

Minutes of
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
December 28, 2021

SPRINGFIELD
CHARTER TOWNSHIP



Sean R. Miller, Clerk

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the December 28, 2021, Regular Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Commissioners

in Attendance: Dean Baker, Chairperson
Ruth Ann Hines
Dave Hopper
Kevin Sclesky

Absent: George Mansour
Terry Rusnell
Jamie Costigan

Consultants present:

Sally Elmiger, Township Planner, Carlisle/Wortman Associates
Mike Smith, Township Engineer, Anderson, Eckstein, and Westrick, Inc.

Staff Present:

Laura Moreau, Supervisor
Joan Rusch, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Hines moved to proceed with the agenda as presented.

Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Yes: Baker, Hopper, Hines, Sclesky.

No: None. Absent: Mansour, Rusnell, Costigan. Motion approved.

Public Comment:

None

Approval of Consent Agenda:

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the November 23, 2021, Regular Meeting as presented with the following correction: On page 4 change "here" to "There". Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Yes: Baker, Hopper, Hines, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Mansour, Rusnell, Costigan. Motion approved.



New Business:

1. Final Site Plan – Dollar General, Northeast side of Dixie Highway, .2 miles south of Oakhill Rd., Parcel ID# 07-03-126-012

Mike McPherson, project engineer from Atwell, introduced this project. He explained that the design of this building was modified from the typical Dollar General design to fit in with the theme of the Township. The single driveway entrance from Dixie Highway will follow RCOC guidelines. The 35 parking spaces proposed are in line with what the business needs, even though it is less than what the Township requires. The site has adequate maneuvering room for semi-trailers. The septic system is an engineered mound system. There is a plan for stormwater retention, and the intent is to obtain an agreement from the neighboring property owner to let stormwater run across his property. This should not be difficult as the seller of this property and the owner of the neighboring property are the same. They have addressed other items based on the consultants' reviews including the safety path, landscaping, and signage. The project proposes all LED lighting. This lighting works a little differently from other lighting and is more intense but is better for this situation.

Ms. Elmiger reviewed her site plan comments:

- This plan proposes parking in the front of the building. It would be preferable to have parking to the side or in the rear. The Planning Commission must decide if the number of parking spaces is satisfactory and should also consider if the deficiency of parking could be addressed by land banked parking.
- The location of the safety path has been moved to within the parcel boundaries and out of the road right of way. The applicant proposes to install the path during construction of the project.
- The revised plans show a row of evergreens along the parking lot and small trees in the islands of the parking lot. The Planning Commission should decide if this is adequate screening of the parking lot from Dixie Highway and note that the screening of the trash enclosure is not shown on the revised plans.
- Some of the lighting just underneath the poles is twice what the ordinance allows. That would be a hot spot in a relatively low-lit area of the Township. She recommends that the applicant work with the lighting consultant to get the lighting levels down to meet the ordinance maximums.

Mr. Smith reviewed his site plan comments:

- The plan has been sealed and signed by an engineer.



- The right-of-way along Dixie Highway is clearly labeled.
- The applicant should explain why soil infiltration was not included in the calculations as this is highly recommended. A copy of the soils report is needed. If no infiltration is possible, then that cannot be included in the design. The detention basin is sized appropriately for a 100-year storm event. If infiltration is possible, then that would shrink the size of the basin.
- An agreement is needed with the adjoining property owner for permission for the stormwater detention outflow to run across that property. Any future development of the adjacent property would have to be designed to accommodate this flow of water.
- Landscaping has been changed to allow maintenance access to the basin structures, but this has not been called out in the plan.
- The conflict between the dumpster wall foundation and the proposed storm sewer has been addressed.
- The pathway location has been changed. However, there is a utility easement that must be addressed. If this cannot be resolved, the pathway may need to be relocated to the ROW.
- The engineering comments would also need to be addressed during engineering plan review.

Ms. Elmiger commented that the ground sign is larger than permitted, but the Planning Commission can approve this.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the lighting plan and the whiteness and brightness of the lights called out on it. The current ordinance requires a dimming plan which begins a half hour after close of business along with security lighting that dims to 50 percent. The Planning Commission determined that the ordinance standards relevant to the lighting and the parking lot should be maintained. The applicant stated that the plan would be revised to meet ordinance requirements.

There was discussion regarding the number of parking spots required by the ordinance (91 spaces) and the number proposed (35 spaces), and the layout of these spaces. Land banking some spaces was discussed. The applicant requested that no condition be proposed regarding land banked spaces. He stated that the number of spaces proposed is what the business needs. The Commissioners reached consensus that the number of reduced parking spots would be acceptable as well as the orientation and layout of the parking.



Chairperson Baker commented that not having soils information means this is not part of the calculations, so 100 percent of the stormwater is moving to the rear of the lot.

Mr. Smith stated that the detention basin has been designed to accommodate a 100-year storm event. All the water goes into the detention basins. No infiltration of water was included in the calculations.

Mr. McPherson clarified that they would provide the soils report. There was not enough infiltration, so the storm water system was designed with this in mind.

Chairperson Baker stated that the neighboring property owner would have to give documented permission allowing stormwater overflow to run across the property.

Dwayne Davidson, owner of the neighboring property, stated that there would be no problem providing such an agreement.

The Planning Commissioners discussed screening. Ms. Elmiger stated that the plan accommodates as much landscaping as can fit on the site. As far as the sizes and materials being proposed, the final size of some of the plants may not get that big. The Planning Commission can decide if the screening proposed would be adequate. The Township could ask for an evaluation of the landscaping once the project is completed to make sure it meets the opacity of the ordinance.

The applicant stated that they will revise the site plan to show the dumpster screening as proposed in their response letter.

Chairperson Baker stated that the ground sign offered is acceptable. Commissioner Hopper commented that the Planning Commission must approve the sign tonight.

Mr. McPherson stated that they will need only one ground sign and one building sign.

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the final site plan for Mark Zawadski for Dollar General project located on PI# 07-03-126-012 currently zoned C-1, as this proposal is in substantial compliance with the Township Zoning Ordinance, with the following conditions:

- **Specifically, per ordinance 40-681, the Planning Commission recommends a reduction in the amount of required parking, as sufficient vacant**



proposed landscape area exists on site to allow addition of more parking for any future usage requirement and that the applicant understands that this parking is sufficient for their proposed operation.

- Revise the dumpster and gate as discussed by the applicant in their 12-21-21 correspondence.
- Verify after installation and prior to occupancy that the north landscape screening meets Township ordinance requirements and the trees in the northeast and southeast be changed to large overstory trees.
- The signage as proposed meets ordinance requirements for size and height as long as the ground sign is 15 feet from the road right of way.
- Address engineer's comments during final engineering review from his 12-10-21 memo, including providing a storm drainage agreement from the adjacent property owner to the northeast.
- Further, address Township ordinance 40-888 – Lighting, in regard to: 1) turning lights off half an hour after close of business OR 2) provide a light dimming plan showing reduction would be 50 percent at night if security lighting is required.
- Provide maximum 4000K lighting to meet Township ordinance requirements.

Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Yes: Hines, Hopper, Baker, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Costigan, Rusnell, Mansour. Motion carried.

2. Accessory Buildings – Proposed amendments to Code of Ordinances Chapter 40, 40-276 and 40-649.

Supervisor Moreau explained that some property owners inquire about building a pole barn, garage, or accessory structure on a parcel without a house on it and are surprised when they are told that it cannot be done. This provision is not as clear in the single-family residential zoning district ordinance language as it is in every other zoning district. Greg Need reviewed the ordinance language and proposed two amendments to clarify the intent. These amendments clarify that no accessory building can be built on a vacant lot prior to the construction of the main building to which it is an accessory.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed amendments and decided to set them for Public Hearing.

Commissioner Sclesky moved to set for public hearing at earliest convenience the proposal to adopt Chapter 40, Section 40-276 and 40-649 as provided by Township attorney dated August 12, 2021. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Yes: Hines, Hopper, Baker, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Mansour, Costigan, Rusnell. Motion carried.



3. Meeting dates and election of officers for 2022.

Discussion was held to keep the meeting dates for 2022 as the fourth Tuesday of the month with the exception of December. December's meeting would be on the third Tuesday, December 20, 2022. All meetings would start at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Hopper moved to set the Planning Commission meeting dates for 2022 on the fourth Tuesday of the month at 7:00 p.m., except for December, which will be the third Tuesday, December 20, 2022. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Yes: Hines, Hopper, Baker, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Mansour, Costigan, Rusnell. Motion carried.

Commissioner Hines moved that the current officers, Dean Baker as chair and George Mansour as vice chair, continue in this capacity for 2022. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Yes: Hines, Hopper, Baker, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Mansour, Costigan, Rusnell. Motion carried.

Old Business:

None

Public Comment:

Commissioner Hopper thanked Ms. Elmiger for her hard work and effort as Township Planner. Chairperson Baker and Supervisor Moreau also expressed thanks and let Ms. Elmiger know that she will be missed.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Yes: Baker, Hopper, Hines, Sclesky. No: None. Absent: Mansour, Costigan, Rusnell. Motion approved.

Joan Rusch, Recording Secretary