

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA**

May 5, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 7, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

Ordinance Amendments

Discussion

1. Article XXV - Lot Coverage Standards
2. Article XVIII Section 18.13 5(d) Pedestrian Pathway
Systems (Dixie Overlay District)

MISCELLANEOUS: 1. Priority List

NEXT MEETING DATE: May 16, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting
June 2, 2005 – Workshop

ADJOURNMENT:

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA**

May 5, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 7, 2005 Planning Commission Workshop

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

Ordinance Amendments

Discussion

1. Article XXV - Lot Coverage Standards
2. Article XVIII Section 18.13 5(d) Pedestrian Pathway
Systems (Dixie Overlay District)

MISCELLANEOUS: 1. Priority List

NEXT MEETING DATE: May 16, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting
June 2, 2005 – Workshop

ADJOURNMENT:

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission –Workshop Meeting
Minutes of May 5, 2005**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the May 5, 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
Chris Moore
Ruth Ann Hines
Dean Baker

Commissioner(s) Absent

Bill Leddy
Paul Rabaut

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Mary Blundy
Collin Walls
Nancy Strole

Consultants Present

Dick Carlisle

Approval of Minutes: April 7, 2005

Commissioner Baker noted that there was a spelling error of Commissioner Steckling's name.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the April 7, 2005 minutes as amended. Commissioner Moore supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Moore, Hines and Baker; No: none; Absent: Leddy and Rabaut. The motion carried by a 5 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as published.

Public Comment: None

Unfinished Business: None

New Business:

1. Article XXV – Lot Coverage Standards

Mr. Carlisle said he compared the ordinance to a variety of other communities and the bottom line is, Springfield Township's are too high, particularly in R-1, R-2 and R-3. In regard to the

commercial and industrial districts, we also have fairly high coverage requirements when compared to other communities. Most communities average 40% lot coverage requirements in commercial areas. Typically, there are higher lot coverage requirements in industrial areas because there is usually less parking requirements. Mr. Carlisle said, after reviewing many previous plans, he did not see many examples where the Township actually reached these minimum lot coverage requirements. He suggested looking at a reduction in lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Carlisle said several communities are looking at, not just lot coverage by buildings, but looking at total lot coverage by all impervious surfaces in an attempt to try to reduce impervious surface on a site.

Chairperson Lamont said he likes that thought but part of the reason for bringing up this subject, is from a legal standpoint. He wanted to make sure the Township is protected when we have large developments come before the Board, and when everything is added in, we are over 100%.

Mr. Carlisle noted that we are still not getting the message to many people (submitting site plans) regarding storm water management. We are still seeing much of the same single method solutions, and this could be one method to try to encourage more appropriate use of multiple management practices rather than just piping storm water into a retention basin.

Commissioner Steckling said he initially thought that no matter how hard we tried, we could not come close to matching the saturation standards the ordinance provides. He said we can change it, but he is not sure it's worth spending the money to mess around with it because it can't be achieved anyway. Commissioner Steckling said the impervious surface issue is another subject, and, is not sure he is excited about it because it is minimizing even more what can be built on a given piece of land.

Mr. Genre said, Mr. Carlisle has the right idea to look at this as an impervious surface. We could easily get up to 60 to 70% of lot coverage with our requirements and impervious surface is probably the way to view this.

Supervisor Walls said he agrees that impervious surface should be the test rather than the building. However, he does not see that this is a major issue in the Township now, in the past or in the near future.

Clerk Strole said she would concur that impervious surface should be the benchmark. She does not necessarily agree with the percentage cut-off.

Chairperson Lamont said one thing he does see with our current percentages of requirement is that it could be misleading to developers coming into the Township. His recommendation, although he likes the idea of looking at total impervious surface, perhaps it would be simpler, more efficient and less misleading to potential developers if we just looked at the percentages of lot coverage.

Commissioner Moore said he has the same concerns as Commissioner Steckling with residential runoff in lakes and asked why we cannot regulate or permit that type of asphalt on a residential lot? Mr. Genre said, we would have to write an ordinance. Supervisor Walls explained that the State of Michigan says we cannot require permits on residential structures of 200 square feet or less or commercial structures of 400 square feet or less.

Commissioner Baker said, although this has not been an issue, he thought that was the mission of the Planning Commission, to provide clarity and comprehensiveness wherever we can. He believes it is warranted to begin the process to review this issue.

- **Chairperson Lamont moved that we take Lot Coverage Standards, Article 25 for further review of the Office/Service, C-1, C-2, M-1 and M-2 Districts with the intent to reduce lot coverage/building footprint sizes to be more in sync with what is actually buildable, and surrounding Townships, and recommended we send this to Carlisle/Wortman for review. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont and Baker; No: Moore, Steckling and Hines; Absent: Leddy and Rabaut. The motion failed by a 3 to 2 vote.**

2. Article XVIII Section 18.13 5 (d) Pedestrian Pathway Systems (Dixie Overlay District)

Mr. Carlisle explained that there are established goals in the pathway plan. At the time this was developed, the commitment and concern was not as immediate as is now. He noted the Commission may want to think about bringing more specificity to the plan as it is and perhaps looking at routing, specific goals and objectives and try to further develop priority routing. Mr. Carlisle said it is imperative to identify partners in the project such as the Road Commission and MDOT. There are other entities important in the entire process and the effort of trails is going on countywide and establishing a pathway committee may be something to consider. Mr. Carlisle said the Township must identify some source of public funding and there are many grant programs available. He does not believe this could be a successful plan without some form of public funding.

Chairperson Lamont commented that this issue came about from the Township Board looking for the Commission's objective and recommendation. Commissioner Hines said it seems that this would be a big commitment on the part of the Township Board in terms of funding. Chairperson Lamont said, or the residents. Supervisor Walls explained that the Planning Commission will, for the most part, have to implement the plan. If they do not believe it is or should be a priority, then they will not be inclined to require pathways on plans and therefore it will go nowhere.

Chairperson Lamont asked if the Planning Commission does in fact support pathways and support them with ordinances that would interconnect future pathways? If we are committed to pathways, we must have the ordinances in place and hopefully, we can find the funding through various entities to support the ordinance. The Planning Commission must also review the current plan and prioritize which sections we feel are most important to start with and which

development areas should be required to construct pathways in front of their development. We must also decide where to require the pathways, whether they be in the road right-of-ways or off the right-of-ways.

Mrs. Zona Sommers, 10730 Clark Road, said the Planning Commission should get residential input from the beginning to see if there is interest, and that would help with funding. Chairperson Lamont said he does not disagree, but believes we need to get past this point first.

Commissioner Hines asked if the Parks Commission should play any kind of role in this plan? Mr. Carlisle said, absolutely, yes. Clerk Strole commented that there is a countywide trail system and a coalition that could be worked with.

Commissioner Steckling said he is in favor of doing something, it is a great idea and is unfortunate that money is an object. At the bare minimum, we should require at least an easement for the pathway. Commissioner Hines said she supports the pathway plans. Commissioner Moore said he supports pathways. Commissioner Baker said he supports pathways.

Chairperson Lamont said the first step is to look at the ordinances and establish priorities. Mr. Carlisle said they must decide which side of the road the pathway would be constructed on. Chairperson Lamont asked the Planning Commission to be prepared with ideas for discussion at the next Workshop Meeting.

Other Business:

1. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls, is set for Public Hearing at the May 16 Business meeting. Review PL and RC Districts is set for June 2. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Build Out/Traffic Study is TBD. Innovative Storm Water Management is TBD. Pathway Systems is set for the June Workshop meeting. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need is TBD and Review Lot Coverage is deleted for lack of support.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary