

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA**

April 7, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 3, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: **Ordinance Amendments**
Discussion

1. Amendment Screening, Fences and Walls (Section 16.13)
2. Amendment Public Lands (PL) & Resource Conservation (RC)

NEW BUSINESS: **Discussion**

1. Lot Coverage Standards
2. Pathway Systems

MISCELLANEOUS: 1. Priority List

NEXT MEETING DATE: April 18, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting
May 5, 2005 – Workshop

ADJOURNMENT:

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission –Workshop Meeting
Minutes of April 7, 2005**

Call to Order: Vice Chairperson John Steckling called the April 7, 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

John Steckling
Chris Moore
Paul Rabaut
Dean Baker
Bill Leddy

Commissioner(s) Absent

Roger Lamont
Ruth Ann Hines

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Mary Blundy

Consultants Present

Dick Carlisle

Approval of Minutes: March 3, 2005

Commissioner Baker moved to approve the Minutes of March 3, 2005. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Steckling, Moore, Rabaut, Baker and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Lamont and Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.

Approval of Agenda:

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as presented.

Public Comment:

Supervisor Walls commented that the plan for Sunset Bluffs will come back to the next Planning Commission Business meeting because it should not have been approved. Supervisor Walls said that under no circumstances should the Planning Commission approve a plan with so much information missing. The applicant specifically asked not to be considered for a final approval. He asked the Planning Commission to please not approve plans that are so incomplete and then pass them on to the Township Board.

Unfinished Business:

1. Amendment to Screening, Fences and Walls – Section 16.13

Mr. Carlisle said, under subsection 2, he added at the request of the Planning Commission, to permit a fence of additional height in closer proximity to the house of up to six feet to provide

more privacy. In regard to item 4 of the amendment, he added an allowance for up to an eight-foot height above the finished floor of the deck or the finished grade around a deck or patio. Mr. Carlisle said he added in subsection 5, “fences, screening walls, or screening structures,” thus expanding that paragraph from just simply referring to fences, regarding the types of materials.

Commissioner Baker said the proposed changes appear to address the issues raised at the last meeting.

Commissioner Leddy commented that perhaps we should consider “non-residential” lake frontage to be included instead of just “residential.”

Commissioner Rabaut said he has been opposed to this change because it allows fencing on the lakeshore. However, this legislation is a vast improvement over what we currently have and would support the ordinance amendments. Commissioner Moore said he agrees that the proposed changes address the issues previously raised.

Vice Chairperson Steckling said Commissioner Leddy’s point regarding “non-residential” deserves more discussion to make sure we are certain that we are where we want to be.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to set a Public Hearing at the earliest possible time for the proposed amendments to Section 16.13. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Steckling, Moore, Rabaut, Baker and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Lamont and Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

2. Amendments to Public Lands (PL) & Resource Conservation (RC)

Mr. Carlisle provided a map to the Commissioners showing what lands are currently zoned PL and RC. When the RC district was established in 1990, it was an attempt to reflect land in the community that was more expansive in nature and had some resource value to it. Mr. Carlisle explained that the PL district was prepared to designate publicly owned property such as schools, Township owned property, fire stations, road commission sites, etc. There are many similarities between the two districts because they were drafted at the same time; therefore, many uses reflected are the same. Mr. Carlisle suggested rethinking the whole concept in what we are trying to accomplish with both of these districts. The draft of changes provided was basically a clean up of language but is not any fundamental change in concept. Mr. Carlisle said he thinks we should evaluate what we’re trying to do and then redraft the language in terms of what is appropriate.

Mr. Genre, Planning Director, commented that the Resource Conservation District Section 4 – Intent - pretty much sums everything up. Mr. Genre said he would like to see this paragraph stop after “water resources” and eliminate everything after “encourage agricultural and other...” He explained that things such as agricultural, farming, golf course and equestrian uses is not in the first part of the intent. When you look at the golf courses, developers do not protect a lot of wildlife and are not into creating amenities for fish and wildlife habitat. When looking at the 4-H Fairgrounds, that is not their intent either. Mr. Genre said he would like to see the Resource Conservation District consist of properties such as Shiawassee and other areas that are preserving

fish and wildlife. Mr. Genre said then, possibly recreating “recreational facilities” for areas such as golf courses to paintball facilities to campgrounds. Mr. Carlisle noted that the large expanses of what we have as resource conservation is public land. Perhaps we should make that all PL and what few pieces we have zoned as RC and are more recreational could be kept RC but make it Recreation Conservation, therefore, creating a new district.

Commissioner Leddy asked about the property that is already dedicated to a conservation society or land conservancy? Mr. Carlisle said all of that property is already covered by restricted covenants.

Commissioner Rabaut asked why we could not fold all of these into one district? Supervisor Walls said, just because something is public does not mean it is resource conservation.

Commissioner Baker said he does not think we should call all of these areas the same thing and thinks we need to bring some clarity to Public Land and Resource Conservation. However, clarity means dividing the areas up. Commissioner Moore said he agrees with comments made by Commissioner Baker but would hate to lose the word “Resource” in Conservation. Mr. Carlisle said this is something we will have to continue to review and work on. He explained that the Township’s philosophy of what constitutes Resource Conservation is significantly different than what other large public agencies view as Resource Conservation.

- **Commissioner Baker moved to recommend that the Township Planner and Township Building Director give consideration to the Public Lands and Resource Conservation Zoning Districts and make recommendations back to the Planning Commission that covers the various property uses that today exist in these areas and should be suitably assigned to them in the future. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Steckling, Moore, Rabaut, Baker and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Lamont and Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Lot Coverage Standards

Vice Chairperson Steckling suggested deferring this discussion to another meeting because Chairperson Lamont is not present, and this was originally his request.

There was unanimous consent to defer this to the next workshop meeting.

2. Pathway Systems

Supervisor Walls explained that at the Township Board Special Priorities Meeting, one item that appeared high on the list was the pathway system. It was agreed to by the Board to ask the Planning Commission to look at the portion of the Master Plan that includes the pathways and make sure it is reasonably current. Implied in that, was to review other activities which have

taken place with Oakland County Trail Advisory Council. The Planning Commission is also being asked to review the ordinances to see if we should modify those ordinances to require pathway systems from developers on all of our major roads, or of all developers.

Commissioner Baker said we have had discussions with developers about sidewalks or “pathways” and there was liability issues raised by some developers with regard to where these are placed. If they are in the road right-of-way, the developer surrenders rights to the road commission. If we require the developer to put the pathway on their own property, then easements must be declared and if someone is hurt on the pathway, the developer or owner is responsible. Supervisor Walls said if we require developers to put in parking lots, or do things on their own property that they may be liable for, then this is no different.

Mr. Genre asked if the Township Board had discussion regarding the existing properties that currently do not have designated pathways and if they are going to establish a pathway fund? He also asked if it was discussed how paths would be interconnected? Supervisor Walls said it was not discussed very specifically but it was asked about connection. The answer is, if we don’t start with the pieces now, there would be nothing to connect in the future.

Mr. Carlisle noted that Independence Township is a good example, they have been requiring this since 1980. They have required developers to install pathways in accordance with their safety path plan, they have renewed millages at least twice that he is aware of, and they have utilized grants.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to request Carlisle/Wortman to review the Township’s Master Plan for its pathway systems and compare it to the Oakland County Trail Network Plans and to provide suggestions with respect as to how to implement the pathway plan including funding. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Steckling, Moore, Rabaut, Baker and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Lamont and Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

Other Business:

1. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls (Section 16.13) are complete and will be set for Public Hearing. Review PL District and RC District are set to come back for the June 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 Roads from R-1 to PL is deleted from the Priority List until the outcome of the PL District. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need is TBD. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Review of Lot Coverage is moved to the May Workshop Meeting. Master Deed and By-Law Enforcement is TBD.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Vice Chairperson Steckling adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary