

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA**

August 4, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 20, 2005 Planning Commission Business Meeting
July 7, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop Meeting

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: **Ordinance Amendments**
Discussion
1. Article XVI, Section 16.13 Fences, Walls and Screening Structures

Planning/Policies
1. Pathway Systems

NEW BUSINESS: **Ordinance Amendments**
Discussion
1. Article XVII, Section 17.12 Resource Protection Overlay District

MISCELLANEOUS: 1. Lake Shore Protection Policy
2. Priority List

NEXT MEETING DATE: August 15, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting
September 1, 2005 – Workshop

ADJOURNMENT:

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission –Workshop Meeting
Minutes of August 4, 2005**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the August 4, 2005 Workshop Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present

Roger Lamont
John Steckling
Paul Rabaut
Bill Leddy
Ruth Ann Hines
Dean Baker

Commissioner(s) Absent

Chris Moore

Consultants Present

Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Mary Blundy
Paul Aska
Nancy Strole

Approval of Minutes: June 20, 2005 and July 7, 2005

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the minutes of June 20, 2005 as presented. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to approve the minutes of July 7, 2005 as presented. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as presented.

Public Comment: None

Public Hearing: None

Unfinished Business:

1. Article XVI, Section 16.13 Fences, Walls and Screening Structures

Chairperson Lamont explained that the Board sent this item back to the Planning Commission with a memo dated July 1, 2005 with some suggested changes. The memo suggests that the Planning Commission review the suggested changes and simply provide a report back to the Township Board.

Commissioner Rabaut asked if the definition of a rear yard is the area not included in the setback area and does this ordinance deal with a fence outside a setback area? Commissioner Steckling said, that is the way he reads it. Mr. Genre said you can build a fence or structure inside the setback area.

Commissioner Steckling said, if a structure could be built within the envelope, he does not see that item 4 of Section 16.13 requires it to have the 80% visibility, it just says it must be 8 feet high.

Commissioner Hines said she is concerned with rear yard as defined with lakefronts, there are some opacity but if you are not on a lake, between the house and setback line you could have whatever you want in the building envelope.

Commissioner Rabaut said he believes a fence should not be more than 3 feet high on a lake side because a 6-foot high chain link fence down to the high water mark is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan to enhance the beauty of the Township. He is also concerned with protecting the movement of animals through the property, and believes if fences will be allowed, they should be moved back to allow animal movement.

Commissioner Baker noted that item #3, "other" needs to be put before "screening" and not after. He explained that he understands the definition of rear yard and its link to being outside of the setback. It makes sense to him because if someone makes application to add onto their home and is within the confines of the setback and does not violate any ordinances, we would say ok as long as they are maintaining some consistency with the existing dwelling. Regarding item #4, as long as we limit the 8-foot height, it is fine.

Commissioner Steckling said he had initial trouble with the definitions, such as "screening structure." As long as rear yard is defined, it seems inconsistent to throw in the word "screening structure" without defining it. He would like to see it removed or defined.

Commissioner Hines said she is concerned with the vegetation issue because you can very rapidly lose any visibility with vegetation. She believes visibility on lakefront lots should be addressed. Mr. Genre said enforcing vegetation would be an enforcement problem.

Chairperson Lamont commented regarding item #4, 8-feet would be within all setbacks and would be designed to provide screening to a finished floor of a deck or patio. In his mind, you must have the deck or patio to have the wall so he does not have a problem. As far as adding "rear yard" to definitions, he has no problems with the changes.

Chairperson Lamont noted that this would be referred back to the Township Board for review.

2. Pathway Systems

Chairperson Lamont said that Dick Carlisle suggested looking at 1) is the pathway plan what we want to see in the Master Plan? and 2) the Planning Commission should consider looking at priorities that might interconnect with other Townships.

Ms. Elmiger said it would be helpful to first identify any pathways that the Township may want to connect to and then prioritize the pathways.

Commissioner Steckling said he would like to consider all pathways and best possible cases and not considering money for purposes of planning. Chairperson Lamont said he would concur.

Commissioner Rabaut commented from his view, prioritizing is a matter of where the needs are. He feels we should identify specific areas where we could start and develop certain core areas and then ultimately connect the core areas as the usage grows. Commissioner Rabaut said the Hamlet of Davisburg would be one obvious core area to start with because there is much recreational activity and some business activity.

Commissioner Leddy commented that he would like to decide if all the trails proposed is the ultimate goal, and if so, make an ordinance that new developments in those areas must provide at least an easement to provide for the future trail.

Commissioner Baker commented that he also sees the Hamlet of Davisburg as a beginning for a trail system. He likes the idea of providing access to Shiawassee and the idea of linking to the Mill Pond and the fairgrounds and eventually moving toward Indian Springs and then further out toward Dixie Highway and Davisburg Rd.

Commissioner Hines commented that her priority is connecting all of the areas around the Hamlet of Davisburg and secondly, the Davisburg/Dixie Highway corridor because there would be a lot of use of a pathway system in that area.

Commissioner Steckling commented that he thinks the Master Plan has very good coverage in terms of the long-range plans. He would like to focus in on this so we can encourage developments to provide pathways or easements for pathways. This would require legal council, and we could tweek the ordinances as we go through the years.

Chairperson Lamont said he welcomes pathways and if prioritized correctly and built correctly, they will get quite a bit of use. His goal to interconnecting are starting with the Hamlet of Davisburg to the Township hall and the parks area, including Shiawassee. He then thought we

could connect Springfield Plains Elementary via Bridge Lake Rd and Davisburg Rd. out to Dixie Highway. Chairperson Lamont said from a safety standpoint, eventually he would like a pathway on Dixie Highway from I-75 to Davisburg Rd. on at least one side. Eventually, we should look at connecting the Hamlet of Davisburg to Dixie Highway and also to Indian Springs Metro Park via Andersonville Rd. Chairperson Lamont said eventually he would like to see Dixie Highway north up to Groveland Township.

Ms. Elmiger asked if the Planning Commission is ready to set priorities? The Planning Commissioners agreed it would need more discussion and a separate meeting. Mr. Genre noted that it would take development of ordinances to accomplish this, and that would take some time.

The Planning Commissioners agreed to keep this item ongoing on the Priority List.

New Business:

1. Article XVII, Section 17.12 Resource Protection Overlay District

Mr. Genre explained that Section 17.12 requires an ecological study from developers, but it does not state at what stage of the development the ecological study is required. The Planning Commission needs to decide if they want these studies at concept or at final.

Commissioner Steckling commented that these cost a lot of money, and if developers provide it at concept and the concept gets turned down, then the developer has spent a lot of money. However, if we give them an approval on concept without the study, the study at the time of final site plan review could change everything. That costs more money and more time.

Mr. Genre commented that if the ecological study is presented early, the developer could find out early that the site may not be suited for development or show very sensitive areas. If it comes up much later, it could be very costly to a developer.

Chairperson Lamont said if we make a developer have everything ready when they come to the Planning Commission, then we should theoretically skip concept and go right to final. We must look at the property rights of the landowner. If they want to develop something, they will know at some point that they need an ecological characterization.

Commissioner Leddy suggested we provide a clearer map of the resource protection areas. He further suggested that these ecological characterization studies may not be completely objective because it is provided at the initiative of the developer and he believes the Township could be setting itself up for problems requiring the developer to provide the study. He believes the Township could make it part of the fees and initiate the study themselves. Commissioner Steckling said he would agree that the study may or may not be objective if provided by a developer.

Commissioner Rabaut said he thinks requiring the developer to do a study will inhibit the concept plan process and would prefer it at final as we do much other information.

Commissioner Baker commented that he would like these things to be easier for the Planning Commission and would like to see the study at concept.

Commissioner Steckling said he doesn't know why we could not require it administratively when they meet with the Building/Planning Department, and is not sure we need to amend the ordinance. Mr. Genre said he can ask for it but he may not be able to mandate it.

- **Commissioner Baker moved that we request the Planning Director to require ecological characterization studies when developments are received that involve identified MNFI sites in Springfield Township so that that ecological characterization study can be made available to the Planning Commission at Concept review. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Rabaut, Hines, Leddy and Baker; No: Lamont and Steckling; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 2 vote.**

Other Business:

1. Lake Shore Protection Policy

Ms. Elmiger said she was asked to review some ways communities are better protecting shoreline vegetation. She has reviewed Springfield Township's ordinance and compared it with six other Townships adjacent to Springfield. Ms. Elmiger said Springfield Township's ordinances are more comprehensive than any other communities she reviewed. She provided a report to the Planning Commission for their review which outlines the benefits of riparian vegetation.

The Planning Commission agreed to review all the materials and set it back on the priority list for a date to be determined.

2. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls was discussed and sent back to Township Board for their review. Review PL and RC Districts is set for the October 6th workshop meeting. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Resource Protection Overlay District is complete. Build Out/Traffic Study is TBD. Innovative Storm Water Management is TBD. Pathway Systems is set for the October 6th workshop meeting. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need and Dick Carlisle is set for the September 1st workshop meeting. Lake Shore Protection Policy is TBD. Existing non-conforming setbacks is set for the September 1st workshop meeting. Watershed Plan discussion is set for the October 6th workshop meeting.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary