

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA**

March 21, 2005

- CALL TO ORDER:** 7:30 P.M.
- MINUTES:** Approval of February 21, 2005 Business Meeting Minutes
- APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**
- PUBLIC COMMENT:** Items Not On Agenda
- PUBLIC HEARING:** **Ordinance Amendments**
1. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales
- UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** **Ordinance Amendments**
Discussion
1. Amend Section 16.13 Fences, Walls and Screening
Structures (Section 16.13)
- NEW BUSINESS:** **Site Plans**
1. Valvoline Instant Oil Change - **07-14-401-014** - Concept
2. Harrington Funeral Home - **07-13-351-002** - Concept
3. Sunset Bluffs - **07-12-227-006** - Final
Ordinance Amendments
1. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales
- OTHER BUSINESS:** **Miscellaneous**
1. Priority List
- NEXT MEETING DATE:** April 18, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting
April 7, 2005 -- Workshop
- ADJOURNMENT:**

The Mission of the Springfield Township Planning Commission is to guide and promote the efficient, coordinated development of the Township in a manner that will best promote the health, safety, and welfare of its people.

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of March 21, 2005**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the March 21, 2005 Business 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
Dean Baker
Ruth Ann Hines
Bill Leddy (arrived 8:30 p.m.)

Commissioner(s) Absent

Paul Rabaut
Chris Moore

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Mary Blundy

Approval of Minutes: February 21, 2005

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the Minutes of February 21, 2005 as presented. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Leddy, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the Agenda as published. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Leddy, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

Public Comment: **None**

Public Hearing:

1. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales

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

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.

Unfinished Business:

1. Amend Section 16.13 – Fences, Walls and Screening Structures

Ms. Elmiger asked if this item could be tabled, as she is not prepared to discuss this matter at this time.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to table the discussion on the ordinance amendments Section 16.13 until the next meeting or when Carlisle/Wortman has the changes available for review. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker and Hines; No: none; Absent: Leddy, Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Valvoline Instant Oil Change – 07-14-401-014 – Concept Review

Mr. Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth & Clark summarized his review dated March 8, 2005. He explained that in regard to site access, it is an ordinance requirement that the applicant address the need for improvements to the intersecting roadway; specifically, the need for acceleration/deceleration and passing lanes. Mr. Ford said he does not believe a passing lane is necessary, but the need for accel/decel lanes should be addressed for final. The applicant should focus more on internal traffic circulation; the proposed fire lane is fairly tight around the south end of the building. In regard to grading and drainage, the site drops significantly from the front to the rear which will require significant mass grading and the applicant is proposing a detention basin in the rear. The applicant must provide detention calculations and demonstrate how they will achieve the necessary storage volume. The applicant is indicating a boulder retaining wall along the rear parking lot and the boulder wall height, at its most significant point, is about 15 feet in height, which is rather severe. He suggested the applicant provide more detail regarding this wall. The applicant did not indicate what type of construction the retaining wall along the north edge of the parking will be. The applicant is proposing that the storm collection system, prior to discharge, go through an aqua swirl storm water sedimentation device however, the applicant did not provide sizing information and maintenance. The applicant must add soil erosion control measures. Regarding on-site utilities, the septic system and field location are proposed to be at the rear of the site. There was no location indicated in regard to the soil borings and the septic sizing needs to be clarified.

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman explained that this property is adjacent to the Bridge Valley complex which is a very significant environmental feature in Springfield Township. The site is not completely within the MNFI area, but it is hydrologically attached to it. The wetland behind this parcel feeds into Bridge Valley and into the lake. Ms. Elmiger said her main concern is the

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

septic field and how the water from the wash facility and the oil change bay materials would be treated and is concerned it will be going into the wetlands and into Bridge Valley. They would like the applicant to address the protection of these areas. Ms. Elmiger said the soil infiltration rates of this parcel are quite high and the ground water recharge area on this parcel enters closer to Dixie Lake, but then is starting to become discharged at the bottom of the slope into the wetland. Therefore, the septic system is in an area closer to the discharge area than the actual recharge. The water filtering through the septic system will go into the ground water that feeds the wetland. Ms. Elmiger said another main concern is the grading of the site. In regard to the impact on the residents to the south, this will be an active business and will need to be screened appropriately. Ms. Elmiger said there are some access lanes that do not meet the engineering standards and are too narrow. She would like general information as to how fluids are cleaned up and if the business will be providing other services besides oil changes and car washes. Ms. Elmiger asked if the oil bays would have floor drains. In regard to Design Standards for the Dixie Corridor, the design standards call for a smooth transition between different businesses and uses, which could be done by matching setbacks or coordinating materials of buildings, she has not seen anything on the plans that would indicate this transition. The standards also call for a community area such as a patio or seating area, which has not been shown on the concept plan. A pedestrian pathway is required in this area and has not been indicated. Ms. Elmiger said she did not see a loading space shown on the plans and the rear circulation is difficult. In regard to parking, the ordinance requires 53 spaces on this site but she recommends that the applicant and the Planning Commission discuss what is really necessary and come to an agreement. Ms. Elmiger said their biggest concern is the impact to Bridge Valley and the extent of grading on this site.

Mr. Robert Tamm of Burt Oil, explained that since this plan was submitted, they have gone to the Oakland County Health Department and because of the soil conditions, they have unofficially told the applicant he could reduce the size and move the septic field. Mr. Tamm indicated on the plans where this would be. He indicated this accomplishes two things, it takes the septic as far from the wetlands as possible and it would allow the applicant to move the detention basin back. In doing this, they would protect some trees and the slope and also reduce the size of the boulder wall. Mr. Tamm indicated that the traffic flow into and out of the site would be a counter-clockwise, rotational traffic flow. He does recognize that getting into bay #1 will be difficult, but feels it does not matter how much room there is, people will still maneuver it in a "herringbone" fashion and bay #1 will be used as an extra services bay. In regard to the septic field, the septic field will not hold any wash water and will be strictly for the quick lube and the bathroom usage. He is currently working with DEQ and is planning on using a "re-claim" system where approximately 80% of the wash water will be reclaimed. Mr. Tamm said they are currently considering a separate drywell system to maintain the other 20% of the water and making the retention area larger.

Mr. Tamm said, in regard to soil boring locations, those will be indicated on the final site plan. With regard to the wetland area, he believes they are 25 to 30 feet off the back of the property and those will be shown on the final plans. With respect to the fire lane, the original plan showed a second building, which is now eliminated, but the fire lane was not eliminated. It is his understanding that with a fire lane up front, he meets the 150 foot requirement for access to the building for fire access. There will be no vacuums on the site for the car wash as asked by the

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

Planner. Used oil, anti-freeze and any fluids used will be stored within the lower level of the building underneath the quick lube. They will be stored there until they are removed by a licensed waste hauler. The quick lube will have floor drains but the floor drains will go to a holding tank. Mr. Tamm explained that they could construct a patio by the front door approximately 13'x13' which would meet the Dixie Highway corridor standards. As far as parking is concerned, Mr. Tamm said their parking needs are associated with their employees and the plans are showing 13 spaces. He suggested seven to eight spaces plus one handicapped space would be reasonable. The nature of his business, dictates that most people never get out of their cars, they simply drive in and drive out. Ms. Elmiger asked if there may be any handicapped employees working in the office? Mr. Tamm said, no, there is no one that staff's the office regularly.

Mr. Ford asked the applicant how many cars per day he anticipates? Mr. Tamm said he anticipates 42 cars per hour maximum and would be willing to construct a 5-foot sidewalk or whatever is required by the ordinance.

Commissioner Hines asked what the proposed business hours are? Mr. Tamm said the quick lube would be 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday thru Friday and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday and 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Sunday. However, the car wash would be open 24 hours.

[Commissioner Leddy arrived 8:30 p.m.]

Commissioner Steckling said he agrees that the Planning Commission should work something out with the applicant in regard to parking. He doesn't think 53 spaces, required by the ordinance, are necessary.

Commissioner Baker asked the applicant how the floor drains in the wash bays will be separated? Mr. Tamm explained that those wash bays are totally separate with solid walls. Anything that goes into the wash bay drains will be dealt with by the DEQ.

Commissioner Leddy said his main concern is to ensure that there is no way water or anything else ends up going into Bridge Lake.

Chairperson Lamont said he is somewhat confused about the reclaimed water. Mr. Tamm confirmed that 20% of the water is essentially wastewater and that 20% would not exceed 1000 gallons per day. Chairperson Lamont he would need to be satisfied in addition to DEQ that nothing would flow into the Bridge Valley complex. He visited the site and noted that there are a line of trees serving as a natural buffer to the north side of the property. He asked the applicant if he intends to preserve those trees? Mr. Tamm said, no, but he would like to preserve as many trees as possible. Chairperson Lamont asked how much of the back area would need to be disturbed to create an adequately sized detention basin? Mr. Ford said the requirement is for a 25-year storm and the applicant has indicated that they can satisfy the requirement and are still 30 to 40 feet from the back of the basin to the property line. Chairperson Lamont asked if the back 50% could be left undisturbed? Mr. Tamm said it is his intention to leave it undisturbed as much as possible. Chairperson Lamont said ordinance requires no mass grading.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

Commissioner Hines commented that she believes this proposal is an appropriate use for Dixie Highway and many of her concerns have been addressed. She does not believe we need much parking on the site and we do need to make modifications for this.

Commissioner Steckling said if it is more beneficial to get rid of the retaining wall and landscape it properly, that would be something worth considering. Commissioner Steckling said the general flow of the site is good and he does not have a problem with the building being set back. He believes we should incorporate the items suggested by Carlisle/Wortman with respect to the Dixie Highway corridor, and he believes the plan is fine otherwise.

Commissioner Baker said he is interested to see the next modifications to the plan and believes the most critical item is gaining assurance that detergents and other things will not make it into the Bridge Lake body of water, however, he likes the plan and its layout. Commissioner Leddy commented that he agrees with Commissioner Baker.

Chairperson Lamont commented that the use for this area is proper for the zoning. It appears to be a nice character building and would harmoniously fit into the future plans for Dixie Highway. He does not have a problem with the building being setback 70 feet instead of 50 feet but proper screening will be required at the south and the north. Chairperson Lamont said he would want the septic in the ground water recharge area as depicted on the map and the drywells used for the surplus waste carwash water be drained in a ground water recharge area. Therefore, he would be more comfortable that any surplus residues would not ever enter the Bridge Valley complex which is important and a Phase II requirement. Chairperson Lamont said he looked at the possibility of eliminating 3 or 4 of the parking spots to the north, which would give the width required for the emergency access and would reduce grading. Chairperson Lamont asked the applicant to make sure the soil borings are shown on the plans as requested and to review the comments from the Planner and Engineer to make sure they are all inclusive. He would like the rear of the area preserved as much as possible.

2. Harrington Funeral Home – 07-13-351-002 – Concept Review

Ms. Elmiger explained that this is a proposal for a funeral home and future office building on 4.22 acres along Dixie Highway. There is currently an existing single-family resident on the site, which will be occupied and maintained by the applicant. The applicant is submitting this plan under the Dixie Highway Overlay District Planned Development Option. Ms. Elmiger noted that the applicant has met all the standards of the overlay district. It will be preserving Softwater Lake which is one of the most important ecological features on the site, because there will be no development along the lakeshore or in the vicinity of the lake. Carlisle/Wortman feels this proposed plan will not result in an unreasonable increase in the need for public services and does not pose a risk to the public's health, safety or welfare. Carlisle/Wortman is asking that the property to the south is properly screened and the collection area be properly screened. Provisions for acceleration/deceleration lanes should be considered. The Dixie Highway Corridor Design Standards do apply to this parcel and the location and style of the office building portion of this plan should be consistent with the funeral home. In regard to the open space and community design features, the applicant does provide a woodchip pathway to the lake

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

and a seating area. It is the opinion of Carlisle/Wortman that the seating area does not meet the standards and could be modified. Ms. Elmiger said she feels the building will be a nice addition to Dixie Highway. They would like the possibility of preserving additional trees on the site and the parking needs to be addressed; the applicant has provided 89 spaces but Carlisle/Wortman feels that 136 spaces would be necessary. In regard to the pedestrian amenities, the applicant shows a sidewalk that leads to the woodchip path and to the lake as an extension of the main drive into the site; it is her opinion it will be much safer for pedestrians if it were a curbed walk, although this would alter the storm water. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman is recommending Special Land Use.

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC summarized his review of March 10, 2005. He commented that the applicant does need to address entrance improvements such as accel/decel lanes however he feels there is no need for a passing lane. Regarding the pavement, the cross section needs to be built up a couple of inches of aggregate base to be in compliance with the Township Design Standards. In respect to site grading and drainage, approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the site will be mass graded but is not a significant grade change because the site is fairly flat. Mr. Ford feels since the applicant is maintaining the rear of the site there is not much chance for degradation of the lake in terms of surface drainage and could be controlled. The applicant is showing erosion control measures on the plan and the detention area is shown for a 10-year storm but needs to be shown for a 25-year storm. Regarding soils, what the applicant is proposing is probably adequate but he suggests that, if there is a clay seam, they should make sure they undercut it to the permeable soils, perhaps with a leaching basin. Regarding on-site well and septic, the applicant does need to provide the correspondence from the Health Department regarding the appropriateness of the location for the septic. Mr. Ford would also like clarification of the septic location to the existing home.

Mr. Jim Scharl of Kieft Engineering explained that accel/decel lane proposals were submitted to the Road Commission and approved. They are requiring these curbed and stop the curb 8 feet from the white line, which is the outside of the right lane. Mr. Scharl said the retention facility is already oversized somewhat and he sees no problem with it. They have taken soil borings and submitted them to the Health Department; the soil borings of the septic area are excellent and he anticipates that they are the same in the area of the detention facility so they could easily put a leaching basin in. In regard to screening, the tanks are underground and it is a requirement that anything from the prep room such as embalming fluids, etc. is put into a water tight tank. That tank is then pumped periodically and taken to a facility. The septic tank itself is just for the restroom facilities. The location of the tanks may possibly be changed and that is why they show the loading area where it is. Mr. Scharl said they wanted to show the future office because it is an important parcel to the design of the entire site and it also lends credence to the design of the storm water facility and falls much nicer into the overlay district. The architecture of this facility will be consistent. Regarding the seating area, Mr. Scharl said he realizes this is an area not very conducive to a community facility; they will modify this and propose the same sort of facility. They are looking at the 5-foot walk area as a sort of outdoor seating area, which could be directly connected to the walkway system down to the lake. They did propose a crowned roadway without curb and gutter, but if they were to curb the west side of the drive, they could conceivably drain the entire roadway to the east. Mr. Scharl said, in regard to preservation of trees, the wild cherry will be eliminated; the pine tree is narley and will be eliminated; the twin

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

cedar is not located in an area to easily save it and there are cedars all over the site that will be saved. The applicant will also be landscaping with additional materials. The septic system for the home appears to be on the lakeside of the house so there would be no problem with the detention system located where it is. In regard to parking, Mr. Scharl said the criteria for this type of use in many nearby communities calls for one space for 50 square feet. More than most of the time this will be adequate, but they recognize that there will be the occasional time when it may not, and preparing for those very few times is almost impossible. Ms. Marcie Harrington agreed that the proposed number of spaces will be adequate.

Commissioner Baker commented that this is a good use for this property and it fits well with the overlay district and the Master Plan.

Commissioner Leddy asked, for the two or three times per year, when there may be a dignitary being laid out, does the applicant have any arrangements with local businesses to use their parking and perhaps run a shuttle bus? Ms. Harrington said no, but that is a good idea. Commissioner Leddy asked the applicant how she proposes holding traffic when a funeral procession is starting? Ms. Harrington said they generally edge out with the coach to stop oncoming vehicles and they do have personnel with stop signs. She currently works on Crooks Road and Woodward Avenue, which both have high speeds and she does not have a problem and has never had to involve police escorts.

Commissioner Steckling asked if the seating area by the lake was proposed because the applicant thought the Planning Commission would like it or because they really want it? Mr. Scharl said his initial thought was up front but he knew he had to do something. Commissioner Steckling said regarding parking, he understands it would be hard to put a final number on, but believes there must be another type of surface that could be used so it wouldn't be a massive sea of asphalt.

Commissioner Hines commented that the patio seating relocation would be more conducive for use and believes this proposal is a good use for this property.

Commissioner Steckling said the overall plan is fine and he likes it. He suggested moving the seating from the lake to the front unless the applicant really wants it there. He would like some of the asphalt eliminated if there is a way to do it.

Commissioner Leddy commented that he has no problem with the plan and believes the seating area is not necessary and could lead to other problems. He does think the applicant should have a plan for overflow in regard to parking.

Commissioner Baker commented that there should be a pedestrian pathway if the overlay district calls for it. Chairperson Lamont said he agrees with that.

Chairperson Lamont commented that the building is nice and qualifies for the planned development option. He believes it fits well within the Dixie Highway overlay and the plan is basically sound and fundamentally very good.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

- **Chairperson Lamont said based upon the information received from the applicant reflected in the Minutes of this meeting, he believes the concept site plan for Harrington Funeral Home, Parcel I.D. # 07-13-351-002, date-stamped 02/18/05 by Springfield Township meets the criteria for the Planned Development Option; he recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Township Board with the following conditions: that screening meets compliance with Ordinance 16.06 particularly the property to the east and by the lake where it abuts residential; review of the accel/decel lanes; pedestrian pathway to be installed along Dixie Highway; resize the detention basin to a 25-year event as recommended by the Township engineer; style of the office building be consistent with the funeral home when developed; waive the ordinance requirement of the 135 parking spaces and 96 would be adequate; the seating area could be relocated as discussed in tonight's meeting thereby eliminating the roadway problem to curb and gutter of the pedestrian path; relocate the pedestrian traffic flow within the parking as described in the Carlisle/Wortman review. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion.**

Commissioner Steckling said parts of the motion that deal with specifics aren't the only conditions and may be added to once the final plan is viewed.

- **Chairperson Lamont amended his motion to include that it is understood that the applicant understands that this is not all inclusive. Commissioner Steckling supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

3. Sunset Bluffs – 07-12-227-005 Final Site Plan

Mr. Scharl explained that when this plan was first submitted to the Planning Commission, they received recommendation for approval and then approached the Township Board. The Township Board gave recommendations and the applicant submitted an amended plan to the Township Board. The Board said it was not necessary to bring it back to the Planning Commission; that plan was then approved by the Township Board as the cluster concept plan in accordance with the density plan. Mr. Scharl said they are back here at the Planning Commission with a plan that was not viewed by the Planning Commission and there are other issues that have been raised. Therefore, they are not seeking final site plan approval, they are simply asking the Planning Commission to discuss some issues raised by Carlisle/Wortman and HRC and table this plan so they can make modifications and come back for approval. He feels that if he were to seek final approval, there would be too many strings attached and it wouldn't happen.

Ms. Elmiger said this site is part of the Waumegah Lake Complex which is an MNFI ordinance, rated as 7 which, qualifies it under the resource protection overlay district. The density and cluster have been approved by the Township Board as part of the concept plan. Ms. Elmiger said it does not appear that the front and rear setbacks were opposite one another. Regarding natural resources, the applicant submitted an ecological report as required. There were some

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

recommendations on this report that are important to pursue. It recommends that the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be consulted about potential impacts this development could have on the Bald Eagle that lives in this area at times. The report recommends that large trees on this site be maintained to help maintain the Bald Eagle habitat. Ms. Elmiger said she has questions regarding the natural vegetation buffer strip and the vegetation conservation easement areas along the lakeshore. The natural vegetation buffer strip is 20 feet wide and there is a vegetation conservation easement that is 50 feet wide; she asked the applicant to explain the difference between the two. Her general recommendation is to only allow clearing for a pedestrian pathway to a dock area; it is their opinion that does not require 35 feet of clearing of the lakefront. The ecological report states that the lakefront is the most important portion to maintain. She feels 10 feet would be sufficient. She asked how the public parts of the shoreline would be protected, such as by the homeowners or a conservation easement. Ms. Elmiger asked for more clarification as to where "selective clearing" will happen. Along the site access and circulation, she suggests it may be possible to put a boulder wall along the drive between lots 1 and 3, this would diminish the amount of clearing necessary. There was no sign information provided and Carlisle/Wortman recommends the applicant have more time to address these issues and gather information, particularly regarding the Bald Eagle issue.

Mr. Randy Ford said, part of the Board granting special land use was the vacating of Chippewa and making sure there are provisions for access to the four parcels owned by Zilka, Ortwine, Thorne and O'Neill. Mr. Franz of Olei Development said he submitted drafts to the Building Department and in those drafts those homeowners did not have any responsibility to help with maintenance. Mr. Scharl assured that they will have access. Mr. Ford said there are turn-around provisions now provided which will end up being the driveway for unit 12. The applicant did a good job of limiting the disruption areas and are pretty much confined to the road right-of-way, but there are some areas such as the common area to the north, that show a 1 on 3 slope. He feels if natural boulders or something is utilized the applicant may be able to tighten up the grading. Mr. Scharl said the clearing and grading would come close to offsetting the cost of the boulder wall and will look very attractive. Mr. Ford said, in regard to the boat launch area, the plans as submitted do not call for anything to be done for the wetland line towards the navigable part of the canal; this will need to be addressed with DEQ. Mr. Scharl said when this plan was done the level of Waumegah Lake was down two to three feet. However, today, it is four inches below the legal level; Brooks Williamson is now working with them and has made application for the dock to the Department of Natural Resources, but the applicant does not anticipate any dredging. Mr. Ford said the grading plan has been well represented and he has no issues with grading.

Mr. Scharl said he did get a review and approval of the septic system from the Oakland County Health Department today and many of the issues raised by Mr. Ford and Ms. Elmiger have already been done. Regarding units 2, 3 and 13, there have been no changes to this plan. In regard to the Bald Eagle mentioned by Ms. Elmiger, Mr. Scharl read a letter from Brooks Williamson that, summarized, states if there is no nest, there is no jurisdiction. He provided copies of this letter to the Engineer and Planner. Mr. Scharl said, in regard to the comments of why some buffers are 20 feet and some are 50 feet, he discussed with the Township about doing whatever possible to move the homes farther away from the lake and put in protection of slopes.

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

Commissioner Steckling asked the applicant, if he is not making massive changes, why would he not want a final approval tonight? Mr. Scharl said if the Commission feels comfortable with that then that is fine, but he does have to make changes and he is concerned that the Commission had not seen this plan previously. Commissioner Steckling said it is different, but there are similar functions to it and he does not have a problem with a final.

Chairperson Lamont said for the first time seeing this plan, he would support tabling this plan to allow the applicant to make the changes because he feels if we went for a final approval tonight, the conditional changes would be so numerous and hates to place administrative burden upon the consultants. If the Planning Commission tables it, as requested, then a final approval could probably be given next month with just a couple of conditions. The applicant would also then have his final permits, which are just rolling in now. Chairperson Lamont said his comments are consistent with the Planner's and Engineers reports and suggestions. He would like the building envelopes to be shown on the plan when it is brought back.

Commissioner Steckling said the only issue to him is the building envelopes and most of the items mentioned can be handled administratively. He feels a final can be given subject to resolution of a number of issues raised and does not see anything big enough that would require him to view the plan again. However, he would want to see specific language in the condominium documents dealing with abuse of natural areas.

Commissioner Hines said she concurs with Commissioner Steckling and does not feel she needs to see the plan again. She would support moving forward with a final approval.

Commissioner Baker said he is comfortable with a tabling motion. He feels very volumed by all of the recommended changes.

Chairperson Lamont commented that, the applicant came in and asked for a tabling motion and now Commissioner Steckling is talking about a long and conditional motion. The role of the Planning Commission is to review plans and make recommendations to the Township Board, especially on Special Land Use. As a Planning Commission, it is our obligation to review the plan; if we have not seen the plan, have not seen the building envelopes, have not seen the boulder walls, has not seen a potential change turn-around by lot 11 along many other things and Carlisle/Wortman and HRC have to do more reviews, and we send it to the Township Board without looking at those reviews, he does not feel the Planning Commission has done their job and he would support tabling, not granting a final.

Commissioner Leddy commented that most of the plan is decent and he has worked with if Mr. Scharl before. He said that if Mr. Scharl says things will get done, then he believes him and would therefore, support final approval.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to recommend the application for final site plan approval for Sunset Bluffs Site Condominium according to the plans, and documentation submitted for review, date-stamped by the Township February 7, 2005. This recommendation is based upon review of the foregoing submissions, as**

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

well as the written reviews of Township planner, and engineer, and a determination that the applicant has complied with Section 18.07.2, and all other applicable provisions of the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance, the Design and Construction Standards, and all applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following additional findings of fact are relevant to this application: Reaffirm previous findings as to density determination and that project qualifies for the Cluster Option under the ordinance. The following conditions are attached to this recommendations: 1) Language in the Master Deed and By Laws requiring Township approval for any amendments to the plan and further language permitting the Township to repair or replace any vegetation or other modifications to the site in violation of the approved plans and to address the costs to the Association or land owners; 2) Will comply with Section 18.12 if lake access is desired for off-lake lots or if not suitable language will be included in the Master Deed prohibiting access; 3) Requirements as proposed by Township planner and engineer. Compliance with the foregoing conditions shall be undertaken on an administrative basis, with the applicant working in conjunction with the Planning Director who may consult with others. The applicant shall not be required to provide the following items for the reasons indicated: 1) Sidewalks will not be required; 2) On site detention basin should not be required and recommend this be waived by the Township Board. Commissioner Hines supported the motion.

Commissioner Hines said she likes the idea of a turn-around opposite lot 11 to provide a T-turn around so lot 12 does not end up being the turn-around point.

- Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to include this suggestion. Commissioner Hines supported the amended motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Steckling, Hines and Leddy; No: Lamont and Baker; Absent: Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 3 to 2 vote.
- 4. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales
 - Commissioner Hines moved that we recommend the Township Board adopt the amendment to Section 16.24 for Transient and Seasonal Display of products or materials intended for sale. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Rabaut and Moore. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Other Business:

1. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls set for the April Workshop meeting. Temporary Outdoor/Transient Sales is sent to the Township Board, recommended for approval. Review of P.L. District and R.C. District is set for the April Workshop meeting. Amend Section 18.08.8 Public Hearing is set for the April 18th meeting. Build Out/Traffic Study is TBD. Innovative Storm Water Management is TBD. Proposal to rezone properties at Andersonville & Farley

Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of March 21, 2005

Roads from R-1 to PL is pending review of P.L. District. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need is TBD. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Review Height and Area Coverage is set for the April Workshop meeting. Master Deed and By Law Enforcement is TBD.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary