

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes June 21, 2016

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the June 21, 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  
Kevin Sclesky  
Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Jason Pliska

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Planner, Carlisle Wortman, Associates

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor  
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

**1. Minutes of the May 17, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting**

**Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2016 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

1. Rezoning Request by Michael and Amber Angona, 9158 Dixie Highway, Clarkston, MI 48348 to rezone the 0.5 acre parcel located at 9230 Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to OS-Office Service from R3 One Family Residential. P.I. #07-14-430-032.

**Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 pm**

No public comment was heard.

**Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:36 pm**

2. Rezoning Request by Charles and Carol Underwood, 7058 Ridgewood, Clarkston, MI 48346, to rezone the 0.5 acre parcel located at 9246 Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to OS-Office Service from R3 One Family Residential. P.I. #07-14-430-031.

**Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:38 pm**

No public comment was heard

**Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:39 pm**

3. Rezoning Request by AJD Development, Clarkston, MI 48348 to rezone the 19.27 acre parcel located at I-75 and Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to C-2 General Business from R-3 One Family Residential. P.I. 07-24-101-005 and 07-24-101-011.

**Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:40 pm**

Mary Ried, 9042 East Bluewater Drive, stated that her property abuts the soccer fields. She stated that she is concerned about increased traffic and noise and is concerned about having a parking lot with lights that are going to beam into her home. There are all ages represented in the condo complex and she is concerned about safety at the bus stop. She is curious about what the plan is for the property. About ten years ago there was a consideration for a big box store at that location and she doesn't know if that is what is being considered now. She stated that once it is rezoned, any big box retailer can move into this site.

Chairperson Baker clarified that there was no plan submitted for this site. This is strictly a property owner that is seeking to rezone the property. Any property owner can come forward to ask for consideration to rezone their property. The Planning Commission has not been supplied with a site plan.

Robert Gray, 9022 Bluewater Drive, stated that he lives closest to where this building would be and he has heard that it is going to be a parking lot. He does not mind this so much because it is better than stores. He requested that a wall be built around the site so

their area is protected from lights. He would like to keep the trees that are there for a buffer.

Chairperson Baker stated that there is guidance in the ordinance language in place when properties are abutting that have different zonings that they have an obligation to make sure that the more intense zoning does not create issues. For example, there are screening ordinances and lighting ordinances which the applicant will be required to comply with.

Carol Mack, 9079 Bavarian Court, expressed her concern about water and drainage. She wanted to express her concern about safety of people coming into the neighborhood off of the expressway. The neighborhood is quiet and the nature surrounding her results in that quiet environment. Her condo is surrounded by a greenbelt. She stated that even though there are ordinances that protect their area, without knowing what those are, it is hard to approve this rezoning. She believes that this is a quiet way of going back ten years and doing the same thing that was proposed then but in a different manner. She is against the rezoning for a multitude of reasons. There is plenty of property down Dixie Highway and she believes that there will be a problem with extra traffic. She is concerned about water and sewer and she does not want Detroit water. They do not have enough information to make an educated and wise decision.

Pamela Merritt, 9030 Bluewater Drive, stated that the wooded berm by them keeps Dixie Highway from coming in their houses. They have a lot of wildlife in the area and she added that the berm goes all of the way down to the pond. She stated that if it is Al Deeby, they would have to drain the oil and grease from the cars and it will drain into the pond which is a natural habitat. She objects to that. She is concerned about heavy traffic congestion and lowering the value of their condos. She stated that she does not care who moves in there but they need to take into consideration that they moved out there for suburbia. There is a lot of other property along Dixie Highway which would be better suited.

Connie McClelland, 7300 Bluewater Drive, Unit 107, expressed concern about a restaurant being located on the other side of her car port. She is concerned about odors and the location of dumpsters because it would affect both end buildings of her complex. She expressed concern about the size of the parking lot being proposed.

Joyce Gibbs, 7243 Bluewater Drive, agreed with the concerns that have already been spoken about. She is concerned about oil and gas run off getting into their drinking water because they are on well water. The increased traffic and the dangerous ingress and egress are also concerns. It is already difficult to get out of Bluewater Drive and this will make it more difficult. She would consider medical offices going in there because they would not generate as much garbage. She is concerned with how big the buildings are, how many buildings are proposed and how much concrete is proposed. She moved there for a reason and asked for consideration for these items from the Planning Commission.

Shirley Lyle, 9005 Bluewater Drive, asked if the Township could rezone it without knowing what is planned for this site.

Chairperson Baker replied yes.

Ms. Lyle asked if when the site plan is brought forward, if it can be denied.

Chairperson Baker replied that it is evaluated and reviewed based on the ordinances, public comment, Planning Commission input and comment, consultant's review and comment and also comment by the Township Board. The Planning Commission tonight will make a recommendation to the Township Board on the rezoning. The elected officials will make the final decision. He summarized the plan that came before the Planning Commission and Township Board ten years ago based on his personal recollection.

Ms. Lyle replied that it hasn't changed in ten years, it has only gotten worse as far as traffic concerns. She is concerned about taking trees down to put up a walls because this is what she will look at and this is not acceptable. She hopes that the Planning Commission takes the comments tonight into consideration and added that she is opposed to the rezoning.

Sally Wallace, 7199 Bluewater Drive, asked about the parcel location.

Commissioners confirmed the location of the subject parcels. They concluded that the gun shop will remain and it is currently zoned commercial.

**Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 8:02 pm**

New Business:

1. Rezoning Request by Michael and Amber Angona, 9158 Dixie Highway, Clarkston, MI 48348 to rezone the 0.5 acre parcel located at 9230 Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to OS-Office Service from R3 One Family Residential. P.I. #07-14-430-032.

Doug Lewan, Township Planner, summarized his review letter dated June 2, 2016. The Planning Commission is a recommending body only; the Township Board will make the final determination. One of the major things that is looked at when considering a rezoning is the Township Master Plan and this rezoning supports the outlined future zoning in the Master Plan. The Dixie Highway Corridor Plan shows this property as being mixed use so the rezoning is also in compliance with the Dixie Highway Corridor Plan. He stated that they do not require a site plan for rezoning. He summarized that the proposed rezoning from R-3 to OS is in substantial compliance with the Township Master Plan and compatible with the adjacent uses and therefore he does recommend approval.

Audience member asked for the definition of mixed use.

Mr. Lewan replied that mixed use is a variety of office, commercial and high density residential. This is the Master Plan definition.

Tom Weiler, 9171 Hillcrest, confirmed that the applicant was asking for Office Service zoning for the property.

Mr. Lewan answered yes.

Chairperson Baker stated that they received a memo from Supervisor Walls today. It informed the Commissioners that the Township had received a correspondence relative to this request. The petitioner, Glen R. Underwood, requested that no action be taken on this or the next rezoning for 9246 Dixie Highway being heard this evening. This was due to issues that are pending in court and State issues relevant to transactions within the family. This correspondence has been shared in its entirety with the Township attorney and the Attorney's advice was that this does not limit the Commission in any way regarding their action tonight and possibly providing recommendations to the Township Board. Any items that are pertinent to this correspondence will be dealt with at the Township Board level at the appropriate time.

**Commissioner Whiting moved to recommend that the proposal sent in from Angona Contracting for rezoning of parcel #07-14-430-032 be sent to the Township Board with the Planning Commission's recommendation of support of rezoning from R-3, One Family Residential to Office Services. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

2. Rezoning Request by Charles and Carol Underwood, 7058 Ridgewood, Clarkston, MI 48346, to rezone the 0.5 acre parcel located at 9246 Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to OS-Office Service from R3 One Family Residential. P.I. #07-14-430-031.

Doug Lewan, Township Planner, summarized his review letter dated June 2, 2016. He stated that he is recommending approval of this rezoning from R-3 Single Family Residential to OS Office Service because it is compatible with the Township Master Plan and adjacent uses. He read the description of Mixed Use from the Zoning Ordinance. He reiterated that only office service uses would be permitted by the Township at this site if rezoned.

Chairperson Baker summarized the principle permitted uses in Office Service.

**Commissioner Hines moved to recommend to the Township Board the rezoning of parcel #07-14-430-031 from R-3 One Family Residential to OS Office Service. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

3. Rezoning Request by AJD Development, Clarkston, MI 48348 to rezone the 19.27 acre parcel located at I-75 and Dixie Highway in Springfield Township to C-2 General Business from R-3 One Family Residential. P.I. 07-24-101-005 and 07-24-101-011.

Doug Lewan summarized his review dated June 2, 2016. He stated that during the site plan review stage, they will be looking for ways to decrease the negative impacts that may occur to the residential properties to the west. He stated that when looking at the Master Plan, this property is planned for planned mixed use. This would be potential uses such as office and retail or a mix of uses. The Dixie Corridor Plan also supports this property being planned as another use besides single family residential. He believes that the planned rezoning to C-2 commercial is compatible with the intent and vision of the Future Land Use Map and plan and the Dixie Highway Corridor Plan. The applicant should be aware that this development will have to comply with the newly adopted Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. The southern part of the site which has a pond will be protected to the greatest extent possible but without a plan he cannot get into detail as to what those actions may be. This project is being requested to C-2 which is general commercial and he summarized the principle permitted uses and special land uses allowed in that zoning district. He stated that the rezoning of this property from R-3 One Family Residential to C-2 General Business is in substantial compliance with the Springfield Township Master Plan and adjacent uses. A lot of the uses brought up by the public tonight with regard to impacts will certainly be part of the discussion when a site plan is submitted.

Commissioner Hopper thanked the citizens for coming to the meeting. He stated that in the ten years since the Redico development was proposed, the Township has done a lot of work on the Dixie Highway corridor. The Township has updated the Dixie Corridor Plan and approved the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. Using these documents, they are spelling out a vision for this area. Dixie Highway is the busiest road and they are trying to direct development so that it is compatible for the entire Township. He feels that the ordinance is protective and the rezoning can help the residents because an applicant now has to come for full site plan review. There are controls over width of screening, height of screening and planting required that come in to play with any commercial development.

A resident asked if the rezoning would make the property part of the tax base for the Township.

Supervisor Walls indicated that the assessment is based on use so the larger parcel would remain tax exempt as long as the church owned it.

Chairperson Baker asked when this is no longer a church owned property, does it then become a taxable property.

Supervisor Walls answered yes, as long as it was no longer owned by the church.

Commissioner Sclesky thanked the public for coming to the meeting. He concurred with Commissioner Hopper's comments regarding Dixie Highway. He stated that when it comes to site plan review, they would be very detailed as to what is proposed. He would look closely at natural preservation which was a concern brought up by the residents.

A resident from the audience asked if the EPA would control the wetlands.

Mr. Lewan answered that it would be the State of Michigan that would be involved on properties five acres or greater. He would assume that the developer would want to stay out of the wetlands because it is much easier this way.

Resident asked if it would be possible for Commissioners to visit the site.

Chairperson Baker answered that it would be more appropriate to visit and view the property when a site plan is presented for review.

Commissioner Whiting answered that some commissioners have visited the site and they are well aware of the tree lines and water concerns.

Resident asked if anyone could come in and request a rezoning.

Mr. Lewan stated that the application requires the signature of the applicant and the signature of the property owner.

Chairperson Baker acknowledged a letter received by the Commissioners from Dr. Richard Baker, 9025 E. Bluewater Drive, Clarkston, 48348. Dr. Baker expressed his concerns regarding the rezoning.

**Commissioner Hopper moved that the Planning Commission finds that:**

- 1. The site is bordered by Multi-Family Residential uses to the west, General Business uses to the north, a church to the east and interstate freeway to the south. Adjacent parcels are zoned for single and multi-family residential and general commercial. Landscape screening and buffering will need to be addressed in detail during the site plan review stage especially due to the adjacent residential uses to the west.**
- 2. The rezoning is compatible with the intent and vision of both the Future Land Use Map and Dixie Highway Corridor Plan. The applicant should be aware that development on this site will need to comply with the design guidelines contained within the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines document.**
- 3. Topography, soils, wetlands and woodlands will be reviewed in detail during the site plan review process for the uses permitted within C-2 zoning district, be compatible with the Master Plan vision for this area of the Township and Dixie Highway. The Planning Commission understands that a rezoning would allow for all of the general commercial as of right uses on this property.**
- 4. Traffic impact and site access will be evaluated during the site plan review. C-2 uses in this area may increase weekday vehicular traffic along Dixie Highway especially due to the visibility from the I-75 interchange.**
- 5. Essential facilities and services will be evaluated during site plan review process.**

**Therefore, it is recommended to the Township Board to rezone P.I. 07-24-101-005 and 07-24-101-011 from R-3 One Family Residential to C-2 General Business. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

Commissioner Whiting stated that all of the documents cited are available at the Township's website at [springfield-twp.us](http://springfield-twp.us).

4. Conceptual Site Plan Approval, Angona Construction, 9158 Dixie Highway, Clarkston, 48348, Parcel #07-14-476-026.

Mr. Mike Angona introduced himself to the Commissioners. He stated that they intend to improve the property with a new building that they intend to use as an office use. The parking lot is going to be paved with curb and gutter. They plan to follow the Dixie Highway recommendations. He appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a front and rear variance and those were both granted.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review dated June 2, 2016. This is a Concept Site Plan so they are giving the applicant input tonight that the applicant can use to come back for Final Site Plan approval. This proposal is for an outbuilding that will be accessory to the contractor's office. There is a small existing garage on site that is intended to remain. This site was recently rezoned to Office Service. One of the questions Mr. Lewan raised is the intended use. Any type of office uses are fine in this zoning district. They need more input on exactly what the use entails because a contractor's yard is not an approved use in the Office Service district. He wants to make sure that this is actually accessory to an office and they are not approving a use that is not allowed in this district. They need a really good understanding of the use that is being proposed here.

He understands that the rear yard setback and front greenbelt variance was granted. He stated that there are no issues with natural resources and the topo submitted. They will be looking for a full landscape plan at final site plan review. The applicant has provided one additional parking space beyond what is required. They would like the intended use provided for the existing garage. They are proposing to improve the access point from Dixie Highway but the approach from Dixie Highway doesn't appear to be changing. This project will have to go before the Road Commission for approval and Mr. Lewan anticipates that there will need to be some widening of the access to the north considering what they are proposing. The applicant needs to show truck turning templates with final site plan. He suggested that the applicant add signage to define traffic patterns for the site. The applicant also should provide documentation from the Road Commission approving the safety path location that is proposed. They will also need Road Commission review and approval for the entrance and storm water discharge and HRC will probably have comments about this. He listed all of the landscaping standards in the review so the applicant will know what they are looking for. He stated that this site is bordered by residential areas to the north and east and the ordinance requires that landscape screening is provided between these two zoning districts. There are a certain number of parking lot trees required and the dumpster has to have screening as per



ordinance standards. A lighting plan will be required at final site plan and will have to comply with ordinance standards. If signage is being proposed, a signage plan will need to be included with final site plan.

Mr. Lewan stated that this is part of the Dixie Highway Overlay and there are some architectural features that have to be provided and the building proposed does not meet the standards. He suggested looking at materials, roof overhangs, window locations, fascade, etc. At site plan it will need to be demonstrated how the proposed building will conform to the Design Guidelines. He suggested that the applicant and the applicant's engineer review the Design Guidelines and Dixie Highway Overlay Standards. He suggested that the applicant provide a narrative as to how he can meet these standards rather than him trying to guess how they are met. He stated that the biggest issue is the use of the building.

Chairperson Baker asked the applicant if he wanted to address Mr. Lewan's comments.

Mr. Angona replied that the use of the building is for equipment. They would also use it for training and safety meetings. They do not receive deliveries on a daily or weekly basis. They have restaurant equipment that they store. The building will also be used to store trucks and trailers. The intent is not to have a large warehouse of construction materials.

Chairperson Baker asked what the business was that was being conducted out of the property. He suggested that it is contracting but asked for more specifics.

Mr. Angona replied that they have a contracting office there. They store restaurant equipment that they bring back from a jobsite and they scrap it out.

Chairperson Baker asked if the equipment was repaired there.

Mr. Angona replied no.

Commissioner Whiting asked if the business was installing restaurant equipment.

Mr. Angona answered that they work with fast food service restaurants. They have been operating out of that site for a year and a half.

Chairperson Baker asked if the new equipment that they will put into a facility is delivered to this address.

Mr. Angona replied no. It is delivered to the jobsite.

Commissioner Hines asked if Mr. Angona would continue to operate his office from the existing building.

Mr. Angona replied yes. He stated that there wouldn't be plumbing or restroom facilities in the new building.

Commissioner Hopper asked how he is going to use the existing garage on the property.

Mr. Angona replied storage.

Commissioner Mansour asked if applicant would be bringing left over materials back to the site and would they be stored inside the new building.

Mr. Angona answered yes; for example, they would use leftover tile on the next project but none of the materials get delivered here.

Chairperson Baker asked if someone comes to pick up the left over materials and equipment or if the applicant takes them off site.

Mr. Angona replied that they take them off site. He stated that they would store a 14 foot trailer in the new building as well after it returns from an out of state job.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Township Engineer provided a report that was given to the applicant. The Township Engineer had comments relative to drainage, suggested a shift in the catch basin and noted that the applicant would need to apply for permit from the Road Commission regarding discharge. The Township Engineer also suggested that applicant needs to comply with the Township's Design and Construction Standards. The Township Engineer also suggested seeing fire truck access template.

Mr. Angona replied that he has a copy of the Township Engineer's report dated May 26, 2016 and that he will comply with the recommendations.

Commissioner Whiting asked if the Commission is considering this an accessory building so it will comply with zoning. She stated that it sounds like if it is only being used for storage, this does not fit with the current zoning.

Mr. Lewan stated that it is not necessarily the Commission's role to figure out if it complies with zoning or not. At final site plan, he would like to see a more detailed description of the use, like what Mr. Angona described during tonight's meeting. The Supervisor's Office with his help can come up with the determination of use; it is not a determination that the Commission has to make.

Commissioner Mansour suggested giving the applicant more information that he can take away from the meeting knowing that he will be more in compliance if he uses it a certain way.

Mr. Lewan replied that he would need to see the detailed description. He suggested that the applicant look at all of the uses and the accessory uses to an office as described in the ordinance.

Commissioner Hines stated that this use is spelled out specifically in the M-1 zoning district and she read that ordinance language. She stated that it seems clear where this use should be located. She is concerned that this use is not related to the OS Office Service district.

Mr. Angona replied that there are similar businesses operating all along Dixie Highway. There is a misconception to hear contracting and automatically assume that it is a storage yard and that is not true. He stated that you can have an office and have an accessory building where you store the vehicles.

Commissioner Hines stated that she would like to see something written that spells out specifically what this is so she feels more comfortable with the intended use.

Mr. Angona stated that the intent is to improve the property with curb and gutter.

Chairperson Baker stated that with the zoning that is established on that property, there are permitted uses and uses allowed with Special Land Use. They are trying to learn about the applicant's use so they can make sure that it is one of the permitted uses. He suggested that the applicant speak about his intentions for use in the narrative that he will supply to the Township and Commission.

Commissioner Sclesky suggested that the applicant take the drawing that he has supplied and considers the information that he has heard regarding the Dixie Highway Corridor plan and long term vision. He asked the applicant if he has read the document and further, if he thinks he will have any difficulty meeting and conforming to the points that the planner has raised as concerns.

Mr. Angona stated that he will review the document and he is sure that you can still do a steel structure with a change of façade. He will take everything into consideration. The thought process was to create an office commercial parking lot and to obtain the variances to construct that.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he is concerned if this use would be accessory to office and he is waiting for proof that this building isn't the main use. He appreciates the applicant showing the 10 foot exception but it is time to start putting the sidewalks in. The Design Guidelines point out the landscaping and he suggested that they start with the stone work and split rail fences that are recommended. He suggested screening headlights from Dixie Highway. He would like to see screening proposed for the back of the property. He asked if the entrance all of the way out to Dixie Highway is going to be improved.

Mr. Angona replied yes.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he would like to see a building more in line with the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. He suggested that the building can still be metal but needs to have architectural design items added to bring it more in line with the guidelines.

Chairperson Baker stated that the 10 foot exception on the plan is depicted in the road right of way and asked if they would need Road Commission approval.

Mr. Lewan replied yes.

Chairperson Baker stated that this is a priority pathways area and they need the County to agree.

Mr. Lewan replied that the issue of the use should be ironed out.

Chairperson Baker concurred.

Supervisor Walls stated that the question of use is important to all Commissioners. He suggested that when the applicant puts the list together, it be brought back to the Commission to get collective opinions as to whether it is or it is not accessory. It would be a continuation of this concept review. The Supervisor's Office can make a recommendation but the Commission would have to approve it eventually.

Commissioners agreed that the applicant should provide this information.

Applicant agreed.

Commissioner Mansour stated that the applicant should review the Dixie Design Guidelines because the concept of the exterior elevation is going to be crucial for the success of this project moving forward. He asked the applicant if he understood.

Applicant agreed.

Old Business:

1. Ordinance Amendment – Section 40-597 Mineral Mining. Set for Public Hearing.

Mr. Lewan stated that the latest round of changes were never reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Township Attorney made changes to the last version that the Planning Commission saw before and there were no significant changes made.

Supervisor Walls stated that this is a continuation of the Public Hearing that was held several months ago but because of the passage of time, it would be better to set for another hearing to consider the minor changes made.

**Commissioner Hopper moved to set proposed Ordinance Amendments to Section 40-597 Mineral Mining for Public Hearing at the next available Planning**

**Commission Meeting. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

Other Business:

**1. Priority Task List**

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

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Pliska. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary