

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes November 19, 2019

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the November 19, 2019 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Commissioners Absent

Dean Baker

Ruth Ann Hines

Dave Hopper

George Mansour

Jason Pliska

Terry Rusnell

Kevin Sclesky

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates

Staff Present

Collin W. Walls, Supervisor

Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Hines moved to approve the agenda as presented. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the October 15, 2019 meeting

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2019 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

None

Chairperson Baker indicated that Lyle Winn, Anderson, Eckstein and Westrick, was ill and therefore could not attend this meeting.

New Business:

1. Preliminary Site Plan Review – Park West Gallery -Storage Building, 12850 Fountain Square, Parcel ID #07-17-301-013, 30 acres, Zoned OS Office Service

Applicant is not present.

Mr. Doug Lewan indicated that this was a re-use of a current building and no new buildings were being anticipated. He summarized his review letter dated October 15, 2019. He indicated that for Final Site Plan the final building height should be shown, they should explain why the truck dock area is being revised to accommodate larger vehicles since only “cube” trucks are anticipated at this site and a picture of a cube truck was sent to him and the Commissioners as representing the truck that would be used. He indicated that the Township Engineer should review the stormwater runoff and detention, applicant should provide a detailed landscape plan at Final Site Plan which should confirm location of all proposed and existing landscaping and if off-site landscaping is proposed. The correct height of pole lighting located at entrance to site on Fountain Square Drive should be shown at Final Site Plan. He added that any new signage must be added to the final site plan as well as building dimensions. He referred to the Township Engineer’s, Mr. Lyle Winn, review letter dated October 8, 2019. He pointed out Mr. Winn’s comments on page 2 of his report. Some of the storm drainage pipe that is being proposed for the truck dock is headed for the septic field and Mr. Winn would like that corrected. He stated that floor plan and elevations were included, and he would like the dimensions added with the Final Site Plan.

Commissioner Hopper asked if the comments that Mr. Lewan had about the truck dock were about the dock itself, or the access to it.

Mr. Lewan answered the access to it. He stated that the applicant included a 50-foot diameter turning circle that would accommodate a semi-truck and he doesn’t think they need this. Cube van access would not require removal of existing landscape islands and tree as proposed.

Commissioner Hopper agreed.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if the Township should be concerned about the status of the current well and septic since it sat vacant for many years.

Mr. Lewan answered that he did not know.

Supervisor Walls answered that he does not know either. He assumes that they have received a building permit for the interior re-construction.

Commissioner Hines asked how long the applicant has occupied the building. Supervisor Walls stated that one of the earlier communications indicated that they owned the building under a foundation for twenty years, but they used it for the storage of clothing.

Commissioner Mansour explained that he is concerned that the drainage for the dock area is undersized; it is listed as a six-inch diameter drain. He suggested angling the drainage pipe away from the septic field in keeping with the grade. So, instead of tying into the existing storm sewer, he suggested that it be angled away.

Commissioner Hopper commented that they should have input from Mr. Winn about this. The first plan that was presented in the summer only had a 2- or 3-inch diameter pipe. He stated that a 6 inch will have less chance of getting clogged.

Commissioner Mansour commented that there might be a lot of leaves and debris in this area potentially that might clog this drain pipe.

Commissioner Hines asked if the applicant received the consultants' reviews.

Mr. Lewan indicated yes.

Supervisor Walls indicated that there is an item in Mr. Winn's review that says it must be done but it is not in the Springfield Township Ordinance or Design Standards and this is the specific software for the turning movement.

Chairperson Baker asked if it was the Autoturn software.

Supervisor Walls answered yes.

Chairperson Baker indicated that the applicant will get copies of Mr. Lewan's and Mr. Winn's reviews as well as the draft minutes from this evening's meeting.

Old Business:

**1. Ordinance Amendment – Section 40-888 and Section 40-2
Glare and Exterior Lighting**

Mr. Lewan reviewed his memo dated November 8, 2019 and the accompanying ordinance amendments to Section 40-2 and Section 40-888 dated November 5, 2019. He stated that Supervisor Walls also had some proposed changes sent via email that he can go over this evening.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that Mr. Lewan made all the adjustments recommended at the last meeting.

Commissioner Hines stated that she was questioning the definition of building façade lighting; there seems to be a definition present where it is not appropriate. This should be moved.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Commissioner Hines asked about page 4, (d) , if Color Rendering Index should also be moved to the definition section. She suggested that they move all the definitions to the definition section.

Commissioner Hopper suggested that they keep the reference to the CRI because they want it on the plan. He concurs with moving it to definitions.

Supervisor Walls stated that the standard for CRI is on the top of page 5.

Mr. Lewan agreed with moving the definitions.

Commissioner Mansour asked why they prohibited building mounted lighting.

Mr. Lewan answered only if it is intended to attract attention to the building and a use not strictly designed for security purposes.

Commissioner Hopper stated that on page 4, 6(a), he believes that it should read, “not more than 100.”

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Commissioner Hopper asked if they even need to include the cut sheet since it is explained in the ordinance language.

Commissioners discussed whether they should include the cut sheets or not include them. Commissioners concluded that the cut sheets should not be included in the ordinance.

Supervisor Walls handed out some material from the Dark Skies Association. He confirmed that the Dark Sky Association is legitimate and recognized by the lighting industry. He suggested that they define what “sky glow” is. He asked about one of the additions that the Commission made to the prohibited list. The reasoning behind (d)(4) is security lighting but that gets lost. He doesn’t know of any architectural lighting that is used for security. He believes the key to this item is security lighting and it is difficult to get the meaning out of what is written.

Commissioner Hines stated that they did not want to inhibit architectural lighting.

Mr. Lewan stated that they can allow architectural lighting in another location in the section. He agreed with the removal of architectural lighting in this spot.

Supervisor Walls asked about Section (e)(8), top of page 5, he suggested that the word “recommended” is changed to “required”.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Supervisor Walls suggested that item (e), that anything over 4000 K should be prohibited unless waived by the Commission.

Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Lewan stated that he will bring this back to the Commission next month with the proposed changes.

2. Stormwater Detention Basin Maintenance Discussion

Mr. Doug Lewan reviewed his memo dated November 8, 2019 and the accompanying ordinance amendments to Section 40-2 and Section 40-891. He explained the new definition for stormwater facility. He explained that Mr. Winn had some comments and the email outlining those comments was provided to the Commissioners. Mr. Winn commented that the ordinance reads like the Township has soil erosion jurisdiction, and it doesn't. Mr. Lewan indicated that he doesn't know where this is coming from and he will need to speak to Mr. Winn for more clarification.

Commissioner Hines and Commissioner Rusnell confirmed where the soil erosion control language is located.

Mr. Lewan confirmed this location and indicated that he will remove this reference. Mr. Winn suggested that they define stormwater facility and not limit the language to just catch basins, etc. Mr. Lewan confirmed that he did include a new definition. Mr. Winn's third comment had to do with what properties were included. Mr. Lewan stated that since it is in the zoning ordinance and zoning standards are set at this point forward, it cannot be administered retroactively.

Supervisor Walls stated that all terms need to be consistent with the new definition of stormwater facility. He stated that the Department of Natural Resources needs to be changed to EGLE. He suggested that in (e)(1), it should be described as the intent because it is not really a regulation. He stated that (3)(a)(4), top of page 3, is something that is not related to storm water; it is a road standard. He suggested that it might be located in the Design and Construction Standards.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he felt the same way about the parking since parking is already in the ordinance.

Mr. Lewan stated that this section in the current ordinance is called Stormwater Management; Impervious Surface Mitigation.

Supervisor Walls stated that this provision doesn't refer to an impervious surface. If they are going to add it, there should be an impervious surface component and why that impacts storm water.

Mr. Lewan stated that the only impervious surface item is center landscape islands. He stated that he will look at that.

Supervisor Walls asked about the "wetlands shall be considered" statement. He asked what the word "considered" is supposed to mean in this instance.

Commissioners discussed this section and possible language.

Supervisor Walls stated that in the maintenance provisions, there is a necessary element missing because there needs to be an agreement signed with the Township in recordable form. He stated that 120 days is too long, and this time period should be reduced. If the property owner doesn't pay the required amount in 30 days, the Township should be able to place a lien. Supervisor Walls stated that he disagrees with the sentence under (b) in that the maintenance can be done by the Township if requested by the property owner. It is the property owner's responsibility and if they don't do it, the Township will do it and charge them. He stated that the word "charter" should be removed from (d).

Commissioner Mansour asked if they need to include "inlets" in the facility definition.

Mr. Lewan answered no, the definition includes all elements under the words "control structure" language.

Commissioner Mansour confirmed that all language should be changed to stormwater facilities for consistency.

Mr. Lewan concurred. He stated that he will make all changes, and this will return to the Commission at the next meeting.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and suggested changes to the Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 p.m. Supported by Chairperson Baker. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary