

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes December 20, 2016

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the December 20, 2016 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  
George Mansour  
Jason Pliska  
Kevin Sclesky  
Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Planner, Carlisle Wortman, Associates  
Randy Ford, Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc.

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

**1. Minutes of the November 15, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting**

**Commissioner Whiting moved to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2016 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

None

New Business:

**1. Conceptual Site Plan-Outdoor Expressions, 8190 Old White Lake Road, Parcel #07-36-451-031**

Jim Scharl, Kieft Engineering, provided a summary of the project. He stated that they are proposing two buildings on the site with only one building initially. The balance of the site will be used for storage. The details will be given at Final Site Plan. He stated that there are storm drainage issues on the site. This entire area has been split up into several industrial parcels and there has been a lot of grading on the site. The original proposal at the site involved developing a retention facility in Waterford Township east of this site. This never happened and the entire site does not have any storm drainage outlets. Any drainage from this site now runs over Old White Lake Road and into White Lake Township. They have good data to design storm drainage facilities that will perc into the soil which ultimately will be the discharge. He has used this type of facility in Oxford Township on two separate occasions and it works well. He will work out the details with the Township Engineer.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his Planning review dated December 2, 2016 and the requirements that would be required at Final Site Plan including landscape plan, photometric plan, floor plans and elevations and detailed sign plan. The most significant item is the outdoor storage that is being proposed and he provided the standards required for outdoor storage in his report. His report also requires more information to be provided on loading and unloading at the site and where that will occur. The ordinance requires that a safety path easement be shown on the plan and they would expect that at Final Site Plan.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his Engineering review. The site access point off of Old White Lake Road requires Road Commission approval and applicant should provide permit documentation. Since it is on a dead-end court, it would not warrant being reviewed in terms of accel and decel lanes, etc. The Health Department will have to comment on well and septic plans. The issue that is of the most significance is demonstrating compliance with the Township ordinance with regard to site drainage. Mr. Ford referenced the Geotechnical report from McDowell which did indicate some widely varying perc rates based on the four borings that were taken. The southeast corner in which the overflow is indicated is the least porous of the four borings that were taken. All of the borings showed fill and this boring on the southeast corner should about 8.5 feet of fill. When the fill is removed and the underlying soils were exposed, this boring showed the least porous of the samples. If there is no parent outlet for the drainage, it requires a minimum capacity of two inches over the entire tributary area. When the applicant comes back for final, the calculations will have to be provided. At worst case, the ordinance requires a capacity of 200 year back to back storms which is a sizeable volume. This issues with runoff and drainage would be the most significant. The applicant has to demonstrate best management practices for the storm water quality and at a minimum the

applicant would have to provide an oil/grease separator at the most downstream structure to capture any floatables.

Commissioner Whiting asked if the two inches mentioned was topsoil or a two inch per hour infiltration rate.

Mr. Ford explained how to calculate the volume required. MDEQ determined the amount of time for the water to dissipate.

Commissioner Pliska asked if those calculations included the square footage of buildings or structures.

Mr. Ford answered not for the two-inch calculation. If there is a concern about the outlet and how it will impact surrounding properties, the Water Resources Commission calculations are based on imperviousness of the surface.

Mr. Scharl stated that they are not proposing that this site is going to be analyzed as a retention facility. The drainage calculations will be based on the ultimate plan, the one showing the building and the parking. He stated that they are going to demonstrate using the McDowell report with the infiltration rates of the soil. All of the storm sewer that is on the site is going to be large volume and will be perforated and laid underground. They are not going to be putting the drainage in a big basin; they will be using the soil to drain the site. The overflow is required and this is where the problem is because the only outlet is across White Lake Road where it is going right now. Mr. Ford indicated that he would like to see a bigger basin at this point but it will be a pond. Instead, they are going to place pipe throughout the site and if it overflows, it will overflow into a small sediment basin if it goes across the street.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that it sounds like an engineered dry well.

Mr. Scharl responded that this is sort of the plan; the pipes that are placed will be placed according to mathematic calculations as to what size they will be. They have soil conditions that will work and this has been verified through the McDowell report.

Chairperson Baker stated that he would like to know the time table of Phase I and Phase II and what will be stored in the storage area.

Applicant introduced himself to the Commission. He stated that they are a landscaping design company based out of Waterford right now. The outside storage will be mainly brick, block and there might be some aggregates in bins. He suggested that they would use large concrete blocks to delineate the storage areas. Most of the vehicles and trucks will be inside the building. They are not going to be creating a large junk pile.

Chairperson Baker asked about loading and unloading.

Applicant replied that they are not getting large shipments of mulch, etc. This is not a retail sale facility; the outside storage will be for company use.

Mr. Lewan stated that all industrial buildings have to show a loading area for the building itself.

Chairperson Baker stated that when Phase II is built, where will the materials be stored?

Mr. Scharl replied that at that time, the landscaping business goes away and the entire rear is a loading area behind building number two. The front will be the parking and there will be 40 foot of asphalt for loading purposes. He referred to Sheet #2.

Mr. Lewan stated that there is plenty of room to have a loading area, they just have to show it on the plan.

Mr. Scharl stated that in Phase I, there is an office building in the front and the rest is essentially warehouse and storage.

Mr. Lewan stated that before Final Site Plan, they will have to add more detail about the exact location of storage areas and loading and unloading areas.

Applicant replied that the time of construction for the second building is when he does not want to do landscaping anymore; it may be five years or ten years; he does not know.

Mr. Scharl replied that they have to show the ultimate design because they have to design and install the storm drains for the completion of Phase II.

Chairperson Baker stated that all of the items that he wanted explained have already been noted by the Engineer and Planner. He noted that on the other side of Old White Lake Road is a residential area so there are screening requirements that are necessary. There are green belt requirements also that need to be followed.

Applicant stated that when initially speaking to Supervisor Walls, his concern is to not create an eyesore for the residents. He envisions that they are not even going to be able to see the property from Old White Lake Road.

Mr. Scharl stated that the area is going to be cut down quite a bit in front so the tree row that is there now is going to go away.

Commissioner Hopper asked if they were only proposing the fence at the back for the security of the retaining wall.

Mr. Scharl replied that there is a fence all of the way around.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the development as proposed is appropriate if they can verify with the Township Engineer that the storm system is going to work. The applicant

explained that the trucks are stored inside. He would want to see the exact locations of storage at Final Site Plan so they can make sure that it is going to be properly screened and they need to be cognizant of the residential community.

Chairperson Baker stated that he does not think they need to set up an easement for a safety path on this property but he would like to see funds to be used for another location in the Township for this in lieu of this site.

**2. Conceptual Site Plan – A1 Management & Storage, 5813 Terex  
Parcel #07-26-126-010**

Michelle Spencer, Powell Engineering, introduced herself to the Commission as a representative for the applicant. The applicant is looking for a change of use. The property is currently existing however it has only been used for cold storage and the applicant is looking to add two bathrooms and changing the use to light industrial for the manufacturing of hot tubs and similar uses.

Rich Mini, applicant, introduced himself to the Commission.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his Planning report provided to the Commission. He stated that when a change of use is proposed, site plan submittal is required. The change of use now requires other ordinance requirements to be met including parking changes. The eastern part of the property has the potential for outdoor storage and he asked for more information on this storage area. Parking is another concern. Much of the property is currently asphalt millings and all parking, loading and drives within Springfield Township are supposed to be paved either with asphalt or concrete. Under certain circumstances, the Planning Commission can allow gravel surfaces to be used when conditions are met and he reviewed those conditions. The first item is the most problematic since employee parking is supposed to be paved and this is a discussion item for the Commission. He summarized the items needed for Final Site Plan including landscape plan, lighting plan and floor plans and elevations. The ordinance does require parking lot landscaping and can be modified by the Commission at Final Site Plan. He asked if the parking lot was going to be gravel surface and how the striping was going to be maintained.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his Engineering report provided to the Commission. He asked for clarification from the applicant regarding the asphalt millings and striping. The proposal is to utilize existing millings over the open storage area as well as delineate the access drive, however the whole surface is millings so it is unclear how they are going to mark out the circular access drive to the site. The applicant needs to clarify how they intend to accomplish this. The applicant has indicated that there is no grading proposed except in the proposed areas of the septic fields. Mr. Ford asked for clarification on the potable well and whether or not it is going to serve all tenants. Final Site Plan should indicate water requirements to each tenant. Oakland County Health Department would need to provide report for both septic and well.

Ms. Spencer stated that the millings are between gravel and asphalt but because they have been there so long, you can paint on them just as you would typically paint on an asphalt road. They do plan on striping out the access road as well as the parking spaces required by ordinance. She stated that they did submit to the Township a copy of the permit from OCHD for the septic and the well. She stated that she would refer to the applicant to give more information on outdoor storage and employee parking.

Mr. Mini stated that 75% of the storage is boats and also some trailers and equipment. He pointed out the storage area that he was describing. He proposed large aisles so that large vehicles could go in between the rows.

Chairperson Baker asked how he would delineate the access drive.

Ms. Spencer stated that they intend to paint it as a drive so there would be lines on both sides.

Chairperson Baker asked how this holds up to grading equipment and snow removal equipment.

Ms. Spencer stated that they will have someone clear it and keep it salted, especially since employees were traveling there.

Mr. Mini stated that when you drive on asphalt millings, there is no dust.

Commissioner Mansour stated that millings are a good alternative to limestone because there is no dust.

Commissioner Pliska asked if the intent once the building is repurposed to continue to store boats and trailers in the storage area.

Mr. Mini stated that they have a tenant for the building but their intent is to continue to store as they are doing now. The boat storage is typically from September to May.

Commissioner Pliska asked if the result of the millings was comparable to crushed limestone in terms of vehicular traffic.

Ms. Spencer replied that the asphalt millings are better than limestone. The millings are repurposed asphalt when roads are redone.

Mr. Ford stated that his biggest concern is if the storage blocked the intended driveway and the Fire Department had to access the site. He wants to make sure that the access is maintained.

Mr. Mini responded that there is room for a fire truck or delivery truck.

Ms. Spencer suggested that they could put up signs on posts showing the location of the drive.

Mr. Lewan stated that industrial use is a more intensive use with regard to employees. This change of use requires a certain amount of parking spaces. The previous storage areas did not have the parking requirements. Now that there are required parking spaces, the choice is either a concrete surface or an asphalt surface because asphalt millings do not meet the standard. The only way around this is a waiver of the ordinance requirements. If the waiver is not possible, they could also ask for a variance from the Zoning Board.

Chairperson Baker replied that the parking requirements would not be met for employee parking and the Commission would not have the authority to grant a waiver so the applicant would be forced to go to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Ms. Spencer stated that they showed 58 parking spaces because that is what the zoning ordinance requires. They typically have 2-3 employees per unit so 58 is a high number. She asked if they could just asphalt the 10-15 required for employee parking.

Mr. Lewan stated that this could occur because the Commission has the ability to alter the number of parking spaces that you have land banked with the idea that if the buildings change to a more intensive use, those spaces could be paved in the future.

Commissioner Hopper asked if they knew what businesses were going in any of the tenant spaces.

Mr. Mini stated that they are trying to get a tenant in each side of the front building, Units 1 and 2. Right now they use the back building and until they can generate more funds, this will continue.

Commissioner Hopper asked if they are proposing to put natural gas in units 3 and 4.

Ms. Spencer answered no, not at this time. Only 1 and 2 are proposed to have a septic field. The septic areas depicted are for future use.

Commissioner Mansour asked if perc tests had been done for 3 and 4.

Ms. Spencer replied yes, but permits were not issued because this is for future use.

Commissioner Sclesky asked where they would suggest the paved parking for employees.

Ms. Spencer suggested the spaces right in front along the door and she pointed to this area on the plan which is the east side of the building.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the third requirement for waiving hard surface parking.

Mr. Lewan stated that for the Commission to grant a waiver, the applicant must meet all three requirements. The employee parking needs to be finalized.

Ms. Spencer stated that they can provide an anticipated employee count and they will show this paved parking on the revised plan.

Mr. Lewan stated that since it is a change of use, they have to look at bringing the site up to current standards. He is not aware of the exact details of the approval for the existing site plan.

Mr. Mini asked if there were any other buildings in the Township like this.

Mr. Lewan answered that he is not aware of another site like this.

Ms. Spencer asked if the asphalt millings could be considered as a form of pavement.

Mr. Lewan answered that there is a cross section of what is required.

Mr. Ford answered that he would have to go back and check the ordinance as to what is required.

Chairperson Baker stated that the eastern side of this property does abut residentially zoned property and he asked if an evaluation should be done of the existing screening to make sure that it meets current ordinance requirements.

Mr. Lewan responded that they would look at that at Final Site Plan.

Mr. Mini asked what the Commission would approve today regarding the paving surface.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Commission is open to hearing more about how the applicant is addressing the ordinance requirement for all of the parking spaces that are required and recognizing that the Commission has obligations in the ordinance that require parking and access roads to be hard surface. There is a question as to whether or not millings qualify as that material. The whole purpose of tonight's meeting was to give feedback and no motions are made. This feedback will be used for the applicant to work with the Township engineer and Township planner to bring back a plan that can be considered for Final Site Plan. There are other items required for Final Site Plan including lighting, landscaping and sign plan.

Mr. Lewan stated that the paving must be done in conformance with the Township's Design and Construction Standards.



Commissioner Mansour stated that there are not many sites that have asphalt millings so any education that can be provided would be helpful.

Old Business:

**1. Conceptual Site Plan – Springfield Industrial Park, (formerly Umbrella Holdings), 9690 Andersonville Road, Parcel #07-26-326-038**

Mr. Scharl stated that the six-month timeframe for site plan approval has expired and they have made a minor alternation to the site plan in reference to outdoor fuel tanks present on the property. There was also a reconfiguration of the truck storage area. The comments of the Township Engineer and Township Planner will be addressed at Final Site Plan. The primary reason for submittal is an updated Conceptual Site Plan prior to submitting for Final Site Plan.

Mr. Lewan summarized his report provided to the Commission. This is a similar plan to last time it was submitted and many of the comments were the same as the last submittal. This is a multiphase project and the fuel storage will occur during Phase I. They need more information on the fuel storage facility which will eventually be removed when the next phases occur. The degree of what these tanks are used for might have an implication on the process. If the tanks would be considered by the ordinance standards as fleet fuel storage and dispensing, this would require Special Land Use approval and this would be an additional step required. There is also an allowance for gravel parking that is being asked for. This would be on the new phase on the south side of the site. This was previously discussed and seemed to be acceptable by the Planning Commission at the prior submittal. He stated that they would also like more information on this gravel parking area on the south part of the site.

Mr. Ford summarized his report provided to the Commission. The only revision that has been pointed out is the inclusion of the fuel storage tanks. He consulted with other members of HRC with experience regarding fuel tanks and the State criteria for permitting of tanks. Certification is 1100 gallons per tank threshold and the proposed tanks are 550 gallon and 1000 gallon. They are below the State permitting requirements. The owner still must comply with the State's flammable and combustible liquids rules and procedures. Whether it is a single wall or double wall tank, if secondary containment is not being proposed, it has to be double walled. He stated that the other comments in his reports reflect the same comments as the plan that was previously submitted.

Mr. Scharl pointed out that the tanks are below the State threshold for permitting. They will be built with double walls.

Mr. Brown, applicant, introduced himself to the Commission. He stated that they would provide a specification sheet on the tanks. He is not sure if they are double or single walled.

Mr. Scharl indicated that they will provide more detail at Final Site Plan to make sure that they meet specifications.

Mr. Brown stated that it is a tank inside a box which acts as the containment unit and this is standard with all of the field carriers.

Supervisor Walls stated that he received a report from Captain Strickland, Springfield Township Fire Department, which indicated that the tanks are present on an adjacent site and they currently have four above ground tanks. Two are 1000-gallon diesel and one is 500-gallon diesel and another is a 500-gallon unleaded fuel tanks. All of these tanks are double walled. There is no concrete pad or spill containment and Mr. Scharl has shown this type of protection on the submitted site plan for consideration. He provided this document for the Commissioners and the file.

Mr. Lewan pointed out that the zoning ordinance has specific standards for secondary containment but a Special Land Use is not required for these proposed tanks.

Chairperson Baker asked about the safety path easement.

Supervisor Walls stated that it is within the road right of way because it is a plat.

Mr. Scharl stated that the storm drain is in an easement outside of the road right of way in front of the lots.

Chairperson Baker stated that they suggested a colocation of the safety path easement with the storm drain. He asked if this was still a part of the submitted proposal.

Mr. Scharl stated that the safety path easement is indicated to be outside of the road right of way in an area to be mutually agreed upon. They will provide an easement on top of the storm sewer but he is not sure this is going to be acceptable to the Township. If they went inside of this area, they would be inside the storm water management facilities. He stated that their proposal would be to put it on top of the storm sewer.

Commissioners agreed to this placement.

Chairperson Baker asked about the configuration of the parking in the gravel area.

Mr. Scharl explained the truck traffic and the personal vehicle parking areas. These are “flow boy” trucks.

Commissioner Hines asked if the Commission has the ability to waive the requirement.

Mr. Lewan stated that this was waived at the first submittal and it was explained that the parking was going to be used on a much limited basis.

Mr. Scharl explained how these types of trucks destroy the asphalt.

Commissioner Hines reiterated that she understood that however she asked if the Commission has the ability to waive the requirement for employee parking.

Chairperson Baker concurred. He stated that the employees are going to be parking their personal vehicles and getting into the large trucks; they still have ordinance standards for employee parking.

Commissioner Hines stated that there is valid reason for a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals but she does not see the ability of the Commission to grant the waiver.

Mr. Lewan stated that the applicant would have to show the driveways, loading and turn arounds receive limited use and are not used for employee parking, customer parking or primary access. This was discussed at prior submittal.

Commissioner Hines asked the length of Phase I.

Mr. Scharl stated that Spartan Asphalt has purchased another building and this is going to be the location of their offices and eventually the entire truck operation is moving to Pontiac. He anticipates that the length would be a couple of years.

Supervisor Walls indicated that Mr. Brown is a partner in this property with another company which is the one that has 75% of the stuff that is on the property. He indicated that the length should not be two years.

Mr. Brown indicated that the other company purchased an 18-acre property. He has been told that this company is using this site for one more year and then they are moving their facility to a much bigger property. In the interim of purchasing the 18 acres and moving their business, there is a need to do business as usual.

Supervisor Walls suggested that if they come back for Final Site Plan, this timeline needs to be addressed.

Chairperson Baker concurred with Commissioner Hines. The employee parking has a requirement to be hard surface and the Commission has the ability to waive the hard surface requirement if certain conditions were met and it appears that the conditions are not met. He believes that this would be a variance request for the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Scharl stated that if they have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, that is what they will do. He will discuss with the applicant the time constraints on filing for Final Site Plan approval and the possibility of applying for a variance.

Chairperson Baker indicated that the minutes of this meeting would be a part of the Zoning Board of Appeals request.

## **2. Conceptual Site Plan and Special Land Use – Maple Grange Ormond Road north of Scott Road, Parcel #07-19-226-025**

Jim Sharpe, Sharpe Engineer, introduced himself to the Commission. Dave Miller, Castlewood Homes, introduced himself to the Commission.

Mr. Sharpe summarized the development submission. Since the first submittal, they reduced the number of lots to 21 units after they had a wetlands investigation report done at the Commission's request. The lots have been reconfigured slightly and now the cluster plan includes 21 units instead of 22 units. He addressed the Planner and Engineer comments from the first submittal. It is proposed to be a condominium development.

Mr. Miller reiterated the reduction to 21 units and stated that the road configuration is basically the same and made the detention pond a little bit bigger.

Mr. Lewan summarized his report provided to the Commission. It is a cluster project and a key component of any open space project is what the property owner could get if they did not do it as a cluster development. He summarized the cluster provisions of the ordinance. He summarized the natural features that are being preserved. If this is recommended tonight, it will go to the Township Board for a Public Hearing. The applicant addressed most of the previous comments with the biggest one being the extra lot which has now been eliminated. He stated that the project meets the ordinance requirements for a Cluster Development and Special Land Use. They need more information at Final Site Plan regarding fire truck access. A full detailed landscape plan will be required at Final Site Plan. Since it is being developed as a condominium, submission of Master Deed and By-Laws should be provided to CWA and the Township Attorney at Final Site Plan. He summarized that the proposed Cluster Development enables preservation of significant wetlands, woodlands and slopes on the site. The proposed development is in substantial compliance with Springfield Township's Cluster Housing Regulations and he pointed out five items in his review that need to be addressed at Final Site Plan.

Mr. Ford stated that drainage is the biggest issue and he has had a couple of conversations with Mr. Sharpe regarding this issue. The detention basin is proposed in the lower right hand corner where they do have a viable outlet into the wetland system. In accordance with the ordinance standards, the applicant must provide storage for a 25-year storm which they indicated they will meet. Near the roadway, there are two retention basins indicated where there is no designated outlet. The applicant has provided calculations on how the drainage is going to be retained. An additional assessment regarding overflow has to be provided at Final Site Plan and he discussed this with Mr. Sharpe. Typically, the onsite retention/detention facilities are contained within the boundaries of the development and there are by-laws that provide the control that the

residents have over those facilities. He raises the potential concern that even though Castlewood owns the two parcels that abut Ormond Road in which the easement areas are located that show the retention areas, the Township attorney will review the documents to make sure there is a comfort level with this type of arrangement. The applicant also provides fore bays because they improve water quality for the discharge and these should be present on the detailed plans. He asked for best management practices that could be integrated into the design to treat the stormwater and the applicant replied that these are going to be paved roads with open ditch construction. The open ditches allow much of the storm water to perc into the ditches and he agrees with that. He suggested that where the stormwater outlets into the basin, they provide native seed mixes. The Road Commission had adopted a Class C Road Standard which is a 20-foot road construction with open ditch construction and that roadway standard has now gone to a 24-foot roadway. The Township ordinance allows some flexibility. If it a low volume road and the speed is posted at 15 miles per hour, then the design that is presented would be satisfactory. For Final Site Plan, the applicant should submit the vertical alignment to make sure it meets guidelines. The Health Department has provided a letter indicating that all sites perc and meet their requirement but they will need individual permits for each building site. They will have to install three test wells and follow the Health Department's guidelines. The entrance off of Ormond Road will require Road Commission permitting.

Mr. Sharpe stated that they are moving in the direction to meet all of the requirements of the Township.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that he approves of the changes made and this is a great location for a cluster development.

Commissioner Hopper thanked the applicant for addressing their concerns regarding the first submittal. He appreciated the screening suggested between this site and other residentially zoned property.

Commissioner Mansour concurred with the favorable comments and agreed that it is a going to be a positive addition.

**Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend to the Township Board Special Land Use approval and Concept Plan Approval for Castlewood Custom Homes for Parcel #07-19-226-025, known as Maple Grange, a Cluster Housing Development proposal as:**

- 1. The proposed development enables preservation of significant natural features that would not be preserved under standard R-1 zoning.**
- 2. Per Section 40-145 the use as proposed is in harmony with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is situated and is not detrimental to the orderly development of the adjacent zoning districts.**
- 3. The location and size of the proposal is equal to what is permitted under right.4.**

4. Since over 30% of the site will be preserved as permanent open space under this proposal, it would not be possible under conventional development.
5. It appears that public services should be capable of accommodating the increased service load caused by this proposal
6. As a Cluster Development, it will allow protection of natural environment conservation of natural resources and energy
7. The proposal can be compatible with adjacent uses provided that stormwater run-off can be accommodated for and adequate screening is provided
8. The Planning Commission finds that this proposal can meet the standards as set forth in Section 40-145.
9. The Concept Plan as proposed meets the requirements of Section 40-594, Cluster Housing Regulations assuming at Final Site Plan review the applicant will:
  1. Meet the screening requirement under Section 40-721
  2. Meet Section 40-593 Condo Project Regulations
  3. Meet Section 40-851 Dedicated Area for Future Sidewalks

Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Other Business:

1. 2017 Meeting Dates and Election of Officers

Commissioner Whiting moved to accept the 2017 meeting dates as proposed being the third Tuesday of each month at 7:30 pm. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Whiting moved to nominate Commissioner Baker as Chairperson of the Planning Commission for 2017. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Chairperson Baker moved to nominate Commissioner Hines as Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Commission for 2017. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Chairperson Baker moved to nominate Commissioner Hopper as Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2017. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

2. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed the Priority Task List. Commissioners discussed the formation of a committee to review the ordinance standards for septic systems adjacent to a body of

water and Commissioner Sclesky and Commissioner Mansour volunteered to serve on this committee.

Public Comment:

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary