Springfield Township Planning Commission – Business Meeting Minutes June 17, 2013

Call to Order: Chairman Baker called the June 17, 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:

<u>Commissioners Present:</u> <u>Commissioners Absent</u>

Dean Baker Kevin Sclesky Ruth Ann Hines Neil Willson

Dave Hopper Bill Leddy Linda Whiting

Staff Present Consultants Present

Sally Elmiger, Planner

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment: None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the April 15, 2013 meeting

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2013 meeting as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky, Willson. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None

Old Business:

1. Discussion – Sign Ordinance, Temporary Signs, Seasonal and Temporary Display of Products and Materials

Ms. Elmiger stated that the outline that was presented from Carlisle Wortman was designed to make the review of the Sign information less painful than the previous time. She summarized Mr. Oppmann's outline that was presented to all Commissioners.

Chairperson Baker summarized an email that he received from Supervisor Walls. Supervisor Walls thought that that they should start with the miscellaneous portion of the signs including temporary and seasonal signs because that is the section that is dealt with continually when people come in to get a permit for these occasions. There are some misaligned items that need to be corrected in this section. Supervisor Walls was also hopeful that the Commissioners would document signs in their travels that they like or that they do not like. The Commissioners should then send a picture of these signs to Supervisor Walls' assistant and she will put those together for the Commission to view. Supervisor Walls recognized that the last review of the signs was cumbersome and he asked if the Commission would want to start from scratch or they could keep some of the aspects of their previous work and correct what is already there.

Chairperson Baker stated that he didn't feel grounded in the previous sign discussion and did not feel that the Commission came to any kind of successful flow. He is in favor of touching the entire sign ordinance in its entirety following a priority list to keep the review orderly. He would like to look it all over with fresh eyes and a new approach.

Commissioner Hines concurred. They should review the entire thing.

Commissioner Hopper asked how far back do they want to go. He asked if they should use what they have as a base. The Commission should figure out what the intent or the overall view is. They should decide what they want to see. He has not used the current ordinance much; the verbage is completely different and he understands that it needed work.

Chairperson Baker stated that scrapping the entire thing and rebuilding is not his intent. They should revisit each aspect of signage. They have a foundation of something but they need to make it connected and consistent.

Commissioner Hines stated that since they are not doing site plans, they don't see how it plays out through site plan review.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the basis is fine, but the inconsistencies need to be corrected.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they need touch ups and corrections in the definitions section. He traveled through an area of North Carolina that had great examples of commercial signage and he will forward a copy of this area's sign ordinance to the Supervisor's office. The Supervisor's Office will forward a copy of this sign ordinance to all Commissioners.

Commissioner Whiting stated that this is a tourist area and they have a certain look. She stated that instead of reading through it, they should approach it from the business point of view. For example, if you were opening a business, is it consistent and are the details there.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Township Board wanted to meet and have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission to begin discussion around the Master Plan. Commissioners reviewed their schedules and suggested meeting in August on either a Tuesday evening or Thursday evening; not August 1st or August 13th. A Saturday morning might work but a weeknight would be preferred.

Commissioners agreed that they would work on the miscellaneous signage in July and prior to that time, they will take pictures of signage and forward them to the Supervisor's Office with comments.

Ms. Elmiger stated that if the pictures were forwarded to them, they could take their comments into consideration and possibly do some editing of the photos to show how they could make them conform. They could help the Commission create the look they want with the accurate dimensions. She stated that she has not spoken with the Supervisor about this yet, but this is something that she and Brian Oppmann discussed.

New Business:

1. Pathways Master Plan Report

Ms. Elmiger summarized the Pathways Master Plan Report that was provided to the Planning Commission. This document summarizes compliance with the Planning Enabling Act which says that they must plan for all legal users which could be motorists, bicyclists, a pedestrian, wheelchair users and children. This Plan allows the Township to comply with Complete Streets guidelines. This plan is a consolidation of the former Davisburg Pathways Plan, the Master Plan and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Commissioner Leddy asked if the County has made any movement toward implementation.

Ms. Elmiger replied no. The only way that the Township is going to build any of this is by working with other organizations. There are very few grants available. If the Township has a plan, they next step is to define segments that they could start to build.

Chairperson Baker asked if the Road Commission is amendable to having the bike paths within the road right of way, alongside the road.

Ms. Elmiger stated that the County has to start implementing Complete Streets themselves and 5% of the money that they get from the State needs to be spent on non-motorized travel. However, this isn't necessarily on pathways, it could also be for lighting or intersection improvements at an intersection that accommodates pedestrians.

Chairperson Baker stated that it is not a given that during resurfacing, the County will automatically extend the roadway to accommodate non-motorized travel.

Ms. Elmiger concurred.

Commissioners agreed that bike travel on Township Roads is not safe.

Commissioner Hopper stated that they have the document now and things are changing because they have to.

Commissioner Leddy corrected 5% to 1% on page 28.

Ms. Elmiger stated that she would make that correction.

Commissioners discussed the pathways plan including designated route and estimated costs. They agreed that if their local pathways plan was in place, Oakland County would be able to consider this plan when they are looking to be in compliance with their overall proposed plan. Commissioners agreed that this document was a quality professional work and they thanked Ms. Elmiger for her efforts.

Commissioner Hines asked if they needed to adopt the plan.

Ms. Elmiger responded that probably the Township Board would adopt it.

Chairperson Baker stated that he understood that this document will bring the previous works together and the committee will consider it when they are looking at the Master Plan update.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the Township Board has seen this document.

Other Business:

1. **Priority Task List**

Commissioners reviewed and made updates and revisions to the current Priority List including adding the Sign Ordinance review to the document.

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 PM. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted ves: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky, Willson. Motion Carried.