

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes April 21, 2020

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the April 21, 2020 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. via Video/phone conference. He stated that the meeting is a video/phone conference call and all attendees needed to introduce themselves before speaking. The public will be given an opportunity to speak under public comment and after each item. Please keep screens off or the IT administrator would turn them off for you. Voting on motions will be conducted as roll call votes.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Dave Hopper  
Jason Pliska  
Kevin Sclesky

Commissioners Absent

George Mansour  
Terry Rusnell

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates  
Mike Smith, Anderson, Eckstein and Westrick, Inc.

Staff Present

Collin W. Walls, Supervisor  
Dennis Vallad, Trustee  
Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator  
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

**1. Minutes of the February 18, 2020 Regular Planning Commission meeting**

**Commissioner Hines moved to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2020 Regular Planning Commission meeting as amended, changing, “plans will be changes” to “plans will be changed”. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Roll Call Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Pliska, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Mansour, Rusnell. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

None

New Business:

**1. Preliminary Site Plan – Bridge Lake Market and Gas, 9420 Dixie Highway, Parcel ID #07-14-401-018, 3.58 acres, Zoned C2 General Business**

Mark Shamoun introduced himself to the Planning Commission and stated that he was representing the applicant. He provided an overview of the project.

Chairperson Baker reviewed the intent of the Preliminary Site Plan review.

Mr. Doug Lewan, CWA, summarized his review letter dated February 17, 2020.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that this is a nice addition to the Township, and he is interested in moving this project forward. He stated that they are short four parking spaces but there is room at the north and south access point which could be used until the shared access drives are needed in the future. He questioned how tall the canopy was from base to top to make sure that there are no conflicts. He liked the seating area offered in the back of the building with the views of Bridge Lake. He stated that there are two access doors in the rear, and he asked if both were going to be used for pedestrian access, or just one of them. He asked if there was anything proposed for the tenant on the north side and he asked about proposed timeline.

Mr. Shamoun answered that they would like to use the shared access area parking spaces until there is development adjacent to this property. The height of the canopy is either 16 or 18 feet so it can clear any tall semi-trucks or RV's. There is no pedestrian access to the doors in the rear; they will be used for deliveries and emergency access only. They are in negotiation with two possible tenants for the north space but nothing firm has been decided. He stated that as soon as they get the green light on the project, they are planning on starting this as soon as possible, hopefully this year.

Commissioner Pliska asked about the design characteristics. He stated that there is proposed used of EFIS. He asked what this was like in appearance, is it like textured concrete? Also, was there any consideration given to expand the use of the stone veneer panels on all the elevations? He suggested that this would give a more rustic and prairie style appearance.

Mr. Shamoun stated that it is a concrete fiberboard meant to resemble wood. It is much more durable than wood and will not stain and doesn't have the maintenance issues that wood does. The EFIS on the building is designed in a certain way to provide a certain architectural look and is 30% more efficient than other products with a higher R factor.

Commissioner Pliska asked if it were more of a textured surface.

Mr. Shamoun replied yes. It was more of a textured surface with cutouts. It is comparable to stucco.

Mr. Mike Smith, AEW, summarized his engineering review dated February 12, 2020.

Commissioner Hines asked about item #6, regarding grades and septic field, what needs to be done to accommodate this area.

Mr. Smith replied that along the back where the applicant is proposing the detention basin and the septic field, it is sloped significantly toward the lake. The designer will need to be creative as to how he flattens this area out and retains the soil.

Commissioner Hines asked if the intent is to remove all the trees to accommodate this plan.

Mr. Shamoun replied that many of the trees will need to be removed but they intend on saving some of them. The area for the septic field contains trees and the ones closest to the lake will probably be retained. It will be a minimal amount that they need to take out.

Commissioner Hines asked what the current cleared area represents.

Mr. Shamoun answered that the current cleared area is about where the proposed septic and detention pond will be.

Chairperson Baker asked about the need for a traffic study.

Mr. Smith answered that he would agree with the need for the current and proposed trip generations to determine if a traffic study is warranted and he believes that it will be warranted.

Chairperson Baker asked what the status is regarding the traffic study.

Mr. Shamoun answered that if a traffic study is warranted, they have no problem getting one. He stated that if a traffic study is needed, they should go ahead and just get one done because to try to determine trip generation numbers will be difficult for this site since it is so unique.

Chairperson Baker mentioned the need for turning templates.

Mr. Shamoun concurred.

Chairperson Baker asked about the driveway access ordinance requirement of 275 feet between drives and how this affects this site.

Mr. Lewan answered that the traffic study would help decide if there could be waiver against this ordinance requirement of 275 feet between driveways on a road with 50 mile

per hour speed limit. The Commission can grant a waiver and he summarized the things that would be considered for a Commission to grant this waiver. Another item related to this is building orientation which is in the Design Guidelines. In the Design Guidelines, there is a standard which says that buildings should be oriented perpendicular to Dixie Highway and share an internal driveway. This was in the review and was also mentioned in the preapplication meeting that there is an opportunity to have a shared driveway to the property to the north. This shared driveway would eliminate the need for a waiver from the Commission. This is worth discussion with the Commission about this point.

Mr. Shamoun answered that changing the orientation would be cost prohibitive and would be difficult to be planned because of the way the property drops off in the rear of the property. Also, since they have a drive-thru, it would be located in the rear of the building which would make the traffic pattern odd and would prevent them to be able to get a tenant for this drive-thru space. Also, reorienting the building would cause them to need ramps and stairs to access the back of the building because of the existing topography and they do not want to rely on ramps and stairs. The property owner does own the adjacent property, but he is considering selling it and does not want to lock a future buyer into a shared driveway that may have different plans than they do. They would depreciate the value of the property by doing this.

Chairperson Baker stated that if they do have a future development to the north, the driveway for that property would violate the 275 feet between driveways that is required. The criteria for siting that next location and its driveway would become more challenging if there is no shared driveway.

Commissioner Hines stated that the applicant should consider the future development of the adjacent property now.

Mr. Shamoun stated that the property owner has no interest in doing that and in addition, the traffic flow through the drive-thru and around the pumps make it challenging. The property owner is set on not doing that because he feels that the future property owner of the adjacent property will want his own driveway.

Chairperson Baker commented that the traffic study that will be done will give information regarding driveway installation proposed and the safety of that driveway. The next individual that comes forward for the adjacent driveway will be up against additional traffic and the inability to reach that driveway spacing that is required.

Mr. Shamoun replied that they will investigate this.

Chairperson Baker commented that he can understand the challenge of changing the building orientation regarding topography and requirement of 100 feet from water's edge to septic field.

Commissioner Sclesky suggested that to protect this site and the neighboring site, they look at separate entrances north and south. He doesn't know if there is enough room to do

that. He suggested that they build in the reworking of the north section of the property to accommodate future development of the property to the north.

Chairperson Baker commented that to add two driveways would give them two driveways that do not accommodate the 275 feet.

Mr. Lewan stated that he understands the applicant's concerns, but they have an opportunity here on Dixie Highway with common ownership and even if the building orientation were not changed, there should be another driveway access that could be accommodated that would benefit both properties. They do not get these opportunities very often.

Commissioner Hopper concurred with Mr. Lewan. Even if they maintain 275 feet, they would be into the other property. He has issues with the applicant saying that he could not orientate the building sideways. He does see a traffic pattern issue since right now they are pulling into gas pumps. The gas pumps could be relocated to the east side and he did the calculations and determined that it would fit. When this comes back, he would like to see where this change of building orientation was considered. He also would like to see shared driveway access especially since this is part of the Design Guidelines. They are creating problems with the future access of the adjacent property.

Mr. Shamoun asked for clarification.

Commissioner Hopper replied that if they orient the building perpendicular to Dixie Highway and put the canopy on the east side.

Mr. Shamoun answered that he doesn't know how that would work because of the way the property slopes, they would end up having ramps and stairs for pedestrians and it wouldn't be safe.

Commissioner Hopper suggested that it would work if they move the building closer to the street and up to 40% of parking in the front. He suggested that they would have a better opportunity to showcase the building instead of pulling in and seeing a row of gas pumps.

Mr. Shamoun stated that they would lose effect of the beautiful front of the building because you would then see the side of the building.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the drive-thru could be located further back.

Mr. Shamoun replied that the placement would be odd.

Commissioner Hopper stated that they could end up with the same front architecture and right now it goes against the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines adopted by the Township. It would be a more creative way to do it.

Mr. Shamoun replied that having the building in a different orientation would kill it to have the front of the building to be a drive thru. The only way it would work would be to give up the idea of the drive thru.

No public comment was heard.

Chairperson Baker reiterated that this Preliminary review was to provide comment to the applicant. The Commission expressed a concern relevant to the driveway access with the desire that a shared driveway be considered due to the ownership of the adjacent lot being the same as this lot. Also, some interest was expressed on what a 90-degree rendering of this building would look like. The Commission would like to know what challenges the change in building orientation would present.

Trustee Vallad asked if this plan will go to the Township Board.

Chairperson Baker stated that the plan will be approved through the Planning Commission because it is a use by right.

## **2. Preliminary Site Plan – Clarkston Complex, 4701 Clawson Tank Drive, Parcel #07-36-401-004, 110.79 acres, Zoned M-1 Light Industrial**

Mr. Brent LaVanway of Boss Engineering and Chuck Harding, Property Owner introduced themselves to the Commission.

Mr. LaVanway provided an overview of the project.

Mr. Harding provided a brief history of the property ownership and a brief summary of the intent of proposed development.

Mr. Doug Lewan provided a summary of his review letter dated March 12, 2020.

Chairperson Baker asked about the proposed land divisions on the site.

Supervisor Walls stated that the proposed land division was submitted early and since it was predicated on a road that did not exist, two of those lots did not have access and the land division was denied. Their option is to line Phase 1B up with the project's development.

Chairperson Baker stated that if the applicant wants to develop a Phase 1A, they must install a road or develop Phase 1A and Phase 1B after the road is installed.

Mr. LaVanway stated that their plan is to develop the four parcels in 1A first, lots #1, #2, #28 and #29. If they are land divisions or condominium development, this is yet to be determined and he explained. As demand increases, they would move into 1B.

Mr. Mike Smith provided a summary of his review letter dated March 10, 2020.

Mr. LaVanway stated that he has no questions or clarifications based on the reviews from the Planner or Engineer at this time.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that he noticed when he went to the site, he understood why so many of the trees are going to have to be removed because of all the grade changes. He asked about the plan for run off for Phase 1. He stated that when he looked at the aerial of the property, he noticed a tree line along the west and suggested that they retain those mature trees and incorporate them in the screening.

Mr. LaVanway stated that the existing basin was constructed when Clawson Tank was constructed. Their intent is to incorporate this into the proposed development. At least a portion of retention pond 2 will be developed in Phase 1A.

Commissioner Hopper stated that Mike Smith indicated that there would need to be an agreement that the four lots would have to share maintenance of retention pond 2 when this area isn't part of this development and this seems problematic.

Commissioners discussed retention pond 2 location and maintenance of this area.

Mr. Mike Smith stated that the applicant needs to determine where this pond is going to fit into the phasing plan. This needs to be clarified.

Mr. LaVanway stated that they will clarify the phasing lines with Final Site Plan.

Commissioner Hines asked what phases they were approving.

Chairperson Baker replied that they are not approving anything, they are offering comment. The applicant should clarify the phasing so that when a site plan is offered, they will be clear on what they are being asked to approve.

Commissioner Hines asked if it is permissible for the runoff to go to retention pond that isn't part of the first phase.

Chairperson Baker commented on what the applicant needs to clarify for Final Site Plan which includes the retention area.

Commissioner Sclesky asked where the applicant is in the conversation with Road Commission and a proposed timeline for the development.

Mr. LaVanway commented on that they are in early discussions with Road Commission and traffic study information.

Chairperson Baker asked about the invasive species identification on the site. He asked what "no significant occurrence" means.

Mr. LaVanway stated that the landscape architect performed the survey and he summarized the results of that survey. The areas that might have had the three invasive species will be removed during construction.

Mr. Lewan urged the applicant to review the zoning ordinance regarding invasive species and how they should be removed.

Supervisor Walls provided comments regarding phasing and historical platting of the property. Private roads are only allowed in site condominiums and details are taken care of as a part of the Master Deed and By-Laws.

No other public comment was heard.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Roll Call Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Pliska, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Mansour, Rusnell. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary