

Minutes of
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 28, 2022



Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the June 28, 2022, 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, Chair
Jamie Costigan
Ruth Ann Hines
Dave Hopper
George Mansour
Chris Moore
Kevin Sclesky

Consultants Present:

Matt Wojciechowski, Giffels Webster
Stephanie Osborn, Giffels Webster
Mike Smith, AEW

Staff Present:

Laura Moreau, Supervisor
Joan Rusch, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Sclesky moved to proceed with the agenda as presented with the spelling of the word “business” corrected. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Yes: Baker, Costigan, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Moore, Sclesky. No: None. Motion approved.

Public Comment:

None

Approval of Consent Agenda:

Commissioner Hines moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Vote: Yes: Baker, Costigan, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Moore, Sclesky. No: None. Motion approved.

a) Approve minutes: May 24, 2022, Regular Meeting

b) Accept report from the Supervisor for the Clarkston Complex Final Site Plan extension

New Business:

1. Whoopee Bowl – Preliminary Site Plan Review, 9560 Dixie Highway, P.I. # 07-14-226-004

Mike Powell, project engineer, explained that the intent of this project is to bring the existing building and apartment building in line with the current design guidelines, and to address any septic

Minutes of
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 28, 2022



and stormwater issues. Mr. Powell introduced Jim Wilson, owner, and Gary Kwapis, architect, who were also in attendance.

Chairperson Baker explained that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide commentary to help with the development of this property.

Mr. Wojciechowski discussed comments from the Planner's review letter dated June 16, 2022. He noted that the project will include an addition to the front of the building, reconfiguring the driveways and parking, and improving the landscape of the existing building. No structural changes will be made to the apartment building also on site. The inconsistencies with the zoning notations have been corrected. The stormwater and sewage treatment have been noted on the plans. There are no issues with the use of the building. The drives have been reworked to provide better circulation on the site. The building has pre-existing, nonconforming setback deviations. The addition does not meet the required setback, but it will not increase the nonconformity. This project should comply with greenbelt standards in the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Hines asked if the new addition needs to meet the front setback requirements.

Chairperson Baker explained that the nonconformity already exists. Because the dimensional difference would not be greater than what already exists, the setbacks for this addition would not need approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Smith stated that this plan is ready to go forward. He commented on items in his review of May 26, 2022, that need to be addressed. The site access needs a permit from RCOC. The overhead door with access drive is now shown. The pedestrian pathway is partly in the road right of way, but this is acceptable because of the constraints of the building, and the pathway easement is shown. The water flows from Dixie Highway to the pond/lake at the back of the site. This pond/lake is governed by EGLE, so a permit will be required. The septic system and well are shown. The grading by the dumpster is steep and a retaining device might be needed.

Mr. Powell commented that the consultants were helpful, and the final plans will provide more detail for the next submittal.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the Fire Chief reviewed the plans and noted a secondary egress may be needed from the second floor.

Mr. Kwapis stated that they are looking at this item.

Commissioner Hopper commented that nothing was being done to the apartment, but it appears that a fence is going in.

Mr. Kwapis stated that they will provide landscaping in front of the apartment building and a fence.

Minutes of
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 28, 2022



Commissioner Hopper noted that there are eleven spaces provided for parking for the apartment building. He inquired if the gravel in front of the building would be used for parking.

Mr. Powell stated that parking would be eliminated from the front of the apartment building and moved to the side. The front of the apartment building would be grass with a picket fence. He also commented that there will be a display of unique automobiles in the building, which is why an overhead door is needed. There will be grass pavers installed in front of this overhead door.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the final plans should show seeding, grass, and other landscape items.

Mr. Powell stated that they will be removing an existing drive in front of the building. The RCOC uses one of the drives for access to the drainage site, so it will remain. They may need to put a barrier at this drive to prevent people from driving across the grass there.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that the driveway to the north could be shared for future development on that side of the property. This should be considered, since the Township encourages shared access on Dixie Highway.

Chairperson Baker stated that the accent fencing must meet the standards of the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines, and that a white picket fence would not meet these requirements.

Mr. Kwapis stated that they will use a fence detail in accordance with the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines in front of the apartment building.

Chairperson Baker noted that there is outdoor seating proposed for customers. He asked if there would be any food prep on the site.

Mr. Powell stated that only pre-packaged food items would be for sale. There would be no food prep or warming of food on site.

Commissioner Mansour commented that the name of the business is spelled several different ways on the plans and asked that this be corrected. He also asked for clarification of the side setback dimension, as it is noted as both 50 ft. and 60 ft. on different parts of the plan.

Mr. Powell stated that he will correct these items.

Commissioner Mansour asked if the ten-year storm drainage plans shown on the plans were typical.

Mr. Smith stated that the existing site is having some impervious surface added to it. Considering that the existing site already drains, the concern is with what stormwater might be added to the system and providing information on how this water will percolate. The plans provide for some detention of water as well.



Commissioner Mansour asked if one bathroom was sufficient for the second story.

Mr. Kwapis stated that having just one bathroom on the second floor was based on the projected use of the facility.

Chairperson Baker stated that this review is to provide comments only. There will be more detailed items required to be shown on the final site plans.

Mr. Powell and Mr. Wilson showed a color board with the proposed color scheme of the building as well as the type of natural stone to be used.

Supervisor Moreau commented that the apartment building should coordinate with the other building on site and use the same color palette.

Chairperson Baker stated that the minutes and comments provided this evening by the commissioners would suffice for the review comments on this preliminary review. The next step would be final site plan review.

Mr. Powell inquired if permits from the RCOC would be needed for the final site plan.

Mr. Smith stated that once the final site plan is approved, then the applicant would go through final engineering review. It is at this point that permits from the RCOC would be required.

Chairperson Baker stated that the summary of the minutes as well as the consultants' conversations and the documents they've already presented will suffice as the preliminary site plan review.

Old Business

1. Solar Ordinance – Revised Draft

Ms. Osborn stated that the solar ordinance has been revised based on previous discussions along with feedback from the Fire Chief. The memo presented outlines the changes the Fire Chief requested and outlines in which parts of the proposed language those are addressed. The memo also demonstrates the calculations used to determine the number of solar panels a household would require. Ms. Osborn determined that a reasonable amount of solar panels would be 1500 square feet. There were no changes made to the definitions or where solar is permitted. Building mounted solar panels are by right in all districts and ground mounted panels are by right in all districts, except the Dixie Highway Overlay District, and only on parcels where the use is residential. The language limiting roof top structures in 40-634.1 has been modified to except solar panels and then refers to the ordinance language in 40-653.

Commission Hopper asked for clarification on item 40-653(c)(3)(h) regarding fence enclosures being inspected by the Building Department and the Planning Commission waiving or reducing screening requirements when vegetation accomplishes the same. Since the Planning Commission doesn't review residential plans, he was wondering if the Building Department could approve the

Minutes of
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 28, 2022



required screening. Commissioner Hopper inquired if this might be something the Site Plan Review Committee could be involved in, although residential site plans do not come before this committee.

The Commissioners discussed who should be responsible for reviewing the screening on a property.

Supervisor Moreau suggested that the zoning administrator could be the one who should inspect if the screening requirement is met or maybe it would have to come before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The Commissioners and planner discussed the intent of the screening requirement, how to determine if the requirement has been met and who determines this, if a fence should always be required without a vegetative screening option, how to apply common sense to this requirement, whether or not the screening language should be more specific, if ground mounted solar panels should be removed from the ordinance, if screening at the property line instead of around the solar panels is better, if screening is even necessary, what types of screening would be acceptable, if screening would be achievable in all situations, and the option of just removing the last sentence in this section and making the zoning administrator responsible for determining if the screening is met. The Planner commented that it would be difficult to account for all possible screening scenarios and suggested that the ordinance could be amended in the future if needed. The Commissioners decided to keep the screening language as is and have the zoning administrator responsible for determining if screening is met. The Planner will adjust the language to reflect this.

Chairperson Baker asked for clarification on height of roof structures in 40-634(1). He asked if no structures other than solar panels may exceed the height limit in the district and if solar panels could be 15 feet higher than the 28 ½ feet required in the district.

Ms. Osborn stated that this section was put in to specifically except solar panels, not just for the height but for the percentage of roof coverage. The ordinance refers to section 40-653 for specifics on solar panels.

Supervisor Moreau suggested that the wording “other than solar panels, which are regulated in Section 653” be moved to after the word “However” at the beginning of the sentence. This should improve clarity.

Chairperson Baker also asked for clarification on screening of roof top solar panels in section 40-653(c)(2)(c).

Ms. Osborn stated that 40-653(c)(2)(g) addresses screening of roof top solar panels.

Chairperson Baker stated, and Ms. Osborn confirmed, that a residential roof top solar panel could be mounted on a flat roof not to exceed five feet in height with no screening.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Commissioners could have a motion to set this ordinance for Public Hearing or bring this ordinance back with edits next month.



Commissioner Hopper moved, based on the draft ordinance text received from the Township Planner and reflected in the minutes of this meeting, to set for public hearing the proposed amendments to Chapter 40 Zoning, sections 40-634.1, 40-653, and 40-2, at the earliest opportunity. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Yes: Baker, Costigan, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Moore, Sclesky. No: None. Motion Carried.

2. Master Plan – Review Resource Packets

Mr. Wojciechowski explained the resource packets provided for tonight’s meeting. He introduced the topics for review that are divided into three sections – Housing, Senior Services, and Downtown Davisburg/Mixed Use Areas. Each section of the resource pack contains articles pertinent to the specific topics. The intent is to get the commissioners thinking about different planning theories and ideas for what the commissioners would like to see in the Master Plan. He suggested that the commissioners pick and choose what topics to delve further into based on their interests and concerns.

Mr. Wojciechowski pointed out the memo on the community septic system in downtown Davisburg that addresses some of the challenges associated with this, including composting and onsite treatments.

Mr. Wojciechowski stated that next month’s topics would include Non-motorized Transportation, Resiliency and Sustainability, and Expansion of the Dixie Overlay District. He suggested that the commissioners begin thinking about these topics and develop questions for dialogue. These topics will be discussed throughout the Master Plan process.

Supervisor Moreau stated that Mr. Wojciechowski has put together these topics from previous discussions with the Supervisor’s Office. She commented that the commissioners should think about ordinances they might like to see revised. One ordinance she would like to see reviewed is the maintenance of animals. The commissioners may also want to be thinking about different goals they have for the Township.

Mr. Wojciechowski commented that this is a good time to establish policies and intent in the Master Plan. It is an appropriate time to look at items from a larger perspective.

Commissioner Hines commented on how the visitability issue could be introduced, as it seemed more of a state building code item than something addressed at the Township level.

Mr. Wojciechowski stated that Township ordinances in conjunction with the building code could address this topic.

Chairperson Baker inquired if ten businesses were joined to the septic system in downtown Davisburg.

Minutes of
**PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 28, 2022**



Supervisor Moreau noted that the resource information indicates that there is a restaurant in downtown Davisburg; however, there are no restaurants downtown. She explained that the Township Board has discussed the downtown septic system extensively. She stated that she recently had a discussion with the attorney regarding this project. In July the Township Board will discuss ordinance amendments along with connection fees, user fees, and a maintenance agreement. EGLE is not involved in permits for this process. Hopefully, by September everything will be ready for other properties to apply to connect.

Mr. Smith explained how this system is designed regarding capacity limits. Once these limits are reached, then the system may need to be extended and then EGLE would become involved.

Supervisor Moreau stated that there are five businesses on the south side of Davisburg Road that are proposed to be part of the sewer district. The intent is to provide reserve capacity for the old lumberyard property to connect. Properties on the north side of the street have more space for their own septic systems.

Supervisor Moreau also noted that there are alternatives for composting solutions that will take dairy products and more research could be done in this area. She stated that the Township would not take on the responsibilities of a composting facility and that pre-treatment of waste is very expensive.

Chairperson Baker summarized that Mr. Wojciechowski has outlined the next steps the Commissioners should take in the Master Plan process, including reviewing the documents provided and considering which topics to address during the process.

Commissioner Sclesky raised a concern regarding shared driveways in the Dixie Highway Overlay District.

Mr. Wojciechowski stated that he will look into the ordinance and agreed that this is something to be discussed when reviewing the Master Plan.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Vote: Yes: Baker, Costigan, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Moore, Sclesky. No: None. Motion approved.

Joan Rusch, Recording Secretary