

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes February 18, 2020

Call to Order: Vice-Chairperson Mansour called the February 18, 2020 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Ruth Ann Hines

Dave Hopper

George Mansour

Jason Pliska

Terry Rusnell

Kevin Sclesky

Commissioners Absent

Dean Baker

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates

Mike Smith, Anderson, Eckstein and Westrick, Inc.

Staff Present

Collin W. Walls, Supervisor

Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

**Commissioner Hines moved to approve the agenda as amended, adding Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-888 and Section 40-2 Glare and Exterior Lighting to Old Business, #1. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Vote: Voted yes: Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.**

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

- 1. Minutes of the January 21, 2020 Regular Planning Commission meeting and minutes of the January 21, 2020 Joint Township Board and Planning Commission meeting**

**Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the January 21, 2020 Regular Planning Commission meeting and the minutes of the January 21, 2020 Joint Township Board and Planning Commission meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Voted yes: Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

**1. Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-888 and Section 40-2  
Glare and Exterior Lighting**

**Public Hearing was opened at 7:04 pm**

No public comment was heard

**Public Hearing was closed at 7:05 pm**

New Business:

**1. Final Site Plan - Park West Gallery -Storage Building  
12850 Fountain Square, Parcel ID #07-17-301-013  
30 acres, Zoned OS Office Service**

Joe Novitsky, JSN Architecture, introduced himself and Robert Schlochet, Chief Financial Officer, Park West Gallery, to the Commission.

Mr. Novitsky provided a project summary to the Commission. The intention is to use the existing building and grounds at 12850 Fountain Square for a long-term storage facility for unsold or slow-moving art. He added that they would like to retain the parking lot area, but they will be responsible for resurfacing, updating and maintaining it. He added that the parking lot would then be there in case there is a change of use for the building since the parking lot is sized for the office use of that building area. They would also like to utilize the existing vegetation as screening for the adjacent residential area. The applicant does not know if he wants to put up a sign or not. He suggested that they would leave the sign there and if they want to put up a sign, they will pay a fee at that time.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review dated January 30, 2020 and the results of the staff review meeting that was held. The applicant is willing to address the comments of his review letter except the removal of the impervious surface which the applicant would like to retain. Also, the applicant would like to use the existing vegetation along the property line to meet the screening requirement. If the Commission were to approve this tonight, the Township would get a revised plan that addresses all comments. He stated that all the items in his review were clarification items. The Commission should discuss the impervious surface and landscape screening items.

Mr. Mike Smith summarized his review letter dated January 31, 2020. He was satisfied with the applicant's responses at the Staff Review meeting. The applicant was willing to meet the requirements. He stated that sufficient truck turning movement has been shown on the plan. The ADA parking issue was resolved since the parking was at the sidewalk level and a ramp is not required. The drainage outlet for the truck well is being directed toward a dry well or a leeching basin as per applicant.

Commissioner Hopper concurred with Mr. Smith on the truck well drainage and the fact that a dry well or leeching basin would be sufficient. He stated that this is part of a 30 acre site so if you look at the actual percentage of impervious surface, it is low percentage of the total. The property line is 400 feet from the truck well and the truck well is below grade. He concurs with using existing screening. He suggested planting the four trees in the parking island which would suffice. He has seen the Park West facilities and questioned if this property would be treated differently since customers are not going there.

Mr. Novitsky commented on other Park West properties.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he appreciates the applicant modernizing the lighting on the site.

Commissioner Sclesky concurred with Commissioner Hopper and does not think the imperious surface is going to be an issue. He is glad that the applicant is going to refresh and update the parking area. If the applicant is finished with the facility and it goes to another property owner, then the parking lot would be suitable for more traffic and would already be in place. He commends the changeover to LED lights on the site. He asked about the well and septic and if they have had the systems tested by a private company to look at the status of those systems. He has no other issues.

Mr. Novitsky replied that they will have the systems evaluated before they occupy the building.

Commissioner Hines stated that it would be unwise and unnecessary to remove the pavement. The screening on the north property line is adequate with what is there but she agrees with putting in the additional four trees.

**Commissioner Hopper moved to grant Final Site Plan approval to Park West Galleries for 12850 Fountain Square, Parcel ID #07-17-301-013, a thirty acre parcel currently zoned OS for the construction of an off-site low-volume storage facility for storage of art work within the existing building including the addition of exterior truck well, delivery area, modifications in parking and landscaping and lighting modernization subject to final Engineering submittal. Plans will be changed per the applicant's February 5, 2020 correspondence. It appears that the current onsite landscaping and existing site conditions address the screening to the residentially used property to the north and require that the four replacement trees be replaced in the north parking area islands. Further, the modernization of the site lights meets the ordinance requirements regarding color, height and intensity. Any signage change proposed will require further Township approval. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Vote: Voted yes: Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.**

Old Business:

**1. Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-888 and Section 40-2  
Glare and Exterior Lighting**

Commissioner Hines asked about #7 on the next to the last page. She asked if they are only allowing warm light sources, why do they need item b.?

Commissioner Hopper stated that the parking lot lights are 4000k and downstairs they are 3500k. Anything above this is measured in Kelvins and he described the process. Anything over 4000k starts to get white hot, so basically it is a way to measure different light color. He thinks by saying nothing over 4000k is redundant but it gets the point across.

Commissioner Hines concurred.

Commissioner Pliska stated that since it says, “should be”, item b. acts as a clarification.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the lighting requirements if site plan is not required and asked if there was a trigger for review.

Mr. Lewan stated that this would take place if someone was rebuilding their entire parking lot. The trigger would be an electrical permit.

Commissioner Hopper asked how do they decide what verification is needed?

Mr. Lewan answered that it is then up to the Zoning Administrator as to what they need to submit.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the height and did they want a 27-foot pole.

Mr. Lewan stated that this is current ordinance language. He determined that there are going to be some cases where they want to protect the other side of the street and it isn't Dixie Highway. He stated that the Commissioners can discuss it, if needed.

**Commissioner Hines moved that the Township Board adopt an ordinance to amend Springfield Township's Code of Ordinances, Chapter 40-888, Glare and Exterior Lighting and adding new Section 40-893 Glare and adding new definition for Lighting in Section 40-2 Definition. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Vote: Voted yes: Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.**

## **2. Ordinance Amendment – Dixie Highway Overlay District – Section 40-596 – Review and Discussion**

Mr. Lewan displayed boards offering all the possible zoning uses for the Dixie Highway Overlay District as per the ordinance. The Commissioners defined which uses they saw as appropriate, which uses they could not approve in this area and which uses might be allowed under special circumstances. All uses were discussed that are currently allowed in zoning districts RC, PR, PS, R3, R2, R1, R1A, RM, RM-1, C-1, C-2 and OS. Mr. Lewan concluded that he would add this information to a chart in the proposed ordinance language and will bring it back to the Commission for consideration in March.

Commissioner Hines asked about adult businesses. She is in favor of taking this out.

Commissioner Mansour asked about marijuana growing facilities.

Supervisor Walls stated that those facilities are not allowed in Springfield.

Mr. Lewan asked if there were other comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Hines asked about page 2, c. and asked if they are calling it the “Dixie Corridor” or the “Dixie Highway Corridor” because either way it should be consistent throughout. On page 4, she asked about the relief from architectural standards and asked if they could say “relief from one or more of the architectural standards” to clarify the intent.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

## **2. Sign Ordinance Amendments – Discussion**

Mr. Lewan reviewed his memo dated February 5, 2020 regarding sign revision discussion.

Supervisor Walls stated that the acreage and the frontage are two things that really don’t have much to do with signage. You can have five acres with two tenants, or you can have five acres that has fifteen tenants. Each individual tenant will want their fair share. Acreage doesn’t relate. He thinks they should be careful about the number of ground signs that they should allow. The signs need to be kept at a minimum distance apart for anyone to see any of the signs.

Commissioner Mansour asked if it would help if they had a required distance from property line.

Commissioner Sclesky asked why a business that was close to the road and that has a wall sign would need a monument sign anyway.

Supervisor Walls stated that the sign setback is 15 feet.

Commissioners discussed possible acceptable locations of monument and building signs.

Commissioner Hines stated that she is not in favor of having multiple signs along parcels with a lot of frontage. This will just lead to sign clutter. She doesn't understand the need for two signs if you are on the same lot except if you are on a corner.

Mr. Lewan stated if you have 400 foot of frontage and the minimum commercial lot width is only 100 feet, you could actually have four individual signs for four businesses.

Commissioner Pliska asked if you could tie it to how many points of ingress and egress you have on a parcel.

Commissioner Mansour asked if you have four hundred feet of frontage, do you necessarily need two drives for ingress and egress, maybe not. As a business, all the tenants need to be advertised.

Commissioner Hines asked if he wanted multiple business center signs.

Commissioner Mansour replied no. He is suggesting having one larger business center sign and then a smaller sign possibly on the same property.

Commissioners suggested that as long as they were not advertising the same business.

Commissioner Hopper added that they needed to maintain adequate distance between signs.

Commissioner Hines stated that they want to encourage fewer drives onto Dixie Highway.

Commissioners discussed the current business center sign at Kroger complex.

Mr. Lewan asked the Commissioners about their thoughts on the possible inclusion of the idea of perpendicular building signage instead of ground signs as an enhancement for the Dixie Highway Overlay District. If they are trying to promote limiting ground signs, that might be considered an enhancement.

Commissioners discussed existing signage in the Township and perpendicular building signage.

Mr. Lewan summarized the language that he provided in the packet.

Supervisor Walls asked if the two signs for 300 feet were just for multi-tenant.

Mr. Lewan answered that he was trying to address business center signs and if it is not clear, he will work on language.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that it will be difficult addressing all the nonconforming lots on Dixie Highway.

Commissioner Pliska suggested that maybe if your business is set back a certain distance, then you get a certain amount of square footage. It doesn't make any sense to base it on parcel size; the number of tenants need to be considered.

Commissioners discussed possible sign designs and location of business center signs.

Mr. Lewan asked how the Commissioners feel about the proposal to allow this second sign at an entry point.

Commissioner Hopper stated he likes that idea.

Mr. Lewan stated that since they have the distance between driveway requirement anyway and they are trying to promote joint driveways, if they do a joint driveway and only have one driveway, they only get one sign.

Commissioner Mansour stated that if there is only one access point, he would like to see the ability to have another sign somewhere else on the property.

Mr. Lewan stated that another thing regarding the vehicle reaction time is that if the entrance is before the sign, the size of the sign increases a lot.

Commissioners discussed size of signs relative to frontage and location.

Supervisor Walls suggested that the Township require an overall plan for business centers signs during site plan process and the goal of the Township needs to be defined much better in the intent section.

Commissioners agreed.

Commissioners discussed sign location and best sign design for maximum exposure.

Commissioner Pliska stated that he would like to see how much, in today's world, are the signs being relied on for potential purchase decisions. He doesn't think it is as high as they think.

Commissioners discussed signage from a marketing perspective.

Mr. Lewan summarized the Commissioners comments to be incorporated in his next draft. Those items include: look at building signs based on distance to Dixie Highway, require site plan approval for business center signs, need good intent section in the sign

ordinance on what the Township wants to accomplish, logo recognition, maybe allowing business center signs that are the recommended 112 square feet at 50 MPH rather than more than that, clarify when they are talking about multiple ground signs that they are talking about business center signs, talk about tenants and not the acreage if they are going to talk about a bump in sign area, consider a minimum distance between signs, possibly include those in the Dixie Highway Overlay District standards enhancement to remove a ground sign if you add a perpendicular sign, perhaps add more than one business center signs on the number of entry points and require business center signs as a part of the site plan review process.

Commissioner Pliska added the criteria for signage based on setback from the road or obstruction from outparcels.

Commissioner Mansour suggested including the obstruction of the business sight line.

Mr. Lewan stated that there is some merit to giving a business a certain amount of square footage and they can do with it what they want.

Commissioners discussed business center signs.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and suggested changes to the Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Sclesky. Vote: Voted yes: Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary