

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes June 20, 2017

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the June 20, 2017 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 (arrived at 8:05 pm)

Jason Pliska

Kevin Sclesky

Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the May 16, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Hines moved to approve the minutes of the May 16, 2017 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Mansour. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

None

New Business:

**1. Conceptual Site Plan Review
Gatecliff Industrial Park, East side of Clawson Tank Drive/Andersonville
Road, 07-36-401-007 & 07-36-401-008**

Mr. Jim Scharl, Kieft Engineering, introduced himself as representing the owner. He provided an overview of the site plan. The proposal is to construct a total of seven buildings but Phase I is for the construction of the first two buildings in the front. He provided a timeline for the different phases of the project. He clarified details about Phase 1 of the project and pointed out the temporary storm drain and the storm drains that would drain to an offsite retention basin. He pointed out that the applicant is not sure about the exact buildings that would be needed in the future but Mr. Scharl pointed out the potential at the site. He stated that the water main is extended from White Lake Road and the applicant will be tying in to and extending this water main to service the site. This water main will be permitted through Independence Township since it is their water. The sanitary facilities will be individual septic areas for each building and he pointed this out on the plan. He stated that the applicant anticipates starting this project as soon as possible.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter. He stated that the Planning Commission is reviewing the entire project but specifically Phase 1 of the project in the Concept Review. The bulk requirements for Light Industrial zoned property are met. There are no significant natural resources but the scattered trees on the site will have to be identified as a part of Final Site Plan Review. There are no concerns with the building arrangement and site location. Clawson Tank is a public road and there are access management standards that need to be met. Driveway spacing is supposed to be 25 feet. Turning circle of a cul-de-sac is different than a standard road and will warrant some consideration by the Planning Commission and they grant a waiver if they find it is warranted. A development is supposed to get a single two-way drive or two one-way drives and the applicant is proposing two two-way drives. The Planning Commission may permit these two drives upon recommendation from the Road Commission and he suggested that they should wait to see what the Road Commission has to say after reviewing the plan. There are a couple of issues with the proposed parking. The entire project is proposing enough parking but if you use the same percentages for Phase 1 only, the number of parking spaces is short. Sixty-six spaces are required for Phase 1 and the applicant is showing 55 spaces. The applicant could add eleven parking spaces.

Mr. Scharl pointed out additional parking spaces that will exist in Phase 1. Mr. Lewan concurred.

Mr. Lewan stated that the property is not in a priority safety path area; however, a safety path easement location is supposed to be shown according to the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that Randy Ford, Township Engineer, provided review comments regarding Essential Facilities and Services which mostly are pertinent for Final Site Plan. For example, they will need a Health Department review of the on-site septic system and the

Engineer will need the storm water management plan. With regard to landscaping, Carlisle Wortman Associates provided information for the applicant regarding greenbelt screening, parking lot landscaping and trash enclosure. A detailed landscape plan is not required at this time. Also, regarding lighting, signage, floor plan and elevations, these items will be due at Final Site Plan stage of review. He stated that the Concept Plan is in general in compliance with the Township's Zoning Ordinance and the minor items brought up in his review will be items that the Planning Commission should consider and address including driveway spacing.

Chairperson Baker stated that the applicant is noting two driveways that are part of this project and another driveway that is part of a neighboring driveway. He asked if the 50 foot between drives requirement is relevant to the two driveways that are being proposed as part of this development or the proposed northerly drive and the neighboring driveway.

Mr. Lewan replied the most northerly drive and the neighboring drive.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Township ordinance would require the driveway to be moved to the south until it impinges on the 105 foot requirement of the other proposed driveway.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that since the cul-de-sac is the dead end of the public street he does not see that as being an issue.

Mr. Lewan answered that the turning dead end of a cul-de-sac is different from a straight road segment. The idea behind these access management techniques are to limit the number of conflict points on a road. He agrees that the proposal deserves some consideration.

Commissioner Hopper asked why they are not adding a drive to the north with the construction of the other phases.

Mr. Scharl replied that it is not a public road; however, Mr. Gatecliff and Clawson Tank could work together to obtain an easement. It is something that conceivably could be added during a future phase and it would depend on what was being constructed. They do not need the additional access in Phase 1.

Commissioner Hopper asked if they are proposing to use the east portion of the lot for storm water.

Mr. Scharl replied yes. He pointed out an existing pond. Mr. Gatecliff has obtained an easement for water usage from Clawson Tank. He pointed out existing storm water runoff areas and added that he spoke to Mr. Ford regarding the storm water proposal and Mr. Ford did not see a problem. The storm water management will be handled mechanically and he pointed out where the drains would be constructed and storm water flow areas. Mr. Scharl stated that the driveway permits will be a part of Final Site Plan Review by

the Road Commission and he does not anticipate any problems given the location of the site.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if the required parking spaces are subject to change based on the development and its use. If so, what happens with the proposed parking.

Mr. Lewan stated that they try to base the parking calculation on what the applicant provided. If the change was to the high use parking calculation, for example Office, they would have to deal with it at that time.

Mr. Scharl stated that they will be looking at this at Final Site Plan through the phases and this is an estimation based on the percentages.

Commissioner Whiting stated that it appears that the parking is going to go close to the edge of the lot on the south side. She noticed a tree line along that line and she asked what was going to be done there in terms of landscaping.

Mr. Scharl replied that they would provide a landscape plan at Final Site Plan stage. They will try to save the quality trees that they can.

Commissioner Hopper replied that it appears that the majority of the trees are located in the back of the site and they would remain through Phase 1.

Mr. Scharl stated that the hydrant is already on Clawson Tank Drive near Andersonville Road.

Commissioner Hopper stated that this development will extend fire hydrants and this will be an additional spot that the Fire Department can pick up water.

Mr. Scharl agreed.

Commissioner Hines stated that she doesn't believe they need a safety path through the industrial park.

Chairperson Baker clarified that the requirement is to have the easement, not to build the safety path.

Mr. Scharl concurred.

Chairperson Baker agreed with the addition of the safety path easement because of its proximity to Andersonville Road which is targeted for safety paths eventually. He asked for clarification of the square footage of Building 5.

Mr. Scharl pointed it out in the chart under General Notes.

Chairperson Baker asked about the two two-way entrances.

Mr. Lewan reiterated the Township Ordinance regarding driveway access.

Commission Hopper suggested that they should have two driveways for safety.
Mr. Scharl explained the reasons behind having the two driveways.

Chairperson Baker stated that the turning radiuses need to be depicted and the exact size of the vehicle that is being depicted.

Mr. Scharl replied that it is a standard that they use.

Mr. Lewan stated that since it is going to be a commercial operation with trucks and trailers, they may want to investigate longer templates including semi-trucks.

Mr. Scharl explained the different scales that are used on the drawings and stated that the size truck template used is a 50 foot fire truck.

Chairperson Baker stated that Mr. Ford made a comment regarding the subbase for the roads is required to be eight inches of 21AA and the proposal showed six inches.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Commissioners are being asked to offer comment on the driveway spacing, number of driveways and the one-way or two-way driveway proposal.

Mr. Lewan stated that the applicant has greater than 300 feet which qualifies them for a second drive if approved by the Commission.

Commissioners agreed with the two two-way driveways.

Mr. Lewan stated that the Road Commission will come back with a recommendation regarding the placement of the driveways and at that time, the Commission can determine the placement based on this recommendation.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that he appreciated the detailed drawings presented.

**2. Armstead Towing-SLU Amendment
10590 Enterprise Drive, Lot #11, Holly Greens Industrial Park
07-03-327-001**

Mr. Jim Scharl and Mr. and Mrs. Armstead introduced themselves to the Commission.

Mr. Scharl stated that this proposal is to make use of the currently vacant property at the corner of Enterprise Drive and East Holly Road. Mr. Scharl provided a brief history of the former businesses that occupied the properties. He stated that Armstead Towing is currently under contract with the State of Michigan to handle disabled vehicles and they need a place to store those vehicles. This is an ideal location for this business because the

biggest concern regarding vehicle storage on a piece of property is screening. He provided pictures showing how the property in its current stated satisfies all the Township requirements. The last business constructed the evergreen tree row along the north and east side of the parking lot. They are proposing to put a fence on the inside of this tree row for security purposes to keep the vehicles secure. The Township requirement limiting the number of vehicles is shortsighted. If there is a large accident on I-75, you might have 50 vehicles that must go somewhere. In this case, more vehicles could be held there on a temporary basis because there is room. If there is no hardship because the screening is already there, he suggested that the Commission have some flexibility and this part of the ordinance be considered.

Mr. Armstead provided a summary of the nature of his towing business.

Mr. Lewan provided a summary of his review dated June 8, 2017. Based on the previous Special Land Use on this property, he considered this use as an amendment to the existing Special Land Use approval. He summarized the Special Land Use standards as well as the additional Land Use Standards specific to towing service facilities in the M-1 zoning district and specific standards regarding outdoor storage. He stated that regarding the Special Land Use Standards, this request meets the standards. He mentioned that salvage yards and “parting out” vehicles could affect the neighborhood negatively and they need to make sure that this site will not be used for these salvage yard types of uses or vehicle repair. He stated that the applicant does vehicle repair in Holly but he understands that they will not be doing vehicle repair at this site. The site will be used 24 hours per day and he noted that some homes are located across East Holly Road and he wants to make sure that the impacts are minimal to the residents. There are some specific standards for towing businesses and this has to do with the number of cars that can be impounded at any time. The Zoning Ordinance specifically indicates only ten and they do not have any flexibility with this number. If this project is approved under our current Zoning Ordinance, they would be limited to ten cars. The only way that more cars could be stored on this site would be if the applicant requests a variance.

Mr. Scharl answered that he understands.

Mr. Lewan continued with his review. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance in 1998 for this property to allow the screening as shown and developed. He identified the specific variance granted which indicates that the Township Supervisor can inspect the screening at any time and if it is not providing adequate screening, additional screening can be requested. He stated that this agreement should run with the property and if this site plan is approved, this agreement should continue to run with the property. Impound areas are supposed to be separated from other parts of the site and he indicated that it is separated. There will be no onsite repairs on site. Most of the outdoor storage will be the impounded vehicles and equipment. He asked about the broken asphalt area noted on the site plan that says it will be used for additional parking area and he asked Mr. Scharl for clarification. Any parking that received regular use is supposed to be paved and parking that has temporary use can be gravel upon recommendation by the Planning Commission. He stated that additional trees need to be planted along Enterprise

Drive to comply with current landscaping ordinance standards. Any additional lighting and signage on site also would need to be identified. The towing and impound facility does generally comply with the Special Land Use criteria as well as the Specific Use Criteria and he summarized the minor points that should be clarified by the applicant.

Commissioner Whiting asked for clarification of the variance that should go with the property.

Mr. Lewan stated that there was a variance granted that the screening that is on site is adequate but it can be inspected by the Township Supervisor and if found to be inadequate, additional screening can be requested. There was an agreement that the previous owner made that said the landscaping screening must be maintained.

Commissioner Pliska stated that he assumes that some of the vehicles deposited on the site are a result of collisions and they might be leaking fluids. He asked if this warrants any consideration as to how this is dealt with in terms of run off and where it might drain.

Mr. Armstead replied that currently they are on pavement and they also have gravel. If the gravel gets contaminated, they can pick it up and get rid of it. They make sure that nothing runs off in to the ground; everything is picked up. If something is dripping, they use a drain pan and kitty litter.

Chairperson Baker stated that the ordinance says that only ten cars are allowed in an impound lot. The impound must be secondary to the towing activity and the impound volume can be as many as ten vehicles. He asked what makes a car be part of the impound inventory.

Mr. Armstead explained how cars are removed from an accident scene.

Chairperson Baker asked if accident clean up vehicles will be taken to this site.

Mr. Armstead replied yes; these vehicles are considered part of the total number of ten. He explained how the vehicles are removed.

Chairperson Baker verified that ten is the maximum number of vehicles that would be on the site, not including employee cars or wreckers. He stated that the application says looking to store "damaged and impounded vehicles" so it appears that they are two different things. The ordinance mentions impounded vehicles.

Mr. Armstead concluded that they are all impounded vehicles.

Chairperson Baker asked if they were also going to park the towing vehicles on site.

Mr. Armstead answered yes, when they are not in use. It is a 24-hour business so they are always in use. Typically, the employee takes the truck home unless they are on vacation and then they drop the truck off at the site so it can be used.

Chairperson Baker asked if they would have an employee on site.

Mr. Armstead replied yes; they would have someone working on dispatch on site from 9 to 5:30 pm Monday through Friday.

Chairperson Baker asked if any vehicle repairs are taking place at the site.

Mr. Armstead answered no; the only time they would do any repairs is if one of their fleet needed repairs.

Mr. Scharl stated that the broken asphalt mentioned is still hard surface.

Mr. Armstead replied that there is 50 feet of good asphalt all the way around the building.

Mr. Scharl stated that storm water management is taken care of and is not changing.

Mr. Lewan stated that from the narrative he read, it appeared that this area was broken up asphalt or gravel but it sounds like it is mostly paved.

Mr. Armstead answered yes and he explained site conditions. It appeared to be gravel in spots but that was cleaned off of the asphalt below.

Commissioner Pliska asked if the gate in the front should provide screening so that you cannot see through the gate. It appears if you are traveling down the road, you could see the impound area.

Mr. Armstead confirmed that behind the gate, the area drops off. The wall on the south side prevents any vision of the area at all.

Commissioner Pliska asked if the definition of screened on all sides would be covered by the gate.

Mr. Scharl addressed the comment regarding five additional trees required along the road. He stated that there was one nice tree out there now which is not shown.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that the screening is adequate and he noticed that the building looked good from his visits to the property.

Mr. Armstead stated that they are going to finish the fence line inside the pine trees. He stated that they also are going to wire the fence that will set off the alarm if someone tampers with it. He also indicated where he plans to install laser indicators that could not be seen.

Commissioner Sclesky commented on the great curb appeal that exists now.

Mr. Armstead stated that they have not decided if they want a building sign or ground sign.

Mr. Scharl replied that the building signage will be mounted per municipal standards and will suffice in this instance.

Mr. Armstead stated that cameras work best with no light.

Commissioner Whiting asked if there could be some ideas pulled out of the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines in reference to the five additional trees required.

Mr. Armstead replied that he does not have a problem planting trees but he just wonders where they can go.

Applicant, Mr. Scharl and Commissioners discussed where the trees could go.

Commissioner Hopper summarized that five additional trees are required along Enterprise Drive and Mr. Scharl has said that there is one already there. He doesn't see any problem with screening but suggested that the five trees would be nice to break up the look of the fence and it is a requirement. He suggested waiving the parking lot landscaping because it will be hidden.

Commissioner Pliska suggested that they could plant ornamental trees.

Mr. Lewan stated that there are set greenbelt trees in the ordinance.

Commissioner Hopper stated that this is a perfect location for this business. The applicant could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance on the ten car limit.

Mr. Armstead asked what would happen if they had vehicles that were not impounded. He explained that a vehicle involved in an accident is not impounded.

Mrs. Armstead summarized the process with an accident vehicle.

Supervisor Walls suggested that if it comes in on a hook, it is an impound and that is the way it is looked at.

Commissioner Sclesky confirmed that he agreed with waiving parking lot landscaping.

Chairperson Baker asked what type of vehicle is moving the impounded vehicles.

Mr. Armstead replied flatbeds or tow trucks.

Chairperson Baker asked if there are back up alarms on them so they will be beeping as they are moving around the lot.

Mr. Armstead replied that they are not as loud as you think.

Commissioner Whiting read the definition of impound. This would imply the separation of the vehicles.

Mr. Lewan agreed with Supervisor Walls. The intention was to limit the number.

Commissioners and Mr. Lewan summarized the duties of the Planning Commission regarding this request and concluded that it would go to the Township Board for approval next and would not need to come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend to the Township Board to amend Special Land Use Approval for Armstead Towing for Temporary Storage Facility for damaged and impounded automobiles on Lot 11, Holly Greens Industrial Park, Parcel #07-03-327-001 in that the proposal meets Section 40-145, Springfield Township Code of Ordinances specifically the location, size and character is in harmony in the district as proposed. Intensity as proposed will not be hazardous or inconvenient to the neighborhood. No variances will be required for this use as proposed. No detrimental impacts to public services or facilities are made by this proposal. Natural Resources will not be impacted with this proposal upon receipt of applicant's mitigating spill policies and procedures. With the limited use and the extensive existing screening, there should be no negative impacts to the residential use properties to the north. Further, Section 40-455(5) Automotive Towing Services standards are met with a maximum of ten impounded vehicles as proposed and no on-site vehicle repair or salvage will be allowed. And Section 40-401 and Section 40-866 requires an eight-foot fence or wall however the area is currently screened with extensive landscaping and a 7-foot-high screening wall and the Planning Commission feels that this meets the intent of the ordinance and hereby recognizes the previous variance that was granted for this property. Also, with the addition of four street trees as required under Section 40-721 and to waive any required interior parking lot landscaping as required under Section 40-721. And to continue the previous landscape screening requirement as previously approved in relation to the maintenance of the existing landscaping screening. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Old Business:

1. Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-572, Building Height Measurement

Commissioners and Mr. Lewan discussed amendments to the Building Height Measurement Section 40-572. Mr. Lewan stated that he had a conversation with the Building Official, Craig Strong, who was generally not concerned about the height measurement amendments proposed. After Mr. Lewan received that initial feedback, Mr. Strong sent him examples of recent home plans that would be a problem. Mr. Strong's

opinion is that yes, in some circumstances based on the roof pitch of the building in question, there may be some issues. He summarized and explained Exhibit A, Exhibit B, Exhibit C and Exhibit D that he provided in the Commission packets. He suggested that if they wanted to try to accommodate the extra feet, they might want to increase the 25 feet to 28.5 feet for a maximum height. This would give them the 3.5 feet difference that Mr. Strong said is created with a walk-out basement. He suggested leaving it at two stories which is the ordinance standard and they have not changed this.

Planning Commissioners agreed with increasing the maximum height to 28.5 feet.

Commissioner Hopper moved to set the revisions to Section 40-2 and 40-572, Building Height Measurement, with the change discussed tonight of changing maximum height in feet to 28.5 feet in all use districts for Public Hearing at the next available Planning Commission meeting. Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and made changes to the Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:39 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