

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of June 20, 2005**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the June 20, 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
Bill Leddy
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioner(s) Absent

Chris Moore

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Collin Walls
Leon Genre

Approval of Minutes: May 16, 2005

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to approve the Minutes of May 16, 2005 as submitted. Commissioner Steckling 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.**

Approval of Agenda:

Supervisor Walls asked to add to the agenda as item #2 of Other Business, Meeting Information Schedule.

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as revised.

Public Comment: None

Public Hearing: None

Unfinished Business:

1. Harrington Funeral Home – 07-13-351-002 Final Site Plan

Mr. Genre, Springfield Township Planning Director, explained that the changes with this plan were landscape buffering requirements, enhancement to the seating area and the pedestrian area. The applicant has done enhancement to these areas and has redesigned the landscape areas between the funeral home and the residential building to the southeast. The landscaping proposed by the applicant is supposed to be designed to the Township's new screening ordinance even though it appears that the plantings and such on the two-foot berm did not need it. Mr. Genre said the only area he feels is of concern at this time is in front of the banked area parking. It does not appear the applicant has added landscaping at this time. However, he feels the applicant has come significantly farther than they were previously and they have done a good job.

Mr. Hertz of Pumford Construction explained that he has included digital photos of existing vegetation around the site. He would like to work with the existing vegetation in providing the screening. The screens are designed to complement the existing vegetation around the site. He explained that there are huge evergreens on the site that provide year-round screening but he does propose to remove the proposed white spruce because of the existing large evergreens. Mr. Hertz said he has reduced the size of the parking lot and impervious surface. He has enlarged the pedestrian plaza to 18' x 18' and included an irrigated rock garden. He has also enhanced the seating area behind the funeral home in the hope that they can count that as their second feature.

Mr. Jim Scharl of Kieft Engineering confirmed that the changes were primarily of a landscape nature and there were no changes in the actual engineering plan. Mr. Ford of HRC confirmed that the applicant has all of the required agency reviews in at this point.

Commissioner Baker commented that this plan has had extensive reviews but the Planning Commission has not seen it for a couple of months. Regarding the two features required, he feels the two features proposed by the applicant does meet the criteria of the Planned Development Option. Commissioner Baker said he is not comfortable that the opacity requirements will be achieved and thought perhaps that could be evaluated at the end of the process to guarantee the opacity requirements are met for the neighboring properties. Commissioner Baker asked the applicant to clarify where the vehicle stacking will occur. Mr. Hertz said the most recent plan shows stacking of 80 cars and does not stack in the driveway due to the emergency vehicle reasons. He indicated on the plans how the stacking will work.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that the parking allotment seems reasonable and the plan seems to be ready to move forward. The only thing missing is the complete lighting and illumination plan. His only other concern is that none of the plans since April 27th have been looked at by the planning consultants and believes that they should be at some point.

Commissioner Steckling said it appears there is no screening on the property on the parking side adjacent to the OS district. Commissioner Steckling said he does not know if the second patio behind the funeral home constitutes the definition of a second feature.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he believes the design along Dixie Highway qualifies as a community design feature and due to the internal pathways, the enhanced patio seating area to the rear can qualify. He believes the pathway and the redesigned crosswalk is a nice safety feature. The lighting plan, in his opinion, does qualify and the Oakland County permit issues have been resolved. Chairperson Lamont said he was at the site last night and believes there are still landscaping questions in all of the Commissioner's minds. It is his opinion that the width on the south side could be increased. In the north to the rear of the retention pond, the applicant would have difficulty widening that up but he believes they could satisfy the commission if they changed some of the mixture. In the southeast side adjacent to the building, the applicant has it scaled out as only 12 feet wide and that is all the space they have; it does abut to residents and he feels it would comply if it were enhanced with some other plantings. Chairperson Lamont said he does believe the area adjacent to the lawn banked parking area for 18 cars that some sort of intermittent shrubs or trees could be placed to break up headlights and/or the movement of cars.

Supervisor Walls asked Ms. Elmiger what her opinion and input in reference to the landscape number 3 in relationship to this particular plan and is 30-foot the test or is 80% opacity the test? Ms. Elmiger said she would think the opacity would be the test and the narrower the landscaping area, the denser the plantings will be. In regard to omitting the evergreen trees where there are trees along this property line, she does not know if she would suggest that because the evergreens are getting thin on the bottom. Chairperson Lamont asked if we could count screening on an adjacent parcel? Ms. Elmiger said she has always interpreted the ordinance that screening is required on the property that is being developed.

- **Chairperson Lamont moved that based upon the information received from the applicant and reflected in the Minutes he believes the final site plan for Harrington Funeral Home, plan date-stamped June 9, 2005 by Springfield Township does currently meet criteria contained in Section 18.07 and in Section 18.13 of the Zoning Ordinance and therefore recommend approval to the Township Board. This motion is conditioned on the following: That the landscaping adjacent to the funeral home to the southeast approximately 100 feet long be screened to 80% opacity at the time of installation; that the landscaping adjacent to the lawn banked parking area approximately 120 feet long be broken up with evergreen type plantings staggered at not greater than 20 feet apart to break up headlights; that the landscape area adjacent to the R-2 parcel on the south be enhanced as wide as possible without affecting the drainage of the site up to 30 feet or without affecting the rear of the parking lot, that area is on the southeast from the shed to the southwest corner approximately 150 feet long; that the screening to the northwest approximately 100 feet long just to the rear of the detention basin be screened to 80% opacity at the time of installation, realizing that it cannot be 30 feet wide and the screen that actually appears to be on the edge of the retention basin be screened in like manner, 80% opacity at the time of installation. Also conditioned that the evergreen plantings proposed on page L-2 of the plan not be**

altered and not reduce the number of pines put in the planting. Also included in the motion, that the community design features meet the criteria for the Planned Development Option and the Dixie Highway Overlay District. Also that native vegetation be used for swales and detention basins and that the swale to be located to the inside of the northwest property line be included in the final design which is not shown on the landscape plan. Commissioner Baker supported the motion.

Commissioner Baker asked that any future office building on this site is not a part of this evaluation? Chairperson Lamont confirmed that is correct. Commissioner Steckling asked if the motion should include that we will waive ordinance requirements in regard to parking and permit the number of spaces shown.

- **Chairperson Lamont amended his motion to approve the parking as shown on the prints and agree with 62 plus 18 overflow as shown on prints dated May 9, 2005. 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.**

New Business:

1. Valvoline Instant Oil Change 07-14-401-014 – Final Site Plan

Chairperson Lamont noted that the car wash has been eliminated from the proposed plan as previously submitted.

Mr. Robert Tamm, owner of Valvoline Instant Oil Change commented that with respect to traffic flow, by eliminating the car wash they eliminated 1/3 of the asphalt area and now have much better stacking and circulation.

Ms. Elmiger noted that the applicant shows a patio in front to meet the open space and community design feature requirement and needs to point out what the second amenity would be. In regard to pedestrian circulation, this building shows a client waiting area and she would like to make sure that they are still encouraging customers to remain in their car. The applicant does show a one-foot wide asphalt path along Dixie Highway. The sign base does not appear to coordinate with the building and she suggests that possibly the applicant create a more cohesive design. Regarding the screening of the adjacent property, Ms. Elmiger said it currently does not meet the standards of the new screening ordinance. Under natural resources, Carlisle/Wortman feels this proposal is much less intrusive upon the natural environment. However, she would like to know if the applicant has considered using a boulder retaining wall for the back of the retention basin. Regarding site access, a loading area needs to be shown on the plans and the maneuvering lane must be 18-feet wide. Ms. Elmiger said they do ask if there would be a sump pump in the basement where the oil tanks would be located and how fluids would stay out of the sump pump. In regard to landscaping, Ms. Elmiger said several things needed to be added to the landscape plan and need more details on the dumpster screen. She asked if the sign would be backlit and how the Valvoline sign would be lit and in regard to size, the proposed sign is over

the size limit. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman recommends final approval once the issues have all been addressed.

Mr. Randy Ford said in regard to site access, the need for accel/decel lanes has not been addressed as of the date of this report but he believes a deceleration is a good compromise but the acceleration lane is not critical. The applicant agreed that if the Township feels road improvements are necessary, a deceleration lane would be more beneficial than an acceleration lane. The driveway on the south side does not meet the 18-foot requirement. Regarding site grading, the applicant has eliminated a lot of grading in the rear by eliminating the car wash. However, Mr. Ford said he feels there is still quite a bit of post grading due to the configuration of the basin. He suggested some boulder wall treatment but the applicant indicated they did not want this. Mr. Ford said the detention basin does meet the Township requirements with 1 on 6 slopes. He indicated he does not have a copy of the Drain Commissioners review of the soil erosion control permit application but the applicant has indicated it is in process and likewise with the proposed septic system.

Chairperson Lamont asked how much grading could be reduced by the installation of a boulder wall? Mr. Ford said the applicant could reduce it significantly.

Commissioner Hines asked the applicant what the hesitation is with the boulder wall suggested by Mr. Ford? Mr. Tamm said, it was his opinion from the last time he met with the Planning Commission that the Planning Commission did not like boulder walls and would prefer a natural slope. He also was led to believe that they wanted to keep everything on top of the hill. Mr. Tamm said he would like to pursue going with 1 on 4 slopes even though the 1 on 6 is within the ordinance as suggested by Mr. Ford.

Commissioner Steckling asked Ms. Elmiger how the applicant could accomplish a “smooth transition” as mentioned in the review? Ms. Elmiger said the corridor design standards give examples such as similar setbacks, although the existing hair salon is quite forward and the residence is quite further back. Coordinating building styles and landscaping connections are options.

Commissioner Rabaut asked if there would be a barrier to prevent a vehicle from driving into the detention basin? Mr. Tamm said it would be a six-inch curb. Commissioner Rabaut asked, regarding the asphalt sidewalk, if the applicant would be open to concrete? Mr. Tamm said, certainly if that’s what has been installed in similar areas.

Commissioner Baker said he agrees that moving the septic to the front takes a lot of pressure off the previous location. Commissioner Baker said, with regard to the smooth transition between properties, he is inclined to feel that this building is setting the standard rather than comply with linking to the neighboring properties. Commissioner Baker said the paver patio is one community feature and asked if the flag pole is considered the second? Mr. Tamm said that is correct and indicated where it would be located.

Chairperson Lamont read some of the community design features for the applicant in regard to open space features. He concurred that moving the septic to the front helps the rear of the site in

regard to grading and wetlands. He concurred that the boulder wall may be a good idea. In regard to accel/decel lanes, he agrees that a decel lane is more important than an accel lane. Chairperson Lamont said it appears the applicant is willing to make the changes requested and with some adjustments he could support approval of this site.

Commissioner Hines commented that she would like to see something done in the back with the retention area. Commissioner Rabaut commented that he would like to see the entrance and exit improved to the maximum extent possible. Commissioner Rabaut said he does not believe a flag pole is a significant second focal point.

Commissioner Leddy said he doesn't see the barrel as a sign as long as there is no writing on it and he agrees that there could be a decorative focal point in the front of the site. Mr. Tamm said most of the space in front is taken up by the septic field and there isn't a lot of room to do something.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved that the Planning Commission approve the Valvoline Oil Change project based on the drawings received May 26, 2005 by Springfield Township. This approval is conditioned on the following: 1) the final plans would be reviewed and approved by the Township Planning Department and our planning and engineering consultants; the issues that would be reviewed would be those outlined in the memo's received from Carlisle/Wortman on June 6th and the HRC memo dated June 13th and the comments of the Planning Commission which include the following: improving the entranceway with an improved deceleration and acceleration lane; create a second focal point that is more expressive than a flag pole; the sign must meet the ordinance requirements and the detention basin be improved to reduce the amount of grading. The motion failed for lack of support.**
- **Chairperson Lamont said based on the information received from the applicant and reflected in the minutes of this meeting he believes the Final Site Plan for Burt Oil, LLC, plan date 5-9-05 and date-stamped 5-26-05 by Springfield Township meets the criteria contained in Section 18.07 of the Zoning Ordinance and therefore moved to approve the final site plan of Burt Oil, LLC conditioned on the following: the final plans are to be approved by Carlisle/Wortman, Hubbell, Roth & Clark and Springfield Township; that the community design features are 1) the patio area, brick paved patio area in front of the building to include a bench of all-season material and a lighted flag pole not to exceed 35 feet in height; that the sign base material match that of the block on the building; that the proposed screening must comply with Section 16.06.3 particularly to the southern multi-use property; as suggested by Carlisle/Wortman and HRC include a boulder wall or a grade increase to reduce the grading and the detention area, this final plan to be worked out administratively by the Building Department and HRC; add woodlands to the existing conditions on plan sets per ordinance 16.06.2; add a deceleration lane acceptable to the Township and Oakland County not to infringe upon the other driveway to the southern property; all signs must comply with ordinance without variance requests; change the safety path material to concrete 8-foot wide; and all**

permits in hand at the Township as required soil erosion and septic permits prior to construction of a building permit. Commissioner Baker supported the motion.

- **Commissioner Baker asked if we need to suggest something more definitive on HRC's sump pump suggestion. Chairperson Lamont amended his motion to include this. Commissioner Baker supported the amended motion.**

Commissioner Rabaut said the motion does not deal with an acceleration lane and he believes it is important. He is also concerned that a flag pole is not consistent with the ordinance requirements. Chairperson Lamont noted that the acceleration lane would infringe on the neighboring hair salon.

Mr. Genre said part of the motion was that the screening to the multiple use would meet the ordinance but we only have 10-feet to work with.

- **Chairperson Lamont amended his motion to reflect that at the time of installation, the opacity is 80% and 8-feet tall as required by the ordinance and the area to be screened is currently shown on the plans to the south. Commissioner Baker supported the amended motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Baker, Leddy and Hines; No: Rabaut and Steckling; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 4 to 2 vote.**

Other Business:

1. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls is referred to Township Attorney and will return to the Planning Commission and date is TBD. Review P.L. and R.C. District is set tentatively for the August Workshop meeting. 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 July Workshop meeting. ZBA/PC Workshop is set for the September Workshop meeting. Lake Shore Protection Policy is moved to the August Workshop meeting. Existing, non-conforming setback is TBD. Open Space/Park Area vs. Detention/Retention area is TBD.

2. Meeting Information Schedule

Supervisor Walls explained that he and Planning Director, Leon Genre have discussed reinstituting having the Business Meeting packet (as much as is available) to hand to the Planning Commissioners at the Workshop Meeting. Attempting as much as possible to give Commissioners two weekends to review plans and so forth.

The Planning Commissioners agreed the additional time would be a good idea.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary