

**SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP BOARD MEETING**  
**September 14, 2006**  
**SYNOPSIS**

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 p.m. by Supervisor Walls

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a) Approved Minutes: August 10, 2006 Regular Meeting with bills and additional disbursements of \$296,015.89
- b) Accepted August 2006 Treasurer's Report
- c) Received August 2006 Reports: Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical and Fire
- d) Authorized payment of bills as presented, total \$53,749.47
- e) Adopted Resolution opposing "SOS" ballot proposal to amend State Constitution
- f) Authorized payment to Clinton River Watershed Council for Stormwater Education Phase II per contract, not to exceed \$22,091.32
- g) Adopted Resolution authorizing road closure of Ridge Valley on October 21, 2006 for annual neighborhood picnic
- h) Authorized \$3,000.00 Contribution to Andersonville Cemetery Association for FY 2007
- i) Authorized the transfer of the SMART Municipal Credits to Independence Township
- j) Authorized expenditure of up to \$540.00 for attendance at the 2006 Michigan Association of Planning Conference in Detroit, October 11-14, 2006
- k) Received communications and placed on file.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Dixie Baptist Church Special Land Use Request: Received oral and written comments

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Tabled Dixie Baptist Church Special Land Use Request
2. Springfield Marketplace: Provided Comments on Preliminary PUD Proposal
3. Adopted Ordinance 16 Amendments
4. Fire Station No. 1: Awarded bids to Professional Heating & Cooling for furnace and air conditioner replacement and to Diamond Concrete Overlays for apparatus room floor sealing
5. Clarkston Chamber of Commerce Dues: Deferred to September 26, 2006 Special Meeting
6. 2006 Building Department Fund and General Fund Amendments: Deferred to September 26, 2006 Special Meeting
7. Capital and Cooperative Initiatives Revolving Fund Grant: Deferred to September 26, 2006 Special Meeting
8. MTA Contribution Request: Deferred to September 26, 2006 Special Meeting

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Fire Station No. 2 Expansion, Construction Management and Financing: Deferred to September 26, 2006 Special Meeting

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ADJOURNED: 11:20 p.m.

NANCY STROLE, Clerk

**Call to Order:** Supervisor Collin Walls called the September 14, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Springfield Township Board to order at 7:35 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

**Roll Call:**

**Board Members Present**

Collin W. Walls	Township Supervisor
Jamie Dubre	Township Treasurer
Nancy Strole	Township Clerk
Dennis Vallad	Township Trustee
David Hopper	Township Trustee
Roger Lamont	Township Trustee
Marc Cooper	Township Trustee

**Board Members Not Present**

**Others Present**

Greg Need	Township Attorney
-----------	-------------------

**Agenda Additions & Changes:**

Supervisor Walls suggested changing hearing Old Business to immediately after Item #2 on New Business. The Board concurred.

He further noted that there is no ordinance report this month. Items #5 and #7 of New Business and #1 of Old Business should be deleted.

Trustee Vallad suggested removing Consent Item h and adding it as discussion under New Business. There were no objections

**Public Comment:**

**NONE**

**Consent Agenda:**

**★ Treasurer Dubre moved to approve the Consent Agenda as revised. Trustee Vallad supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Dubre, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

- a) Approval of Minutes: August 10, 2006 Regular Meeting with bills and additional disbursements of \$296,015.89

- b) Acceptance of July Treasurer's Report.
- c) Receipt of August 2006 Reports: Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Litigation and Fire.
- d) Authorize payment of bills as presented, totaling \$53,749.47.
- e) Adopt Resolution opposing "SOS" ballot proposal to amend State Constitution.
- f) Authorize payment to Clinton River Watershed Council for Stormwater Education Phase II per contract, not to exceed \$22,091.32.
- g) Adopt Resolution authorizing road closure of Ridge Valley on October 21, 2006 for annual neighborhood picnic.
- h) Authorize \$3,000 Contribution to Andersonville Cemetery Association for FY 2007.
- i) Authorize the transfer of the SMART Municipal Credits to Independence Township.
- j) Authorize expenditure of up to \$540 for attendance at the 2006 Michigan Association of Planning Conference in Detroit, October 11 – 14, 2006.

**Receipt of Communications**

- Senior Transportation Report
- Resolution by City of Ferndale opposing Ballot Proposal to ban Affirmative Action
- Letter from Village of Holly thanking Fire Chief Charles Oaks
- Yearly report from CAYA and request for contribution for 2007.

**Public Hearing:**

1. Dixie Baptist Church: Special Land Use

Mr. Jeff Ferweda of Sedgewick & Ferweda Architects explained that they are proposing two soccer fields and two baseball fields in addition to the proposed church and school. The building is designed to be kept off the road as far as possible and they would be reshaping the pond for stormwater issues along with creating another pond. They would like to create walking trails out of the existing logging trails. Mr. Ferweda showed the layout of the buildings and elevation drawings.

Mr. Jeff Lemaux, 12564 Rattalee Lake Rd., asked where the septic and backfill is directed? Mr. Ferweda explained on the drawing that the septic field would be located within the soccer field. A tank at the corner of the of the building would be pumped to the septic field. Mr. Lemaux asked if there would be lights on the ballfields? Mr. Ferweda said no, not at this time.

Ms. Michelle McCoy, 8119 E. Holly Rd., asked what they will do with the newly redone E. Holly Road? What would the hours be? Is there a marching band? Where is storage for buses? How many students and has future growth been accounted for? Signage and property values? Supervisor Walls explained that there are two proposed signs. Mr. Ferweda said one sign would be 16 foot tall. Clerk Strole noted that the plan proposes three signs. There are no road changes with the exception of a accel/decel lane; there is no marching band; school hours are 8 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday thru Friday; there would be no evening ballgames; church services are Sunday

from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. and Wednesday from 6 pm to 7:30 pm; daycare is 6 am to 6 pm and the maintenance facility would house six buses.

**Supervisor Walls opened the Public Hearing at 8:05 p.m.**

Mr. Lemaux commented that he would like to see this site continued as residential. However, if that does not happen, he would like stipulations on the project such as: no lighting on fields; lights in the parking lot not to exceed building height, campground be denied; road signs limited to small signs and no hunting by anyone allowed.

Mr. Stuart Hill, 9047 East Lake Rd., asked if this development is conditioned on the sale of the church's existing property? Mr. Ferweda said, yes.

Mr. Dave Feichtner, 9820 Clark Rd., commented that this development would have a negative impact and he hopes it does not get past this Board.

There were no further public comments.

**Supervisor Walls closed the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.**

**New Business:**

1. Dixie Baptist Church: Special Land Use

Trustee Hopper commented that he has difficulty with this because the plan presented tonight is completely different from the plan he reviewed. There is no landscape plan; he has not seen a topo; the plan presented does not even show the complete site. He believes he does not have enough here to approve a Special Land Use request. He believes the location could work if it is done properly but does not agree with the proposed banked parking location. He needs a reason why they would change the existing pond and is concerned about the screening to the west. Trustee Hopper further said he has an issue with the signs proposed and the steeple is too tall to be in accordance with our ordinance.

Clerk Strole commented that she concurs with Trustee Hopper's comments, and the plans shown tonight are not what she reviewed. She believes this proposal could qualify for Special Land Use but she needs much more detail. Clerk Strole noted that she is concerned with RV camping, and it is not permitted in residential. Lighting should not be on an "if" basis and she agrees with the attorney that the acreage is cumulative and the applicant would have to go to the ZBA for a variance. Construction of a church, daycare, elementary school and high school requires a minimum of 54 acres under the ordinance.

Trustee Lamont commented that we are lacking stormwater and landscape plans and those are critical to make a decision on SLU. Banked parking cannot happen in the green belt and the terminology "campground" does not fit in this use. Building height and steeple height are a

concern as is screening between land uses. Trustee Lamont said he could not approve SLU with the information presented tonight but agrees that, done properly, it could qualify.

Trustee Vallad commented that he did not have a problem with the Special Land Use even if variances are necessary. He believes the acreage question is based on public schools, not private. He would like the sign issues addressed and the steeple height and also has a concern with the sight distance.

Trustee Cooper said the ballfields in proximity to the lot line will have to be revised because foul balls will trespass onto neighbors property. He does have concerns with the driveway situation and would like to see the anticipated traffic study. He believes that one entry would be sufficient. Without a left-turn lane, he would have serious issues. Trustee Cooper said there are ways to have visiting ministers without having to have a campground.

Treasurer Dubre said she concurs with the comments made by the Board and is disappointed that the plan presented tonight is not what she has reviewed. She believes the SLU is workable but has an issue with signage.

Supervisor Walls said he is concerned with the drive sight distances. It is his opinion that one drive into this facility would be far more appropriate, centrally located at the crest of the hill. He agrees that the ballfields are too close to the west property line and believes there is not enough room to provide screening as required by our ordinance. The dugout is in the setback and buffer area. He did not see a loading zone that accommodates the kitchen and regular service needs of the facility. The ordinance only allows one ground sign and the maximum height is 6 feet. He does not like the terminology "campground" and what it implies. He would like a better explanation of the proposed pavilion.

- ★ **Supervisor Walls moved to table any action on the Special Land Use until revised plans and information are presented in accordance with the standards of the Ordinance and addressing comments this evening. Clerk Strole supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Dubre, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

## 2. Springfield Marketplace: Preliminary PUD

Mr. Dale Watchowski, President and CEO of REDICO gave a presentation explaining the history of REDICO and the proposed Springfield Marketplace. **A copy of the detailed proposal is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township.**

Trustee Vallad asked the applicant if they have ever done a retail project in a community with no sewer system? Mr. Drane of ROGVOY Architects explained that REDICO does have a project similar on M-5 with a waste water treatment plant.

Treasurer Dubre asked if they have done any projects that back up to residential as close as this proposal? Mr. Watchowski said most of their projects are adjacent to residential.

Clerk Strole asked the applicant if they have had any discussion with Bordine's to coordinate planning? Mr. Watchowski said they have met with the Bordines and are exploring how they might mutually utilize a wastewater treatment plant. They have also discussed the possibility of coordinating the entrance ways. Clerk Strole said a boulevard at the entrance to the Township would be a great benefit and the Master Plan calls for a boulevard at that location. She asked the applicants if they have explored that? Mr. Watchowski said, no, but they could take that into consideration. Clerk Strole asked the applicant to explain what he means by "gathering places." Mr. Drane said some of the smaller buildings in front will have outdoor seating such as benches, light fixtures and planters.

Trustee Lamont asked the applicant if they evaluated the line of site from the two story condos to the complex with a 14-foot high combination berm, wall and trees? Mr. Watchowski said yes. The back of the buildings will look as good as the front and he does not believe they will diminish property values. Trustee Lamont asked if the berm is adequate? Mr. Drane said. Yes, and they have offered many options to the residents.

Trustee Hopper commented that this development as proposed is much too intense for this site and for the Township as a whole. The development does not maintain the rural character nor does it meet the goals and policies of our Master Plan or Design and Construction Standards or our Zoning Ordinance. Trustee Hopper cited numerous Ordinance Sections in which he believes this to be the case. Specifically, Section 14 – PUD Ordinance; Section 14.01.3a – Regulations, he does not see where this project fits; Section 14.01.3b – Proposed type and density shall not result in an unreasonable increase or need for public services; Section 14.01.3e – Shall not result in an unreasonable negative economic impact on the surrounding properties; Section 14.01.3g – Proposed development should be consistent with the goals and policies of the Township Master Plan; Section 14.02.3d – Project Design Standard, drainage and utility design shall meet or exceed the standards; Section 14.02.3h – Where non residential uses adjoin off site residentially zoned properties, noise reduction and visual screening must be addressed; Section 17.09 – Community Sewer Systems - this is a special land use; therefore the applicant must address all of Section 18.08. Section 18.07 – Site Plan Review required in specific districts – the proposed development must not be injurious to the surrounding area. Section 18.07.2c – location of buildings adverse effects will be minimized; 18.07.2d – Proper development of roads protect the general health, safety and welfare and character of the Township. Trustee Hopper said he further concurs with Trustee Lamont's comments.

Clerk Strole commented that a key element for a PUD is that there be a recognizable and material benefit to the ultimate users of the project and to the community. This development is primarily intended to serve non-residents and is a regional shopping facility in her opinion. The traffic analysis justifies that conclusion. The traffic analysis states that 83% of the anticipated traffic is coming from outside this Township. The tax benefit to the Township is minimal and we cannot significantly strain the community services; we would have to add a sheriff deputy to help with this and the tax benefit won't even cover that cost. Clerk Strole said the Master Plan

calls for a boulevard at that site because that is the gateway to the community and will help control traffic. One light at the entrance to this development is unacceptable in her opinion and the traffic analysis confirms this. Clerk Strole explained that she can drive 15 minutes either north or south and reach a home improvement store. She believes the project as a whole is too intense for this parcel.

Trustee Lamont commented that there is no recognizable and material benefit to this community that could justify the PUD approval. The proposal, as presented in its current form is not characteristic with our Master Plan. The square footage is far too dense for this parcel and he has a great deal of concern with the screening to the nearby residents. Open spaces around the project are amenities and good features but there are 1750 parking space right in the middle. Trustee Lamont said he believes this will place a higher demand on our public services. Traffic is a major concern but he does not know if the one proposed light would be perceived as a benefit to the community and further efforts to coordinate with the Bordines should be pursued. He does believe this is a high quality proposal.

Trustee Cooper said he believes a PUD could work at this site but not the way it is presented now. Until many of the aforementioned areas are addressed, he has a problem with it.

Trustee Vallad commented that a less intense proposal would be more acceptable and a boulevard on Dixie Highway would be well received. He believes we need some development but not at this intense level.

Treasurer Dubre commented that REDICO has developed quality developments but she has some concern with the proposed buffering. She also has a concern that this proposal does not meet the material benefit requirements and it does not have the required rural character of Springfield Township. She believes there are too many proposed buildings and it will basically be a 24-hour operation because trucks will load and unload at night. She concurs with most of Trustee Hopper's comments and Springfield Township is in need of a lot of things but not a development of this intensity.

Supervisor Walls said he did visit the applicants Green Oak Township development and he has no question in his mind about this developer and the quality they develop. He has rarely heard such positive comments about a developer by a municipality. However, the same benefits to Green Oak Township are not reflected in the plan presented to Springfield Township. The Township Board is faced with making a decision on what is before them, not what could be. The fact that the developer has not attempted to address the goals and policies and standards of this community is unfortunate and out of character. The supposed 1.1 million dollars in taxes, if that is so, rolling back millages to reflect what would be the probable 2008 tax, Springfield Township would receive approximately \$124,000: \$45,800 of which would go into the Police Fund and the cost of a deputy exceeds \$135,000. That is not a community benefit. \$22,400+ would go to the Fire Fund which will not cover the increased medical runs and runs to car accidents. The traffic study given indicates that 83% of the traffic for this project will come from the south and east on Dixie Highway or I-75 and this does not primarily serve Springfield Township. He believes this project could generate cars in excess of 20,000 cars per day and that is a significant negative

impact to this community that cannot be mitigated by one street light. The applicant did not demonstrate a community benefit that is commensurate with the cost and detrimental impact of this project. He has a major concern about the fact that we have a policy and standard that discourages underground stormwater and that is what the applicant is proposing. We have a Master Plan policy that encourages native vegetated swales and naturally designed detention areas. We are given support for underground storage from Macomb County Standards. This is Northwest Oakland County. Supervisor Walls said he strongly believes the project must be moved further away from the residents and does not believe we should allow the proposed banked parking in the greenbelt. The plan as presented does not meet community standards, goals, policies and does not provide sufficient benefit to mitigate the cost and the problems that will be created by it.

Supervisor Walls opened public comment at 10:08

Mr. John Davey [a Bloomfield Hills resident who owns property at 12610 E. Holly Rd.] commented that the Board should focus on the quality of life and consider new jobs and the tremendous benefit this will provide Springfield Township.

Ms. Kim Huppertz, 9009 E. Bluewater Dr., said she has many concerns with this project and is not in favor of permitting it.

Mr. Bill Beauchamp, 8791 Cedar Ct., said he is in favor of this developer building at this site. He asks that no trees be removed.

Ms. Theresa Kelly, 9042 East Lake Rd., said she is in favor of this development.

Ms. Lori Taylor of Grand Blanc Township, commented that her children reside with their father on Lavon Street and she is in favor of this development.

Ms. Connie McClellan, 7300 Bluewater Dr., and manager of Bavaria on the Water, said she does not want this development here.

Ms. Carol Cane, 9067 Bavaria Ct., asked that the Board give the developer some direction so that he can come back with a plan that could be approved.

Mr. John Critzer, 8356 Fawn Valley Dr., Independence Township, said he is in favor of this development.

Mr. Gene Ewing, President of Springfield Pines Condominium Association, commented that this will affect property values and he is opposed.

Mr. Aaron Trager, 9846 Forest Ridge Dr., said he is very much in support of this project.

Mr. Alan Jesiel, 9872 Forest Ridge, commented that he hates that this project is so adversarial. He likes the wide open space by the church and he would pay more in taxes to get this developer



to relocate to another area of the Township. Companies do not know as much as people give them credit for and he suggested the Township Board do their due diligence.

Mr. Tim Wittebort, 8615 S. Shore Point, commented that Michigan has the second worst economy and this would provide good jobs for wives and teenagers and he is in favor of it proceeding.

Mr. Edward Kici, 9065 Rattalee Lake Rd., commented that REDICO is a good company to work with and he is in favor of this proposed project.

Mr. Dave Feichtner, 9820 Clark Rd., commented that any development must be commensurate with our Master Plan and goals. However, this project is not the right answer, as the negative impact would be substantial.

There were no further public comments.

Mr. Watchowski commented that with all due respect to the Board, he is floored and shocked by the response of the Board tonight. They are looking for some direction and are willing to work with the Township to move this project forward. REDICO would very much like to work in this community and he has never gone into a community where they have had so many people come out and speak on their behalf. Mr. Watchowski asked the Board if they want REDICO to disappear or continue working with the Township. The majority of the Board members concurred that they are not encouraging REDICO to disappear. However, they must work with the Township to restructure the proposal so that it meets Township standards and policies.

### **Old Business:**

1. Second Reading: Ordinance 16 Amendment

Supervisor Walls explained that this is an amendment to an existing ordinance that was originally drafted in 1970. Reasons for the amendment are many but primarily they are to bring the definitions into compliance with current state law, to simplify a complicated ordinance and to remove provisions which were zoning provisions. The current ordinance and the draft ordinance does not say that we do now or ever have prohibited recreational vehicles. The ordinance as it exists and as it is proposed, deals only with junk and unlicensed and/or inoperable vehicles, recreation vehicles, trailers, etc.

**\* Clerk Strole moved to adopt Amendment to Ordinance #16 as published for Second Reading but with the insertion of the clarifying language presented to us this evening, said amendment to take effect seven days after publication of Notice of Adoption. Trustee Hopper supported the motion.**

Mr. Dave Feichtner, 9820 Clark Rd., thanked Clerk Strole for the way she tried to get to the bottom of his questions that he called her about.

Mr. Joe Raschke, 5680 Hillsboro, asked if this change indicates he must remove his “corn popper” from his landscaping? Supervisor Walls explained that is not the intent of this and he does not have to remove it.

Mr. William Amis, 8500 Tindall, asked if he would have to remove his demolition derby cars that they use in the 4-h Fair? Supervisor Walls said if the cars are inoperable and/or unlicensed they are in violation of the ordinance today and would be if this passes.

Mr. Gary Turner, 8292 Tindall, said he owns dragsleds and does not have property large enough to build a pole barn. Supervisor Walls said this ordinance amendment does not change how an ordinance officer would view the property.

Mr. David Vadeboncoeur, 5175 Hillsboro, suggested putting car covers on these items and making it look neat.

Mrs. Overfield, 6575 Ridgewood, asked the Board if this is the same as the previously proposed Blight Ordinance? Supervisor Walls said, no.

**\* Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Dubre, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

Supervisor Walls suggested hearing the remainder of tonight’s business at the Budget Hearing on September 26, 2006 and add to the agenda, gravel program discussion and a banner request. The Board unanimously agreed.

Fire Chief Oaks asked if the Board would discuss Item #4 of New Business before they adjourn. The Board agreed.

3. Fire Station No. 1:
  - a) Furnace and Air Conditioner replacement
  - b) Apparatus room floor sealing

**\* Supervisor Walls moved to authorize the Fire Chief to award the contract for the furnace and air conditioner to the low bidder, Professional Heating and Cooling and the bid for sealing Station #1 floors to the contractor recommended by the Chief. Trustee Cooper supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Walls, Dubre, Strole, Vallad, Hopper, Lamont and Cooper; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

**Public Comment: None**

Regular Meeting Springfield Township Board  
Sept. 14, 2006

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Supervisor Walls adjourned the meeting at 11:25 p.m.

---

Collin W. Walls, Township Supervisor

---

Nancy Strole, Township Clerk