

**Springfield Township  
Planning Commission –Workshop Meeting  
Minutes of March 3, 2005**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the March 3, 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  
Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Bill Leddy

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

John Steckling  
Paul Rabaut  
Chris Moore

**Consultants Present**

Randy Ford

**Staff Present**

Collin Walls  
Leon Genre  
Mary Blundy

**Approval of Minutes: February 3, 2005 Workshop Minutes**

- **Commissioner Baker moved to approve the minutes of February 3, 2005 as presented. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: None; Absent: Steckling, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

**Approval of Agenda:**

- **Commissioner Baker moved to discuss New Business Item #1 before the Unfinished Business in order to have this discussion immediately following the Public Hearing. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: None; Absent: Steckling, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

**Public Comment: None**

**Public Hearing:**

1. Rezoning M-1 to PUD – Prospectors Industrial, intersection of Andersonville and White Lake Roads – Requested by Tim Wickersham. Parcel I.D. # 07-36-451-022

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Chairperson Lamont explained that this property is zoned M-1 and is proposed to be rezoned to a PUD for the purpose of a gas station/convenience store.

Ms. Denise Gyorke, 4136 Cross Road, White Lake Township, commented that she bought a house here for the rural atmosphere and was of the understanding that everything north of M-59 was to be on one acre minimum. She thought, at very worst, anything that went in would be rural residential. Ms. Gyorke said there are people that exceed the speed limit and if the gas station is constructed, it will be worse.

Ms. Leona Melton, 8251 Old White Lake Rd., White Lake Township, commented that she will be looking right at the gas station. When she moved here, she was told that none of that would be put in and they would be in the country. She does not understand why a gas station is needed when there are gas stations down the street. Ms. Melton said she thinks it should stay country.

Mr. John Tyson, 4158 Cross Road, White Lake Township, commented that he has a problem with this proposal because of the traffic congestion. Andersonville Road and White Lake Rd. intersect and is already a bad intersection. Mr. Tyson said this is a rural area and he doesn't want gas stations since there is already a gravel pit in the area. He believes the traffic issue should be addressed before constructing anything in this area.

Ms. Janet Nelsey-Peterman, owner of the property at Cross Road and White Lake Rd. in White Lake Township, said this has been farmland for many years and asked why the residents should suffer from a gas station when she does not intend to leave her property as anything other than farmland or vacant.

Ms. Christine Draska, 4216 Cross Road, White Lake Township, commented that she has small children attending Andersonville Elementary. On any given day, it takes her 3 to 4 minutes to make a left turn onto Andersonville Road from White Lake Rd. In the evenings, she is backed up to the intersection to try to make a left turn onto White Lake Rd. where it meets Nelsey. The traffic is horrible and since it has been paved, they are dealing with people cutting through from M-59 to I-75 using her backyard. There has been an increase of traffic on Maceday Lake Rd. cutting through Cross Road to circumvent the left turn at Nelsey Rd. Ms. Draska said she is picturing a super-huge "speedway type" setting and she is concerned with the sale of beer and wine from this location. She believes this proposal is too invasive to the residents.

Mr. Robert Long, 4228 Cross Road, White Lake Township, commented that this intersection is horrible and the layout of the land is also horrible. To put any type of structure up makes no sense.

There were no further public comments.

**Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:48 p.m.**

## **New Business:**

1. Rezoning M-1 to PUD – Prospectors Industrial, intersection of Andersonville and White Lake Roads – Requested by Tim Wickersham. Parcel I.D. # 07-36-451-022

Mr. Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth & Clark summarized his latest report of February 21, 2005. With regard to drainage easements, the applicant has recently executed some drainage easement agreements with the Carnwath development. The storm sewer for this site will drain across the back and tie into Carnwath's storm sewer. The most significant issue with this property is the traffic issue. Last year the Planning Commission directed the applicant to obtain a traffic impact study, which has been completed. Mr. Ford said his firm reviewed the study and the basic issues have not changed. Most significantly, the ability of northbound traffic on White Lake Rd. to make a left turn onto Andersonville Rd. during evening peak hours. Mr. Ford explained that the Road Commission has a ranking system of "A" being the best down to "F" being the worst. This intersection is currently rating at a level of service as "F," and when the new development is added the situation will be worse. Currently during the afternoon peak hour there is a delay of 92 seconds and it increased to a delay of 460 seconds at full build-out of the proposed building. However, if the traffic light is added, as requested by the applicant, the level of service is rated as an "A." The study establishes that it would meet the county's warrant for a traffic signal but as much as this intersection is on a "watch list" there is no money to fund it through the county.

Commissioner Baker said the issue for him is the traffic impact and we recognize that it is already strained with simply a stop sign. At this point in time, he has serious reservations about the impact of the traffic and the volume of flow that exists now. Commissioner Baker said he realizes that the county will review the issues surrounding this to decide if a signal is necessary, but he believes they would wait for the situation to present itself to a higher level.

Commissioner Leddy commented that he believes this intersection is a serious problem and will be a serious problem regardless of whether a development is constructed or not and will get continually worse. There are many things that could be done to alleviate these problems regardless of this proposed building. He believes the entire area needs to be improved before someone is seriously hurt or killed there. Commissioner Leddy said, as far as this proposed development is concerned, the property is already zoned M-1, not farmland. If this development doesn't go in, another type of industrial development may, and he doesn't think it can be prevented due to the M-1 zoning. He believes we are in need of a gas station in that area.

Commissioner Hines said she agrees with the comments and concerns of the traffic issues but with or without this building, traffic is a nightmare and something needs to be done. Regarding this development and the surrounding property, it is zoned M-1, light industrial and the only issue is the PUD. She is not opposed to rezoning this to a PUD allowing the mixed use and believes the gas station and convenience store would serve as a support service. Commissioner Hines suggested that the applicant consider a phased development until the traffic is under control. However, with or without this development there is a traffic concern.

Chairperson Lamont said this property is 4.3 acres and is already zoned M-1, light industrial along with the surrounding property. A light industrial facility could be built here and comply

with the ordinance without a public hearing. The PUD proposal is proposing a mixed use on this site and based on the ordinance, the applicant has met the criteria for a PUD. Chairperson Lamont said he agrees with the rest of the Commission in that, the traffic impact would be a deciding factor. Signalization of that intersection may be the hurdle that is needed to help him personally decide to allow a mixed use here. He believes the proposal is natural and nice looking and fits harmoniously in the plot. The applicant appears to have met most challenges raised and perhaps a phased development may be the avenue to approach this. He believes a convenience store would be harmonious and service the local residents.

Commissioner Baker complimented Mr. Wickersham on his design and development. He thinks it is a positive use of the property and is zoned M-1 already. Going with a PUD, he noticed in Section 14.01.3(b), it states "The proposed type and density of use shall not result in unreasonable increase and the need for or a burden upon public services, facilities, roads and utilities." Commissioner Baker said, if we were going strictly M-1, that is not an obligation he finds in the M-1 status, it is about the use meeting the property and not about infrastructure issues. A PUD, as he reads it, we've pointed out that, are these roads already in such a state that this does not push it any further. Commissioner Hines said, in Section 16.03 states "the Township body responsible for site plan approval may require a traffic impact analysis..." and she does not believe this refers to any specific zoning. Mr. Genre said, that is correct.

Chairperson Lamont said we already have the study and it indicates there would be a problem, particularly northbound. He believes this proposed development of a mixed use on this parcel would be contiguous and harmonious and fall within a PUD requirement. Except for traffic. The traffic impact study supports that, however, the study also supports that if a signal with left turn arrows were installed, it would not only alleviate traffic with the proposed development but it would improve traffic even without the proposed development. It would go from an "F" ranking to an "A" or "B" in all directions at all times with or without the development. Chairperson Lamont said this is an important fact for the Planning Commission and the public to be aware of.

Mr. Tim Wickerham said, as far as a traffic signal goes, he has had communication with Oakland County Road Commission and is hoping to resolve this in the future. He is hoping for approval tonight to move onto the next step, and in between those steps, get this resolved. Mr. Wickersham said he thinks this is a beautiful development and will work well in this part of the Township.

Ms. Draska said they live on private wells and this development will be introducing gasoline into their ground water. She noted that she could live with M-1 light industrial but cannot live with a convenient store and gas station that would be open 24 hours per day. The proposal of signalization has been thought through for the people turning left onto Andersonville Rd. but it has not addressed the traffic backup from Nelsey and White Lake Rd to the new paved portion of White Lake Rd.

Mr. Long said there should be a right turn lane coming from White Lake to Andersonville and two lanes each way would help. Mr. Ford explained that the Oakland County Road Commission

will make the final determinations regarding the roads and signals, not the Springfield Township Boards.

Ms. Draska asked if the development would be tapping into their private wells? Mr. Ford said the applicant will drill their own private well. Ms. Draska asked what impact the gas station will have on their wells and septic? Mr. Ford said, "none." The development is too far from their homes to impact them, and the applicant by far exceeds the minimum requirements by the Health Department.

Supervisor Walls said there is a specific request by Carlisle/Wortman that the Planning Commission decide on the difference of opinion between the Township planner and the applicant on the pedestrian circulation. The Township intends to set up a meeting with the Road Commission's Traffic Safety Director, our engineer, the applicant and the appropriate traffic engineers to see if we can impress upon the Road Commission the need to do something proactive.

Mr. Scott Malvich, 5180 White Lake Rd., said he is in support of this proposed gas station.

Mr. Long commented that the road he lives on is a "Beautification Road" and will not be changed at any time in the future.

Ms. Peterman asked what impact the gas station will have on her acreage and the drainage from it? Chairperson Lamont said, "none, there would be no drainage onto her property."

Chairperson Lamont noted that Dick Carlisle of Carlisle/Wortman did not like the proposed pedestrian circulation from the convenience store to the light industrial and provided a recommendation on page 9 of his review. Chairperson Lamont said he likes the proposal made by Carlisle/Wortman regarding the pedestrian circulation.

Commissioner Baker asked the applicant about lighting? Mr. Wickersham said a lighting plan exists and would be submitted further into construction plans.

- **Chairperson Lamont said, based upon the information received from the applicant reflected in the minutes of the meeting tonight, information and feedback from the community planner, Carlisle/Wortman, the Township engineer, Hubbell, Roth & Clark, he believes the final planned unit development meets the criteria contained in Section 14.0 of the Ordinance and therefore he would recommend to the Township Board approval of the final site plan of Prospectors Industrial, Parcel I.D. # 07-36-451-022, plans dated 02-07-05 and date-stamped received 02-10-05. This approval is conditioned on the following: 1) compliance with applicable recommendations from Carlisle/Wortman review date 01-06-05 with special note that all lighting detail including canopy lighting be shown on the prints and comply with the ordinance without deviation; 2) Carlisle/Wortman review dated 02-23-05 pedestrian circulation be reconfigured to planner's suggestion cutting straight across instead of out into traffic; 3) compliance with applicable recommendations from the HRC third review dated 02-21-05 date-stamped 02-22-**

**05; 4) compliance with the narrative dated 01-10-05; 5) Township attorney review all documents and approve; 6) a traffic light is installed at Andersonville and White Lake Roads prior to the development opening, this requirement based on Section 14.05 of the PUD Ordinance conditions which states “conditions imposed shall be designed to protect natural resources and the public health, safety and welfare of individuals in the project and those immediately adjacent.”. Trustee Hines supported the motion.**

Commissioner Hines said a phased process would be appropriate for this in light of the current traffic situation. Commissioner Baker explained that while he appreciates the development and the buildings, he feels this traffic situation, without the development is broken. He also feels that the addition of a light, while it be an enhancement, does not take in the full account of the distance between White Lake Rd. and Old White Lake Rd., and he believes this is a package and although it is not part of our Township, it is a part of our problem.

- **Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Hines and Leddy; No: Baker; Absent: Rabaut, Steckling and Moore. The motion carried by a 3 to 1 vote.**

### **Unfinished Business:**

1. Review of Public Lands (PL) District – Verbal from Carlisle/Wortman
  2. Review of Resource Conservation (RC) District – Verbal from Carlisle/Wortman
- **Chairperson Lamont moved to postpone discussion of this until the next workshop meeting in April. Trustee Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Steckling, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

### **New Business:**

2. Amend Section 18.11 (4) b and Section 18.08

Chairperson Lamont said in regard to Section 18.08, the changes are to allow 24 months for special land use instead of 18 months and changing other wording from 365 days in paragraph 2 to 12 months. In paragraph 3, changing wording from one year to 12 months. The purpose is to have consistent timeframes.

- **Chairperson Lamont moved to revise Section 18.08 as described in the February 8, 2005 memo and to set for Public Hearing at the earliest possible date. Trustee Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Steckling, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

In regard to Section 18.11 (4), this is to change wording and timeframes from final review within 6 to 12 months following the review and approval of the concept plan by the Township Board.

- **Trustee Hines moved to set for Public Hearing an amendment to Section 18.11 (4) b as proposed in the document dated February 8, 2005 to set a time period of 12 months rather than six months. Trustee Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Steckling, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

### **Other Business:**

#### **1. Hamlet of Davisburg**

Mary Blundy summarized her review of the Hamlet of Davisburg Meeting on February 23<sup>rd</sup>. [A copy of this memo is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township]. She explained that she will no longer be attending these meetings regularly and will be a “resource” person for this group.

Chairperson Lamont said he thinks that Mary Blundy’s involvement and everyone’s involvement has shown that the Township does care about the Hamlet and wants good things happen to it.

#### **2. Priority List**

Review Screening, Fences and Walls is set for the March 21<sup>st</sup> Business Meeting. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales is set for Public Hearing at the March 21<sup>st</sup> Business Meeting. Review PL District and Review RC District is set for the April Workshop Meeting. Amend Section 18.11 (4)b not (5) b and Section 18.08 is set for Public Hearing at the earliest possible date. Hamlet of Davisburg is to be deleted from the Priority List and is still work in progress. Build Out/Traffic Study is TBD. Innovative Storm Water Management is TBD. Proposal to rezone properties at Andersonville and Farley Roads from R-1 to PL is pending review of the PL District. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need is TBD. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Review height and area coverage Article 25 is set for the April Workshop Meeting. Master Deed and By-Law Enforcement is TBD. Prospectors Industrial is complete, sent to Township Board and to be deleted from priority list.

### **Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary