

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes May 17, 2016

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the May 17, 2016 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:

Dean Baker
Ruth Ann Hines
Dave Hopper
George Mansour
Jason Pliska
Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Kevin Sclesky

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Planner, Carlisle Wortman, Associates
Randy Ford, Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the April 19, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2016 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

1. Ordinance Amendments – Home Occupations Section 40-649

Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:32 pm

There was no public comment.

Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:33 pm

2. Ordinance Amendments – Noise Section 40-833

Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 pm

There was no public comment.

Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:35 pm

3. Ordinance Amendments – Vibration Section 40-884

Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:36 pm

There was no public comment.

Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:37 pm

New Business:

1. Ordinance Amendments – Home Occupations Section 40-649

Commissioner Hopper suggested continuing the Public Hearing at a later time after the Township Attorney and Township Planner have had time to provide comments. The Township Board on May 12, 2016 asked the Township Attorney and Township Planner to review the proposed amendments and provide feedback.

It was noted that the Public Hearing was already closed.

Chairperson Baker explained that even if they do send the amendments to the Township Board, the Township Board can return the amendments to the Planning Commission if needed.

Commissioners agreed to move forward with the amendment by sending it to the Township Board for review.

Commissioner Whiting moved to recommend Ordinance Amendments to Home Occupations, Section 40-649 to the Township Board for their review. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

2. Ordinance Amendments – Noise Section 40-833

Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend Ordinance Amendments to Noise, Section 40-833 to the Township Board for their review. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

3. Ordinance Amendments – Vibration Section 40-884

Commissioner Hines identified in Section One, the amendment was referred to as Section 833 instead of Section 40-884.

Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend Ordinance Amendments to Vibration, Section 40-884 to the Township Board for their review with the correction above. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

4. Conceptual Site Plan Approval
Springfield Industrial Park
Parcel #U-07-26-326-038

Jim Scharl, Kieft Engineering, introduced himself to the Commission as representing Springfield Industrial Park. He stated that the site plan that was approved for this site a couple of years ago included the addition of a large office building and the retention of two existing buildings. The balance of the property would be used for vehicle storage. Over the last year, the business has gone in a different direction and they now feel that they have outlived the facility. They have now come up with a two phased plan that they are presenting tonight which consists of contractor's offices, storage and facilities. He stated that they still have the asphalt business and they have the need to store the vehicles. He outlined the phased plan. Phase 1 would be the construction of building #1 and alteration of building #3, construction of gravel surface and building #2 would continue to be used for cold storage. They are proposing to build a new storm management facility in front of Building #1. The storm management area in front of the gravel parking lot is similar to what they have proposed. The landscaping in front of building #1 will be replaced after grading. The street improvements will include the relocation of the ditch along Andersonville Road. They will provide a new site plan and new landscape plan for this area along Andersonville Road. He stated that they previously had two driveways, but are now proposing only one driveway that will be a little wider than normal to facilitate the truck traffic.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated April 29, 2016. His concern is with the vegetation along Andersonville Road and he asked that this information be submitted with the Final Site Plan. There is no issue with the number of parking spaces. He stated that for phase I, there are more truck parking spaces recommended than employee parking and he thought that would be the same. The semi-truck loading area is being proposed as gravel. On-site parking and drives are supposed to be paved according to ordinance however the Planning Commission can waive the paving requirement. He read the options for waiving the requirement. There is a single point of access off of Andersonville Road and RCOC will need to review it prior to Final Site Plan. He stated that he would like to see some truck turning templates on the site. There is a note on the plan that an easement would be provided along Andersonville Road for safety path. The exact location of this easement will have to be finalized during the final stage of review; currently it says "in a mutually agreed location." He stated that prior to final, they will need to see verification of septic system from the Health Department. He stated that the landscape plan is not required, but he did provide landscape requirements so he would expect to see these addressed at Final Site Plan. Also, a detailed lighting plan and sign plan will need to be provided at Final Site Plan as well as the floor plans and elevations for all buildings.

Mr. Ford summarized his review dated April 29, 2016. The most significant issue is in terms of storm water management. He stated that it is an increase in impervious surface with the total of five buildings and all of the hard surfaces for the driveways and parking lots. This site is part of an industrial platted development and there is a regional detention facility that was constructed for this site. He needs an analysis from Mr. Scharl emphasizing what was assigned to the property and what they have now to deal with because if there is an increase in run off then they have to accommodate that in some manner. There is a possibility for the onsite storage of the increased storm water although the details have not been worked out. Mr. Scharl indicated in the narrative that they are going to be providing a storm water management plan and this is what Mr. Ford will use. The site had approval for the two curb cuts from RCOC before and he believes there was RCOC approval for the proposed entrance which reflects the tapers and the right turn decel lane. For final site plan, documents should be provided from the Road Commission. He stated that they did question the ability of an emergency vehicle to loop through the site. He pointed out areas on the plan that need modification because they came up short in these areas. The most appropriate thing would be to provide a circulation plan on the drawing. He stated that they also need verification from Oakland County Health Department regarding the review of the septic at the proposed location and the sizing of the system to accommodate all four buildings. Building #2 is not going to have plumbing facilities.

Mr. Scharl addressed the concerns of the consultants. The gravel truck parking area will house a variety of trucks and their intent is to put as many in there as they can. It is a gravel area and there is enough room there for truck drivers to find a spot to park their trucks. He stated that the waiving of the gravel parking lot was approved at the last site plan review meeting. He stated that the large trucks destroy asphalt regularly. This is an

area that in the future is going to contain a building and it doesn't make any sense to put down asphalt just to tear it up. Regarding the fire access, the building is already there and vehicles can get around there now. He offered to move the well to provide more room on the side of the building. He recognizes that it is tight, but there is not a lot that they can do because there is an existing building.

Commissioner Mansour commented in regard to fire vehicle access. He pointed out an area on the site that he recommended placing a turn around.

Mr. Lewan stated he is looking for a plan with turning radius and templates.

Commissioner Mansour asked if they are required to have a septic tank for each building.

Mr. Scharl replied yes. He pointed out the septic locations and pumping stations on the plan. He stated that there are some isolation issues between the well and septic and the plan submitted meets those.

Commissioner Mansour pointed out a different layout option.

Mr. Scharl replied that Mr. Wardin at Kieft Engineering designed the septic.

Commissioner Mansour asked if the storm water line along the road is being abandoned.

Mr. Scharl described the existing and proposed storm water drainage. He stated that he did not do the storm water plans for the original Valentine's Industrial Park and he asked if those original plans were available. He stated that they have no idea what coefficient of runoff was proposed.

Mr. Ford asked how far this site is removed from the regional facility.

Mr. Scharl pointed out the location of the basin.

Commissioners, Mr. Scharl and Mr. Ford discussed storm drainage on the site.

Commissioner Mansour asked what the landscaping was going to look like in front of the buildings.

Mr. Scharl stated that the landscaping would be placed in accordance with Township ordinance standards.

Commissioner Mansour asked about the location of a transformer between Building #5 and the existing building on lot 20.

Applicant replied that it is a meter.

Mr. Scharl addressed the number of square feet of office space and he pointed out the grade change on the lot. They are anticipating a sign in front with the names of all of the tenants.

Commissioner Hopper asked what they are being asked to approve when the applicant returns for final site plan review.

Mr. Lewan answered that if the Commission approves the entire site plan, then the entire site plan is good for a year. If they only present Phase I for Final Site Plan approval, then they are going to have to come back for additional phases.

Commissioner Hopper suggested that there is particular attention paid to screening from the R-2 area across the street that will be presented at Final Site Plan. He would like to see something on the plan.

Mr. Scharl stated that they have to relocate the road side ditch and he is aware of the screening. The original site plan had the safety path to be in a mutually agreed place because in normal circumstances it would be in the road right of way, but there are issues.

Commissioner Hopper replied that they need to show something and have an easement for it. He asked if the proposed well for Building #3 can be moved to address the emergency vehicle radius.

Mr. Scharl agreed that it can be moved.

Commissioner Hopper agreed with looking at the turning templates.

Commissioners, Mr. Scharl and applicant discussed the asphalt paved area that is a difficult turn for emergency vehicles.

Commissioner Hopper confirmed the location and use of the pumping station. He stated that the single curb cut is an improvement.

Chairperson Baker stated that Mr. Scharl said that the Planning Commission had previously agreed to the gravel parking lot and in reviewing the motion and minutes, he does not see that in the document. It must be evaluated again for this plan. He asked what the impact would be to the run off calculations if this area was paved.

Mr. Ford stated that it is an easy exercise for Mr. Scharl to look at current run off and look at the impact if it was paved. He stated that Mr. Scharl could give an estimate about what could be stored in front in the analysis. There should be some consideration given to this.

Mr. Scharl stated that having regional detention facilities makes it easier to sell the lots. He stated that hopefully they can come up with some rationale as to what is there and

what they are proposing. He stated that he would work with Mr. Ford to provide adequate details.

Chairperson Baker stated that the last approval included co-locating the safety path within the drainage easement. He asked if this was still a viable alternative.

Mr. Ford and Commissioners discussed the location of the safety path.

Chairperson Baker stated that he would like an evaluation of the impact of large vehicles moving in and out of this area which is so close to a residential area.

Mr. Scharl stated that the trucks go in once and come back once.

Chairperson Baker replied that there is still 15 trucks and this is enough to give the neighboring properties concern.

Mr. Lewan asks if there is an opportunity for an emergency vehicles to gain access through Terex.

Mr. Scharl replied that there is not an easement but there is asphalt property there that can be transversed.

Mr. Lewan offered that this could address some of the access concerns.

Mr. Ford suggested that the applicant match pavement.

Chairperson Baker stated that the applicant use the comments and work with the consultants as necessary.

Old Business:

None

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and made updates and revisions to the current Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

Brandon Scheib, 8659 Kier Road, asked for clarification on what would be considered a home occupation. He stated that he is a contractor and he followed pretty much every rule. He only has one employee and he doesn't have any advertising on the outside of the building. There is no more vehicle traffic than normal. He didn't understand if there would be a ruling on this as far as storing of materials because he provides a service and

people do not come to his house, it is all material that he provides at other jobs. He didn't know if they considered this running a business out of the home.

Chairperson Baker stated that the items that they have spoken to relative to this topic permitted items that are incidental to the work. The individual lives at home, conducts business out in the population and items that are incidental to your work that you properly stored on the property are not relevant. No changes have been made relevant to those items that he remembers. He stated that if Mr. Scheib is complying, there is nothing they have done here to change that. He stated that if there are pieces of PVC, tools and vehicles that he drives, nothing that the Commission has done has changed that. The focus of the Commission's discussion was people coming to a residence and conducting a business in that dwelling.

Mr. Lewan agreed. He stated that if Mr. Scheib was operating before under the ordinance, he is probably still fine.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Whiting moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary