AT & T Mobility Proposal to be located at 12870 Scott Road, PI # U-07-20-100-021 subject to: 1.) Waiver of the landscaping screening requirement on the east and north side due to the fact that sufficient vegetation exists to provide that screening, waive the screening required and accept the proposed landscaping plan for the south and west sides in that the distance from the road would make this screening unnecessary, 2.) The applicant's engineers states that no existing towers will provide adequate coverage thus this installation is required to provide proper coverage for the residents of Springfield Township, 3.) The applicant is proposing to allow collocation on this installation, 4.) The applicant submit removal bonds and contact information and meet other Township Ordinances including addressing the Township Engineer's concerns regarding the access drive construction and 5.) The applicant addresses Section 40-648 of the Springfield Township Code of Ordinances. Seconded by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

## **6. Kroger Fuel Station Relocation Concept Site Plan**

Mr. John Damrath of Landplan Engineering introduced himself, Mr. Chris Rogers, Kroger Corporation and Danny Kurzman, Property Owner to the Commission. Mr. Damrath stated that the project came to Kroger in the interest of solving traffic problems and conflicts in and around the Kroger fuel station. Mr. Damrath provided an overview and aerial photos of the proposed project and a project summary. This proposal mimicked the documents and plans provided to the Commissioners and include plans to move the

Kroger fuel station and also plans for a McDonalds restaurant to the property directly to the south of the fuel station's current location.

Commissioner Leddy stated that he has two main concerns: the first is the queuing problems for the pumps and the need for alternate stacking lanes for additional traffic.

Mr. Damrath answered that they are currently conducting a traffic study and this should be able to give them more information about the traffic needs; conducting this traffic study was one of the recommendations of the Township Engineer.

Commissioner Leddy stated that he is also concerned with cars turning left on Dixie Highway which conflicts with cars pulling into the shopping center.

Commissioner Whiting stated that this plan doesn't address the concerns regarding left turns into the shopping plaza.

Chairperson Baker suggested that they hear comments from the Planner and Engineer.

Mr. Oppmann summarized his report dated January 11, 2013. The most critical are dealing with access and circulation issues. This is a good opportunity to set the stage for the overall site and having a successful access and circulation. The modifications that they are suggesting are good and they will help. The new entrance is located 250 feet south of the existing entrance; the Ordinance requires 275 feet.

Mr. Damrath stated that this has changed; it is now at 291 feet from the existing drive. They have made site plan changes involving making the driving more at a 90 degree angle.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they see a conflict in the new access drive regarding people entering the site and having to make an immediate left into McDonalds. This is seen as a potential problem. This site may need to be completely rearranged and they would prefer if the access drive was as far south as possible. There are many circulation conflicts in the site. Also, when the back half of the site is developed, they have to consider the increase in traffic at that time. There is an extension drive that goes from the north existing shopping center and dead ends at the dumpsters at McDonalds. As part of the Dixie Overlay District, there is a provision to provide cross access. Randy Hosler provided ability to access their site so there is the possibility to provide cross access from the existing Kroger all of the way to Randy Hosler to help dissipate traffic in the future. If they put the access drive as far south as possible, this would allow people to enter at the current drive or the new aligned drive, but altogether they feel it would allow better access. The way Costco and Sam's Club approach their gas stations, there is only one way in and one way out and this seems to work. There should be some shifting in the site, possibly rotate it to provide better access of the site. The amount of parking for the McDonalds does not quite meet ordinance and they have to show stacking spaces on the site plan to insure these can be met. In reference to the Overlay District, the access and circulation concerns are a large part of that. They need to provide two community design

features; they are proposing a bike rack but they need to add another feature. The overlay district allows up to 40% of parking in the front yard and there is quite a bit of parking in front of McDonalds that might or might not be necessary.

Mr. Ford stated that they had a lot of the same potential issues. The traffic study will be important and he is glad to hear that they are doing this. There are some revisions that have been made including the separation of driveways. They feel it is important to push the driveway as far south as possible. They encouraged the applicant to eliminate any drive access off the new driveway. Even with the pavement cross hatching there are the same concerns with the traffic stacking off of Dixie Highway. He suggested that they could look at rotating the fuel station so that the access points were only off of the service drive. They would suggest creating a continuous service drive along the back and not having parking spaces that back up into this service drive to avoid potential conflicts. The traffic study should address a lot of these concerns and he suggested sitting down with the applicant and Mr. Oppmann. The water and sewer systems were appropriately sized for the front development but they will have to look at them and make sure that the intensity of the development matches up with what was designed and if not, they will have to make some tweaks in the system. They did not show the water system on the plan; there is a water system and a pond for fire suppression.

Commissioner Hopper thanked the applicant for addressing this concern that is prevalent in the Township. They have an opportunity to correct this situation now. He suggested that the proposed canopy would be more in line with the design structure of the existing Kroger. There is a McDonalds on Telegraph that has the same situation and only allows access off the back service drive and there are no issues coming in and out. The McDonalds entry and the fuel center's side entry are conflicts and he would like to see them eliminated. All of the access should be provided off the back driveway. The site lighting does not meet the Zoning ordinance; 41 foot poles are not allowed and the foot candles suggested are also not allowed. The signage needs to be addressed; 4 signs might be appropriate, but a 20 foot tall sign does not meet the intent of the ordinance and this should be changed. The entrance drive should be moved south of the McDonalds. The access drive to Hosler was put there for a reason. He does not see Hosler being the commercial development that this is but he would like to see integration of sites. The bike rack is good but he does not see this as a community feature; they should connect a bike path and possibly put in other community features. Commissioner Hopper asked if the sanitary and fire line could be pushed to the west so that they would be in the greenbelt. This would allow easier interconnect for the future development of the seven acre parcel. Commissioner Hopper reiterated that he was not opposed to the square footage of the signage proposed, but the intent of the ordinance is to bring everything down and make it low and that is what he suggests.

Commissioner Whiting asked if the traffic concerns will be better understood after a traffic study and will a revised plan be submitted. This is her largest concern.

Mr. Damrath answered yes.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that this is a concern Township-wide and he thanked the participants.

Commissioner Hines stated that she would like to see access for both McDonalds and the fuel station from the back drive and not from the entry drive.

Mr. Kurzmann stated that there are no proposed changes to the current most northerly exit being a right turn out only.

Mr. Oppmann pointed out an area that would be good for benches; he pointed out that there is a paragraph of suggestions in the ordinance and suggested that the applicant look there for additional community features.

Commissioner Willson stated that his first concern was that there wouldn't be any better circulation, but they are making a good attempt to solve the issue. He asked if Kroger would reverse the placement of the two buildings.

Mr. Rogers, Kroger Real Estate Development, stated that switching the placement of the buildings would not work for Kroger. They have spent a considerable amount of time drawing up this plan after eight or nine months of study. He was involved in developing the original center and he does not think that it was a mistake. This became one of the best performing fuel centers in Michigan and if they had average attendance, there would be no issue with traffic. This is a unique situation with traffic because of the volume. They first looked to see if they could improve access in a quick, simple and much less expensive way. They determined that a new location would be the best long term solution. One of the keys to build a successful shopping center is having many convenient ways in and out. The outside fuel group developed this plan and they have developed 1250 fuel stations for Kroger. They are concerned about traffic and they do not want to spend the money and have the same traffic issues. Since they have more dispensers proposed, it makes it much easier to get in and out. McDonalds ties together with the Kroger because there are some financial issues going on between Danny Kurzmann and Kroger. Kroger is making a 2 million dollar investment and they want it to work. They do not want to move it farther from the store.

Commissioner Willson asked about the abandoned current fuel station.

Mr. Rogers stated that there are no formal plans at this point. They are looking at marketing this long term as a Tim Horton's type fast food restaurant.

Commissioner Willson asked if connecting to Hosler changes their perception of the plan.

Mr. Rogers answered that they would have to see where it connects and one of the issues would be the use of the property and they would be concerned if it was developed into a competitive use.

Commissioner Willson asked if they took into account development of the seven acres of open space behind the proposed fuel station.

Mr. Rogers answered that this would be up to Mr. Kurzmann, property owner.

Mr. Kurzmann answered that there is no viable development option for this property. The financial situation right now does not support it.

Chairperson Baker stated that he likes the idea of a safety path throughout the entire parcel to allow pedestrian access. The idea of the cross hatch for McDonalds is too close to Dixie Highway and is ill advised. This is a project that they are hoping will create positives for that site including improved ingress and egress.

Josh Mank, Project Manager for Kroger, stated that this is proposed to be the largest fuel station in Michigan.

**Chairperson Baker moved to recommend the resubmission of a Concept Plan from Kroger for the relocated fuel station after recommendations from additional third party groups including traffic study and Randy Hosler landowner regarding cross access options. This resubmitted concept plan should address lighting issues that have been raised, safety paths, improved plan for circulation of vehicles, additional community design features, signage, idea of the western road not dead ending into the dumpster, parking spaces at McDonalds and the possible relocation of the access drive further south and while still maintaining the proper distance between access drives. The intent would be for the applicant to continue meeting with Township Planner, Township Engineer and other Township offices and return an updated site plan to the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

## **7. Amendment to M-1, Light Industrial District**

Mr. Oppmann stated that this proposed amendment would correct the current M-1 District that has mining regulations in it. This is meant to eliminate all of those requirements and cross reference it to the new section that was discussed tonight. This should clear up all of the issues with cross references in the Ordinance. This is Section 40-455, Uses Permitted Subject to Special Conditions in the M-1 District.

**Commissioner Hines moved to schedule a Public Hearing at the most practical date for amendments to Section 40-455, Uses Permitted Subject to Special Conditions in the M-1 District. Seconded by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Other Business:

**1. Update Priority List**

Commissioners reviewed and made updates and revisions to the current Priority List.

Commissioner Hopper suggested that Planning Commission meetings are not held on days in which the Civic Center is closed. Commissioners agreed.

Public Comment:

Mr. Denny Vallad asked about the consideration of a 425 Agreement proposed for the Dixie Highway property south of I-75.

Chairperson Baker replied that this was still on the Priority Task List.

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hopper moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 PM. Supported by Commissioner Willson. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Sclesky, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary