

**Springfield Township  
Planning Commission – Business Meeting  
Minutes of November 19, 2007**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the November 19, 2007 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

**Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present**

Roger Lamont  
John Steckling  
Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines (arrived 7:34 p.m.)  
Frank Aiello  
Bill Leddy  
Laura Moreau

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

**Staff Present**

Collin Walls  
Nancy Strole

**Consultants Present**

Sally Elmiger

**Approval of Agenda:**

Commissioner Steckling asked to add as item #1 under New Business, By Law Discussion. There were no objections to this addition.

**Public Comment:**           **None**

**Consent Agenda:**

- ★     **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Aiello supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Aiello, Leddy and Moreau; No: none; Absent: Hines.**

Approval of Minutes:           October 15, 2007

Receipt of Reports:           None

Action Items that do not require Board discussion:   None

Communications: \* Letter from Charter Township of Highland

                                  Notice of Intent to Plan

                                  \* Letter to O.C. Planning & Econ. Development Serv.:

                                  Review (3) parcels from 8-2-07 PC Public Hearing

**Public Hearing:               None**

**Old Business:**

1.     Rezoning Procedures:
  - a)    Procedure Clarifications
  - b)    CWA Proposal

Commissioner Hines arrive 7:34 p.m.

Supervisor Walls said the Planning Commission is to be commended on behalf of the vast majority of the township residents who supported what they are doing. Supervisor Walls thanked the Planning Commission. He explained that the overwhelming majority of the residents who came into the township to discuss the proposed rezonings were very supportive of the efforts and proposals that came about at the August 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing. Supervisor Walls said it is important to recognize those who spoke in opposition because the vast majority of their concerns were valid and they need to be addressed. However, he has not seen any actual discussion from the Planning Commission of the individual concerns expressed. He hopes that was not a reflection that the Planning Commission feels they are not capable, because they are. Carlisle/Wortman is one of the best planning consultants available and he is proud that they represent us, but they are our consultants. The Planning Commission members are the people who make the recommendation to the Township Board. He believes several points raised at the public hearing, with a minimal amount of review, can be addressed very easily, such as HCMA, Shiawassee Basin and Lil Mac Development area. Supervisor Walls showed the Planning Commission on a map areas he was referring to.

Clerk Strole reiterated that she spoke with hundreds of people regarding the proposed rezonings; and, without question, once they understood what the ultimate goal is, they were very supportive. In regard to noticing, Clerk Strole explained that the Clerk's Office always follows the law in regard to public noticing. If there is any question in her mind, she always errs on the side of caution and goes above and beyond what the law requires. The Clerk's Office was not required by law to send out many of the notices and maps for the proposed rezonings, but she did it as a courtesy. The Clerk's Office will not send out special notices just because certain individuals are demanding special attention. Clerk Strole explained that the Township really tries hard for transparency. When individuals accuse the township of hiding something or not doing their best with noticing, that is hogwash.

Commissioner Aiello said he feels that the mapping is important. He explained that involving Carlisle/Wortman was never meant to punt policy making; it was to punt information gathering and filtering. He would have been happy to go to a work session for a project this big where there was no public comment, and we could have been briefed ahead of time. He suggested that the Planning Commission go back to having workshop meetings when we need them.

Commissioner Baker asked if we need to put more formalized definition into exactly what it is we are looking for. We have not asked for the right things, because we did not necessarily know

their value or ease of accessibility. Maybe that is something that a workshop meeting would be useful for. We did cite several things we thought would be relevant to various properties and would give better understanding of the impact of our proposals. He is very willing to discuss more in workshop meetings.

Commissioner Steckling said he agrees with Commissioner Baker and agrees that the Planning Commission can do this, perhaps through work sessions. The photos and mapping will help with this process. He suggested going through with the committees that we have already established for this process. Chairperson Lamont agreed.

Supervisor Walls said he would get aerial photos to the committees but he needs a committee date.

The Planning Commissioners unanimously agreed to hold a Workshop Meeting on December 6, 2007 at 7:30 p.m., at which time they would break into their respective committees to discuss the various parcels proposed for rezoning.

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that the Planning Commission meet on December 6, 2007 at a workshop meeting and split into the two sub-committees and discuss the individual properties and treat it as a normal workshop meeting. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Hines, Aiello, Leddy and Moreau; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

In regard to the Carlisle/Wortman proposal, Chairperson Lamont explained that this was pulled from the Township Board Agenda at their last meeting because he felt it was not time for that to go to the Board. There was also text language changes made to proposed zoning ordinance amendments, which, prior to the latest revisions in state statute, used to have to come back to the Planning Commission but no longer have to. Those changes were deemed minor changes in clarifications and changes that were adopted by the Township Board for Second Reading. Clerk Strole said she would provide the Planning Commission with a copy of those changes.

- 2. Master Plan – Phase 1
  - a) Notice of Intent to Update Master Plan
  - b) Review: Goals and Policies
  - c) Review: Update Background Data and Description

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that the Planning Commission send out the letter that Clerk Strole drafted and submitted to us in our package as is required by the Coordinated Planning Act to all of the parties as required by statute and to any other parties that the Clerk feels would be interested in receiving it. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Hines, Aiello, Leddy and Moreau; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

In regard to Goals and Policies, Ms. Elmiger said she specifically put in the work plan to update the Master Plan, is whether or not they feel it would be important to have a particular meeting to discuss the Goals and Policies with the Township Board. If they do not feel that is necessary, it can be removed from the work plan.

Chairperson Lamont asked if the commissioners feel the need for a joint meeting. He personally believes the Goals and Policies of the current Master Plan are on track. Commissioner Aiello said he does not believe a joint meeting is necessary. Chairperson Lamont said he concurs with Commissioner Aiello. Commissioner Baker said he does not see the need since the minutes will reflect the desires of the Planning Commission. The majority of the Planning Commissioners agreed.

- ★ **Chairperson Lamont moved that the Planning Commission feels that the Goals and Policies in the Master Plan Phase I are adequate and at this time does not feel the need to hold a joint meeting with the Township Board. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Hines, Aiello, Leddy and Moreau; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

Regarding the update on background data and description, Commissioner Baker noted that on page 15 it mentions paid on-call firefighters with a full-time fire chief. It is his recollection that we have two full time firefighters, and that would be a good place to mention it. Page 17, third paragraph, notes that the natural resources were studied in the early 80's and again as part of the Headwaters project. Commissioner Baker said he believes that should be more extensively explained as the 80's does not indicate why it was studied. Ms. Elmiger said she would review it and expand upon this statement.

Commissioner Hines said page 92 refers to aging baby boomers or empty nesters, and page 94 states only 9% of the population is over the age of 60. She is seeing these paragraphs as inconsistent. Commissioner Hines explained that we would plan differently if the trend is toward a population that is more aged. Ms. Elmiger explained the difference between the two paragraphs and said she could change the pie chart to a graph to show the distribution and how it has changed over the last ten years. Commissioner Hines noted a typographical error on page 133. "determination us based upon" should be "was based upon."

Commissioner Steckling said in regard to the listing of major employers in the area, Scott Ford should be "Szott Ford."

Commissioner Hines asked, regarding page 99 and the Single Family Residential paragraph, as it seems inconsistent. Ms. Elmiger said she assumes it meant that attached units are allowed in a single-family residential area. However, she would confirm that.

Supervisor Walls suggested that if we make the existing land use categories more closely aligned with the zoning, fine, but do not make them identical. We have a large area of the township that has existing agricultural uses which is allowed in residential zoning. We do not have agricultural zoning districts.

Commissioner Baker said page 109, second paragraph, references old income figures and we do have the new ones because they were used on page 13. Commissioner Baker noted a typo on page 114.

Ms. Elmiger said she would make the respective changes and plan to bring the revisions back to the Planning Commission as soon as possible. Supervisor Walls said this process will be in two phases and before we wrap it all up, Sally may want to go back to the population and economics section and revisit those before. Supervisor Walls and Clerk Strole said they would send their written comments to Ms. Elmiger and the Planning Commission.

## **New Business:**

### **1. By Laws Discussion**

Commissioner Steckling explained that we have By Laws that we recently reviewed, amended and adopted. In regard to the public comment period, it provides for a three minute time limit unless the time is extended by the Chairperson, and no member of the public shall speak twice on one subject unless authorized by the Chairperson. Commissioner Steckling said we have to have some kind of understanding on how to deal with that and notify the public before the public comment period. He also believes we should adhere to the By Laws that we adopted. Commissioner Steckling suggested putting this on a future agenda for further detailed discussion.

Commissioner Aiello asked if there is anything in our By Laws referencing where public comment is appropriate. We have been reopening discussions due to public comment. Commissioner Steckling said that is a good point, and it would be nice to formulate a policy. Commissioner Aiello said he would look into language for that and review By Laws provisions. Chairperson Lamont said "Roberts Rules of Order" allow for public comment for items not on the agenda at the beginning and at the end of a meeting and, of course, during a public hearing. Commissioner Aiello said he does not disagree with the format. What he believes is inefficient is that we allow public to comment in the middle of the Planning Commission discussion and then we get into a back and forth dialogue. It is not standard procedure in a public meeting and is inefficient. More structure would be fairer to the public as well.

The Planning Commission agreed to adhere to the By Laws.

## **Public Comment:**

Dr. James O'Neill, Holcomb Rd., said he has a copy of the First Amendment of the Constitution if anyone is interested. He commented that the public was going to have an opportunity to have input regarding rezonings and then it would go on to the Township Board. He discussed this with Clerk Strole and said he would try to resolve and educate the people as to their grievances. He is not sure what he heard tonight, but he thinks there will be committees. He asked if the people on the committee will have the power to speak and vote on what would be presented back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Leonard Gorz, 7687 Brook Lane, commented that he does not agree with a three minute time constraint for public comments, and when talking about someone's property, the property owner should have as much time as they like.

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary