

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
FINAL BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA**

**September 19, 2005**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:30 P.M.

**MINUTES:**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Items Not On Agenda

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** Site Plan  
1. Wilderness Estates - **07-21-101-008** - Final

**NEW BUSINESS:** Site Plan  
1. Miller Farms - **07-13-101-009** - Final  
2. Maxx Storage - **07-36-376-017** - Concept  
3. Robert Rich - Private Road - **07-31-451-005** - Concept  
4. Autumn Hills (PUD) - **07-05-126-001** - Concept

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Miscellaneous  
1. Priority List  
2. Rezoning **07-14-478-037** 9191 Dixie Hwy.

**NEXT MEETING DATE:** October 6 -- Workshop  
October 17, 2005 -- Business

**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 September 19, 2005**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the September 19, 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  
Paul Rabaut  
Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Bill Leddy

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

Chris Moore

**Consultants Present**

Randy Ford  
Sally Elmiger

**Staff Present**

Collin Walls  
Leon Genre  
Nancy Strole

**Approval of Minutes:**                      None

**Approval of Agenda:**

Chairperson Lamont asked to add as item #2 under Miscellaneous: Rezone Parcel ID #07-14-478-037; 9191 Dixie Highway.

There were no objections to this addition.

**Public Comment:**                      None

**Public Hearing:**                      None

**Unfinished Business:**

1.        Wilderness Estates #07-21-101-008 Final

Ms. Sally Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman said there are only two remaining outstanding items from her review. One is across from unit #17. There is an area impacting the required wetland boundary. Ms. Elmiger suggested ways in her review to improve that area and possibly include a boulder retaining wall. They do not have enough information to know what kind of grading will be done in that area. The second item is next to detention basin A. The applicant has added

sedimentation basins and some pretreatment to the stormwater and has redirected the outlet for the detention basin A away from the Shiawassee river. However, where that detention basin is now outletting, it is not going into the wetland, and she believes it is possible to change it to flow into the wetland and then make its way into the river. Carlisle/Wortman recommends final site plan approval as soon as those two items are addressed.

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC commented that most of their previous comments have been addressed. He had the same comment regarding basin A as Carlisle/Wortman, but they also suggested rather than aim in the direction where there is very little wetland area, that the applicant could turn it more in a southwesterly direction to give it more of a chance to dissipate. Mr. Ford said one concern he still has is with regard to the hydraulic modeling that the applicant has done of the stream flow through the property. HRC has requested that the applicant provide information and an actual copy of the model. In regard to the sewer system, the applicant needs to provide the O&M manual to HRC. There are discrepancies between the Exhibit B's and the construction plans and Mr. Ford noted those in his report for the applicant.

Mr. LaVanway explained that in regard to the basin A, he will look at redirecting the outlet further away from the river. With regard to the drive, he did specify a guard rail in his construction plans so their intent is to have minimal grading in this area. He will have a little bit of fill immediately behind the guard rail but will stay a good distance away from the wetland. Mr. LaVanway said he wrote a response letter to HRC and explained that for the next submittal, they will submit a table that specifies the lowest opening elevations. Regarding the hydraulic modeling, he will provide the data that has been reviewed by DEQ.

Commissioner Baker commented that he supports the request to eliminate sidewalks and the recommendation to complete an analysis of the screening after the roadway is constructed. He supports the recommendation to evaluate the street tree requirement after roadway construction and the recommendation of the Township engineer to increase the diameter of the outlet piping from the detention basins to four inches and the request of the Township engineer to receive all necessary hydrological information. He would like the Springfield Township Fire Department to be present at all controlled burns. Commissioner Baker said once that information is to the suitability of the Township engineer he would be in favor of supporting this proposal.

Commissioner Hines said she would support making a part of the motion that basin A be redirected. Commissioner Rabaut said he would agree with Commissioner Baker's comments and he believes it is very important that we verify that this will not be a flood prone situation for the residents.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to recommend final site plan approval for Wilderness Estates according to the plans and documentation submitted for review, date stamped by the Township September 7, 2005. This recommendation is based upon review of the foregoing submissions, as 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 other applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following**

**additional findings of fact are relevant to this application: 1) A Consent Judgment has been entered into regarding this development. The following conditions are attached to this recommendation: 1) Screening between land uses shall be evaluated after the roadways have been constructed; 2) the necessity for additional street trees shall be evaluated after the roadways have been constructed; 3) items #1 and #3 under the HRC letter dated 8-18-05 under the heading "Site Grading and Drainage," paragraphs 1 and 2 under the heading "site utilities" and paragraphs 1 through 5 of Exhibit B drawings shall be added as additional conditions compliance with those; 4) satisfaction of item #3 in the Carlisle/Wortman letter dated 8-17-05, 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 sidewalks due to the sensitive nature of the site. Commissioner Hines supported the motion.**

**Commissioner Baker said he would like to not lose the fact that controlled burns would be linked with the Springfield Township Fire Department having control. Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to include this. Commissioner Hines supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

### **New Business:**

1. Miller Farms – 07-13-101-009 – Final

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman said, regarding the amount of open space, the applicant did widen the corridor of open space at the rear of lots 3 thru 5 from 20' to 60' and amended some other lots by approximately 10 feet. There is some transition between this property and some abutting property and there is a wetland to the west that the applicant would like to keep visible, therefore the Planning Commission needs to decide what it thinks is appropriate for that transition along the west boundary. Ms. Elmiger said the Township Board previously looked at this plan and required that an access easement from the existing home be made to the proposed roadway; however, the applicant and the homeowner do not want that. Ms. Elmiger does think that the detention basin could be amended slightly to give it a more aesthetic appearance rather than an engineering appearance. Additional information needs to be added to the landscape plan such as some tree sizes don't meet the ordinance requirements and she was looking for a note regarding restoration of the disturbed areas next to the roadways. Specific information regarding the sign location and design needs to be provided. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman recommends final approval once these items have been resolved.

Mr. Ford of HRC said one issue he has is with the amount of site grading required to accommodate the proposed infrastructure. It is dictated by the configuration of the roadway and the applicants desire to mass grade and have the building pad set up for construction of the various building units. Much of the site is proposed to be mass graded with the exception of some of the natural buffer area shown at the south end. There are steep slopes and rolling terrain

but with the exception of the buffer areas along the west, it is devoid of trees. Some of the steep slopes will be graded out again to balance the site and set it up for future construction. Mr. Ford said the detention requirement has been pretty well resolved. Although the basin was sized appropriately some of the calculations did not meet the Township's standards but as it works out, the basin is adequately sized and all the applicant needs to do is nominal raising of the outlet control structure to get a little bit more capacity and provide the required 1 foot of freeboard and they will have the 25 year storage volume. Mr. Ford said the applicant has provided the review of the Road Commission and has met the Township requirement. In regard to the Health Department, the correspondence that HRC had was a denial and he is not sure if the Health Department has since given approval. Mr. Ford said the Exhibit B drawings do need some updating.

Mr. Tad Kreer of Land Design Studio explained that the entry is no longer a boulevard but also contains a widened area at the entry for school buses and children waiting. The buffer has been significantly increased in some areas including the southeast boundary. All the areas to the west have views of the wetland complex and the applicant believes it is a disservice to their development to plant a screening wall. Minor changes in the lots resulted in increasing the open space slightly by a little over one acre. The applicant added a gazebo and possibly a future garden area. In regard to the storm water management area, Mr. Kreer said he feels a linear system for the pond will be most effective with a series of basins. They did specify a special seed mix that would be compatible with prairie type plants proposed. Mr. Kreer said they pulled all the evergreens to the perimeter of the property and integrated the oak trees and other large deciduous trees throughout. Mr. Kreer said regarding grading, they have worked to increase the road grade significantly and do not have trees that will be impacted as part of the mass grading.

Commissioner Baker asked the applicant to comment on the request for an easement. Mr. Dale Frankel said they viewed this as a negative for the development and the adjacent owner did not want it and in their view it just did not make any sense. Commissioner Baker said the motion from the Board "requests" an easement and does not require it however, it simply sets the land aside for future use.

Commissioner Leddy asked if there are any allowances at the entrance to Davisburg Rd. for an easement to provide for future pathways? Mr. Kreer said there is adequate room to provide an easement. Chairperson Lamont asked the applicant if they were willing to provide an easement? Mr. Frenkel said that would not be a problem.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he likes the proposed gathering area and the gazebo. He likes the changes to the entryway and the fact that the applicant would be willing to provide an easement at Davisburg Rd. There is a sign issue and Commissioner Rabaut said he believes it is appropriate to balance it out with two logos. He agrees with the applicant that there should not be an access point to the existing home.

Commissioner Baker said he understands the applicants request not to screen the wetland area but he did not consider what anyone else may see from the outside. He feels that may be something to evaluate as this proposal goes forward.

Commissioner Hines said, because the surrounding property is residential, the applicant has provided adequate screening and buffering and nothing further is necessary.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to recommend final site plan approval for Miller Farms according to the plans and documentation submitted for review, date stamped by the Township 8-25-05. This recommendation is based upon review of the foregoing submissions as well as the written reviews of the 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 other applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following additional findings of fact are relevant to this application: 1) this property has been approved for a Special Land Use and the Cluster option. The following conditions are attached to this recommendation: 1) screening/landscaping/greenbelt to be established including the possible reconfiguration of the detention pond administratively after the road construction is complete; 2) unresolved engineering concerns as expressed in the HRC letter dated 9-6-05 shall be handled administratively; 3) the provision of an easement of at least 8 feet for a bike/safety/sidewalk path along Davisburg and Bridge Lake Rd. will be provided. 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 sidewalks based on the rural nature of the area and the lack of necessity for them. Commissioner Baker supported the motion.**

Commissioner Rabaut said the motion did not cover the sign issue or the access easement to the existing house. Commissioner Steckling said it was intention not to mention that easement.

- **Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to include a dual logo sign, downsized to meet the ordinance. Commissioner Baker supported the amended motion.**
- **Chairperson Lamont suggested adding to the motion, that the mass grading would provide general elevation for home sites so that it eliminates double mass grading when home sites are put in. He further noted that the applicant has put septic on his prints and suggested that the septic to be generally as shown on the prints be added to the motion so the septic can be moved around to provide the best possible location on the sites. Commissioner Rabaut amended his motion to include these changes. Commissioner Baker supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

2. Maxx Storage – 07-36-376-017 - Concept

Ms. Elmiger said the applicant is proposing to build a self storage facility in two phases. The first phase will contain a 13,000 sq. ft. office and climate controlled storage building and two

mini storage buildings for a total of an additional 13,300 sq. ft. The second phase will include nine additional self storage buildings. Ms. Elmiger said screening of existing residential properties will be required and natural resources will be preserved to the maximum extent possible. Carlisle/Wortman had comments regarding the storm water system and how it may potentially impact the ground water and how pollutants will be filtered from the storm water before it reaches the ground water. Regarding landscaping of the retention basin, she questioned how it may be amended to improve the environmental functioning of the storm water facility? Regarding setbacks, Ms. Elmiger thought the building is higher than the allowed height under the ordinance. Under natural resources, she asked to have any soil borings that were made in the septic area shown on the plans. Regarding site access circulation and parking, she noted some concerns regarding the extent of pavement on the property. The number of parking spaces is more than required in the ordinance, however, she does not see it as a problem. In regard to safety paths and sidewalks, she suggested adding a sidewalk from the climate control building to the office and further suggested potentially adding some area for the future development of a safety path across the front of the property. Ms. Elmiger said the proposed retention basin is being proposed to be excavated to the same level as the high water mark for ground water in July. This may be a lower level than may be there during high water times so she is curious how pollutants will be filtered before they reach the retention basin. Ms. Elmiger asked how emergency vehicles will access the site when it is locked?

Mr. Randy Ford said with regard to site grades, the site is fairly flat with the exception of a pronounced hill at the southeast corner. It is his understanding that that may be knocked down and is under discussion. With regard to site drainage, the applicant shows a basin and has sized it in accordance with Township standards. However, there is a requirement that there be an evaluation of an overflow in the event that the basin should fill up. He suggested they set up the system so there is a way to backflow through the storm sewer system towards the large pond to the south by way of agreement with that property owner. Mr. Ford noted that the Township ordinance require the applicant to address the need for improvements at the entrance. The internal circulation pattern seems to be adequate in terms of radius for fire trucks and emergency vehicles. The sites will be developed with on site well and septic and have indicated that the applicant should provide correspondence from the Health Department and identify the location of the septic tank and fields.

Mr. Tim Affolder of Hexagon General Contractors, said they are proposing to build this project in three stages with a total of approximately twelve buildings. Storage for RV's and boats would be developed with phase 1 as indicated on the plan and they have intention of building the entire storm sewer structure with a fence with phase 1 and landscaping would be on the outside of the fenced areas. Mr. Affolder said he is looking at proposing part of the retention pond system with perforated pipe in between structures to dissipate some of the storm water before it ever gets to the detention pond. The buildings facing Andersonville Rd. would be made of either stone or brick to have an attractive appearance. He has applied for a variance as the ordinance requires a masonry pier, and he would like to use a prefinished metal pier. Mr. Affolder said he believes screening from residential properties is important and intends to accommodate the neighbors. He also has no problem allowing a 10 foot easement for a safety path in front of the property.

Commissioner Baker said lighting will be an issue and the applicant should take into account the abutting residential area.

Commissioner Rabaut said he agrees with the comments by the Planner and Engineer. The height of the building looks to him like a sign or billboard, and believes it is five feet too high beyond the ordinance requirements. Mr. Genre, Building/Planning Director, said he is going to ask the applicant to add to his ZBA application an interpretation from the ZBA for the height in a commercial area to see if it meets the intent of the exceptions that are listed in the ordinance.

Chairperson Lamont said he would encourage the applicant not to utilize a chain link fence for the sections that abut residential. He would like to see a pathway easement as offered by the applicant. Chairperson Lamont said colors and materials will need to be provided and he agrees that the ordinance will require masonry construction. It would be imperative that he see a fire alarm system approved by our fire chief and installed and regarding the retention basin, he would like to see the suggestions by HRC in the plans when it comes back for final site plan review.

3. Robert Rich – Private Road – 07-31-451-005 – Concept

Ms. Elmiger said this parcel is located within the Schmitt Lake MNFI area with a rating of 9 out of 11. The existing conditions show that clearing and grading has been conducted and during this process some silt fencing was knocked down which allowed extensive erosion into the northern wetland and a portion of the buffer has been removed. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman supports HRC's suggestions for storm water management facilities and also recommends that, where possible, the wetland buffer be revegetated with native species. As far as ordinance requirements for the road go, it is 1,290 feet long and would require one tree for every 30 lineal feet or 22 trees. However, because the site is heavily wooded, she recommends a field inspection after the road is installed to see if existing vegetation will meet the street tree requirements.

Mr. Ford commented that there will have to be a road maintenance agreement in place for various properties accessing this roadway. He noted that there is a discrepancy on some of the callouts on the road cross-section and the applicant needs to clean up the plan to correct that. While Township ordinance requires road improvements, by virtue of the fact there are only a few lots here, it is probably not going to qualify per the Road Commission's criteria for those improvements.

Mr. Mark Adams, representing the owners and the design engineer, said his calculations on the wetlands and the natural drain and what they will add to that, will have no effect on the surrounding properties. He is asking not to do any detention basins to limit anymore disruption of the area. To move the road any further to the south, he would have to take out more trees and will be seeking some comments regarding storm water area.

Commissioner Baker said there is severe grade and is curious how the applicant will protect the slope? Mr. Adams said they are working with some retaining wall issues.



Commissioner Leddy said the sight lines are not good on this road and felt the applicant should consider making a wider apron at the entrance from Ormond Rd.

Commissioner Leddy asked if utilities would be underground? Mr. Adams said, yes. Commissioner Rabaut said he is not a fan of gates across roads. Commissioner Steckling said he believes there should be an easement and maintenance agreement with the road.

Chairperson Lamont said he is concerned about the existing wetland encroachment and getting utilities through that area without any damage. MDEQ and Drain Commission permits must be obtained. He concurs with Commissioner Rabaut about the gate at the entrance. Chairperson Lamont said he also has an issue with the development of the road without assuring that the roadway drainage does not sheet flow into the wetlands and perhaps swales would be appropriate.

4. Autumn Hills (PUD) 07-05-126-001 - Concept

Ms. Elmiger said this proposal straddles Springfield Township and Groveland Township. The applicant is proposing a mixed development of commercial, office and residential uses on two parcels that straddle the boundary. There is no indication how much will be commercial but the plan does show 85 residential units. The Master Plan designates this as low-density residential and the proposed land uses are not consistent with the Master Plan. The type of residential being proposed is homes on small lots but no details have been submitted.

Mr. Ford said he felt the applicant could clarify the intention with respect to the infrastructure, the roadway and how they envision it in terms of ownership and maintenance responsibility. Mr. Ford said additional details are needed including making sure there is adequate space to accommodate the proposed infrastructure as well as the utilities.

Mr. Helminski said this is approximately 24 acres on the residential side and approximately 15 acres on the commercial side. On the commercial side, the idea in the proposal is not for a specific site plan approval but for an area plan approval with specific uses being permitted in the OS and C-2 Zoning District understanding that there are some uses that they and the Township feel would be inappropriate.

Commissioner Leddy said the proposed plan does not come anywhere close to the density recommended for that area and he would like to see more complete plans before moving forward with this proposal.

Commissioner Steckling said he has trouble with the logistics and the fact that this is totally opposite from our Master Plan.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that this proposal is in total conflict of the Master Plan and he believes it could be detrimental to the community and could raise the risk of ground water pollution.

Chairperson Lamont commented that the transition from office/commercial to residential is a possibility of the PUD that the applicant used and could be further enhanced but it would have to be more of a planned mixed use involving residential with the ability to walk to the commercial. He does not believe the plan meets a PUD in Springfield Township and there is no open space. The proposed tot-lot is the only open space on the entire residential portion of the plan and our character calls for a lot of open space.

Mr. Robinson said they would appreciate the opportunity to work with a sub-committee from the Planning Commission and Groveland Township.

### **Other Business:**

1. Rezoning of Parcel I.D. #07-14-478-037 / 9191 Dixie Highway
  - **Commissioner Steckling moved to set for Public Hearing the rezoning application for Parcel I.D. 07-14-478-037 for the first available date. Commissioner Hines 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.**
2. Priority List

There were no changes to the priority list.

### **Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary