

PLANNING COMMISSION

Final MEETING AGENDA

May 15, 2006

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

MINUTES: April 06, 2006 Workshop
April 17, 2006 Business Meeting

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.25
Safety Paths
2. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Article II, Section 2.00
And Article XVI, Section 16.17, Lots Abutting Water Bodies.
3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Article XVIII,
Subsections 18.07.4 and 18.07.4.a, Site Plan Review Procedures

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Existing, non-conforming setbacks

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.25, Safety
Paths
2. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.17, Lots
Abutting Water Bodies.
3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 18.07.4 &
18.07.4.a., Site Plan Review Procedures
4. Schwan's Home Service, Inc. – Final Site Plan

OTHER BUSINESS:

Miscellaneous

1. RC, PR & PS District Language – Review language going to Public
Hearing.
2. Eagle's Ridge - Final Site Plan

NEXT MEETING DATE: June 19, 2006

ADJOURNMENT:

The Mission of the Springfield Township Planning Commission is to guide and promote the efficient, coordinated development of the Township in a manner that will best promote the health, safety, and welfare of its people.

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of May 15, 2006**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the May 15, 2006 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
Paul Rabaut
Bill Leddy
Dean Baker
Bill Champion
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioner(s) Absent

John Steckling

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Collin Walls

**Approval of Minutes: April 6, 2006
 April 17, 2006**

Commissioner Leddy noted that he was not present at the April 6th meeting but is noted as speaking. Commissioner Champion noted that the comments referred to on Page 3, were his.

- * Commissioner Leddy moved to approve the minutes of April 6, 2006 as revised. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Hines; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

- * Commissioner Baker moved to approve the minutes of April 17, 2006 as presented. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Hines; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

Chairperson Lamont noted that Eagle's Ridge requested to be moved to the end of the agenda. Sleepy Hollow was requested by the applicant to be removed.

- * Chairperson Lamont moved that Springfield Retail Final Site Plan be removed from the agenda. In his opinion, although the site plan is aesthetically and architecturally pleasing, the engineering is incomplete. Therefore, no discussion would be proper without the detailed information with respect to the on site sewage disposal system and information on a water system. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Hines; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Public Comment:

Mr. Victor Saroki, architect for Springfield Retail said he has many of his colleagues present and they are prepared to answer questions. However, he was hoping that his civil engineer would be present and is not. Mr. Saroki said it is unfortunate that the Commission has decided to remove them from the agenda.

Public Hearing:

1. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.25 Safety Paths

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:50 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:51 p.m.

2. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Article II, Section 2.00 and Article XVI, Section 16.17, Lots Abutting Water Bodies

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:53 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:54 p.m.

3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Article XVIII, Subsections 18.07.4 and 18.07.4.a, Site Plan Review Procedures

Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

Unfinished Business:

1. Existing, non-conforming setbacks
 - ★ **Commissioner Baker moved to remove existing, non-conforming setbacks from the agenda and if we have an indication that this is still a topic of discussion, it could be placed on a future agenda. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Hines; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

1. Amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.25, Safety Paths
 - ★ **Commissioner Hines moved to recommend to the Township Board that the amendments to Section 16.25 Safety Paths be adopted. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Leddy, Baker, Hines and Champion; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
2. Amendments to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.17, Lots Abutting Water Bodies
 - ★ **Commissioner Hines moved that we recommend to the Township Board that we adopt the amendment to Zoning Ordinance 26, Section 16.17 dealing with lots abutting water bodies. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Leddy, Baker, Hines and Champion; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
3. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 18.07.4 & 18.07.4.a, Site Plan Review Procedures
 - ★ **Commissioner Rabaut moved that the Planning Commission recommend the Township Board adopt the amendment to Zoning Ordinance 26, Section 18.07.4 and 18.07.4.a, Site Plan Review Procedures. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Leddy, Baker, Hines and Champion; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
4. Eagle's Ridge – Final Site Plan (MOVED TO END OF AGENDA)

5. Schwan's Home Service, Inc. – Final Site Plan

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman said the applicant is proposing to put an addition on an existing building. The expansion will include 12 new spaces for delivery trucks and 12 new spaces for employee and visitor parking. Proposed contours need to be added to the site plan. Four trees will be removed for the parking lot but she does not see this as a problem. There is one tree marked to be retained but it is not outside the silt fence. There is some wetland on the east side of the property and it appears a large berm was constructed also. The parking lot is less than 20 feet away from this but she does not see a point in requiring the 20 foot buffer. Ms. Elmiger asked about the parking since there are 45 parking spaces proposed but it says there will be 38 drivers using the parking lot at one time. The parking area does have electrical hookups for the freezers on the trucks and she asked if those spots would be used for vehicles when trucks are not present. Ms. Elmiger asked how many customers would be served at this location? Regarding safety paths and sidewalks, she asked how the sidewalk on the west side meshes with the parking lot because someone in a wheelchair would have to go into the parking lot to get up the ramp. Ms. Elmiger suggested that additional methods for reducing stormwater be proposed for this site. She asked where the existing air conditioner would be relocated. Regarding lighting she would like additional information showing the fixtures. In regard to landscaping, Ms. Elmiger noted several comments in her review. Regarding the berm, it is not planted all the way along the boundary but she feels this is adequate. Her concern is planting plants on the berm, she feels it may be a better idea not to plant on the berm but on the west side of the berm. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman recommends giving the applicant more time to address these issues.

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC commented regarding drainage, the project engineer does have to address the ordinance requirements. Regarding Section 17.11 of the ordinance, it requires there be best management practices in place to try to mitigate any adverse drainage impacts. The applicant should look at grease/oil separators which have not been submitted on this plan. Mr. Ford said the ordinance requires that any lateral storm sewer construction be profiled. The applicant needs to address debris at the drainage outlet. Mr. Ford noted that 2 foot elevation contours are supposed to be provided on the final site plan and are not. Regarding soil borings, a couple of borings did show soft underlying soils that he believes the engineer should review.

Mr. Bruce Wallace, representing Schwan's Home Service commented that they can accommodate all the comments fairly easily. In regard to the parking issue raised by Ms. Elmiger, Mr. Wallace said there is a separate spot for each truck with three loading bays. There will be in total 43 truck spaces and 43 separate parking spaces. This facility will not have consumers coming in therefore there will be no parking necessary. In regard to the air conditioner, Mr. Wallace showed where the new unit would be and also showed the Commission where the proposed sidewalk would be located.

Commissioner Hines commented that both the engineer and planner recommend the applicant deal with the revisions and come back to the Planning Commission. She agrees that there are many outstanding things and she would need to see the revised plans addressing all these issues.

Commissioner Champion said he would agree with Commissioner Hines and agreed with Ms. Elmiger that screening should be to the west of the berm and not on the berm. Commissioner Rabaut agreed. Commissioner Leddy and Commissioner Baker both concurred.

- * Commissioner Hines moved to table the site plan review for Schwan's Home Service, Inc. and provide them the opportunity to address issues raised by the planner and engineer and meet with the Township administration if they deem appropriate and place it back on the agenda when the issues have been addressed. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Leddy, Baker, Hines and Champion; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

6. Sleepy Hollow Concept Site Plan (DELETED FROM AGENDA)
7. Springfield Retail Final Site Plan (DELETED FROM AGENDA)

Other Business:

1. RC, PR & PS District Language – Review language going to Public Hearing

Clerk Strole said while she was preparing language for the public hearing notices, it came to her attention that we are adding a new definition for “equestrian facility” but we need to delete the existing definition for “equestrian facility public.” Section 3.0 contains the list of zoning districts needs to delete the PL District and add the PR and PS Districts. In Section 25, Schedule of Regulations, we need to delete the PL District and add the PR and PS Districts. However, that then involves deciding on lot size, setbacks, etc.

Mr. Genre said, after staff discussion, we recommend that for Zoning District P.S., lot size to be 1 acre minimum with 110 feet of frontage, two-story maximum, 25 foot in height without basement, 28.5 feet with basement. Setbacks to be 50 foot front, 25 foot side, with a total of 50 feet and rear setback of 35 feet. Maximum lot coverage to be limited to 30%.

- * Chairperson Lamont moved that the Planning Commission add and delete the items that were discussed by Clerk Strole and continue to set for Public Hearing language for the RC, PR and PS Districts making the changes discussed tonight deleting definitions and changing Schedule 25 as discussed by the Building Director including that the PR numbers for Section 25 will be exactly as those shown for RC and the current ordinance and that the PS numbers for lot size will be one acre, minimum width will be 110 feet, two-story will be 25 foot height without basement, 28.5 with basement, setbacks will be front 50 foot, at least one side 25 foot, total of two sides 50 feet, rear side 35 feet and the maximum percent of lot area covered by all buildings is 30%. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut, Leddy, Baker, Hines and Champion; No: none; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

New Business:

8. Eagle's Ridge Final Site Plan

Mr. Ford noted that the Exhibit B drawings have been taken care of since the last meeting. One minor issue is that the culvert size is different between the construction drawings and the Exhibit B's. A gas easement is also shown on one document but not the other. Regarding grading and drainage, the applicant did make an effort to try to minimize the amount of mass grading and confine it to the road right-of-ways with the exception of a couple of areas where they must swale to get the drainage routed to the appropriate facility. The applicant does need to extend soil erosion or silt fencing around the ball pit area at the north end of the site. Mr. Ford said the roads do comply with AASHTO guidelines and HRC recommends utilizing option B versus the proposed option A for the turn-around. HRC had not received any correspondence regarding on site well and septic at the time of this report. However, there is correspondence from the Health Department stating they have received information and are reviewing it.

Ms. Elmiger said the applicant did provide grading lines as asked at the previous meeting. She suggested that if the applicant does not want to grade individual homesites, they should provide grading plans for the home builder to preserve the woodlands and suggested that the open space areas be maintained in a natural condition. She previously suggested moving lot 13 out of the woodlands but that was not received positively by the applicant. Carlisle/Wortman recommends using option B for the turn-around and waiving the sidewalk requirement. Regarding landscaping, Section 16.06 does require a description of the plantings which she does not have. The plan does identify sod in some areas but does not identify seed varieties for hydro-seeding. Native seed mixes are suggested by Carlisle/Wortman to be used in areas. The applicant is hoping that the street tree requirement will be taken care of by the existing trees left on the property. If additional trees are needed, Ms. Elmiger said she felt the recommended plants on the plan were more appropriate for a more lomey condition and this is a dry, sandy site.

Mr. Grant Ward said regarding the turn-around, he is showing an option A and option B. One option is using the driveways of units 4 and 13 rather than using a turn-around. Mr. Ward recommends staying with a turn-around which allows a dedicated spot for emergency vehicles. The posting of a 25 mph speed limit is not a problem. He is in the process of making changes requested by the Road Commission. He will do the drainage changes at the entrance way for the Road Commission. Mr. Ward provided a copy of the letter from the Road Commission to the Planning Commission. In regard to Carlisle/Wortman's review letter, Mr. Ward said he has a grading plan included with these plans and they do show that he is matching all the existing grades around the perimeter of each lot. Mr. Ward said he likes to leave the building envelope as large as possible to allow maneuvering by the builder and this would allow tree preservation. Regarding unit 3 septic field area, the health dept. requires two test holes for the primary field and one for the reserve field. The slopes are steep in this area but there are ways to make it work. As for the woodlands, this site has very few high quality mature hardwoods. In regard to the use of the open space, Mr. Ward said he will not be putting anything in but if the

homeowners choose to, they can. He did add posts and signage to delineate the open space from the individual units. Mr. Ward said in regard to vegetation, the entryway plantings will be colorful although not all native. The grass plantings were chosen very carefully for the purpose they will serve.

Commissioner Leddy said he does not see why already disturbed areas could not be used for a recreation area. He believes it would be best to set aside areas not to be disturbed but if the homeowners want to use an already disturbed area for a play area, he does not have a problem with it.

Commissioner Baker said this is a cluster-by-right and the ordinance states that a minimum of 50% of the net site area must be permanently preserved in an undeveloped state. In his opinion, a playground or ball field is not an undeveloped state. Supervisor Walls noted that the ordinance goes on to state it may include a recreational trail, picnic area, children's play area, greenway or linear park. Commissioner Baker commented that, in regard to the turn-around, he does not agree with using two driveways and does not think it is very logical in regard to the homeowners. He would prefer option A. He likes the idea of not introducing lots of non-present plantings and likes the idea of waiving the sidewalk requirements.

Commissioner Hines said she does not believe we should utilize two homeowners driveways for a turn-around and would support using option A.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he liked the idea of using markers in the open space, he agrees with waiving sidewalks. He recommends that the Master Deed and By Laws clearly specify the use of the open space and he recommends it comply with the written ordinance and not be developed into anything and left in its natural state. Chairperson Lamont said the screening between lot 1 and the roadway should be natural and believes the turn-around proposed option b is a better option. He believes other minor clean-up items on HRC's review should be taken care of before he could proceed with this plan.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he believes option A for the turn-around is the better option and he agrees with waiving the sidewalks. Commissioner Leddy agreed. Commissioner Champion said there are many items that need to be resolved such as the sidewalk, the turn-around, and the potential playground areas.

- * Commissioner Rabaut moved to table further consideration of Eagle's Ridge proposal so the applicant can resolve issues here tonight and further move that the Planning Commission recommend the turn-around A because it is a safer option than turn-around B, further move that the Planning Commission waive the sidewalks and further move that the future playground areas and walking paths be shown on the plans. Other issues to be addressed by the applicant include markers are added to delineate open space areas, include in the Master Deed and By Laws restrictions on fertilizer, the items listed on landscaping including seed mixes and to leave the area between lot 1 and the road in a natural state. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Rabaut,**

Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: Hines; Absent: Steckling. The motion carried by a 5 to 1 vote.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary