

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes April 17, 2018

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the April 17, 2018 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Road, Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Dean Baker
Ruth Ann Hines
Dave Hopper
George Mansour (arrived at 7:42 pm)
Jason Pliska
Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Kevin Sclesky

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates
Randy Ford, Hubble, Roth and Clark, Inc.

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk
Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the agenda as presented. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Mansour, Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the March 20, 2018 meeting

Commissioner Whiting moved to approve the minutes of the March 20, 2018 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Mansour, Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

**Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-721
Landscaping Greenbelts and Buffers, and Screening**

Public Hearing was opened at 7:34 pm

Pam Merritt, 9035 East Blue Water Drive, commented that there is going to be a meeting with General RV next month regarding their desire to build a recreational vehicle center which concerns her because of the distance between her property line and theirs. She stated that they want to make sure that they have a buffer zone rule in effect now so their property is protected. Her living room faces the trees that would be the buffer between the two properties. She recalls a few years ago they were fighting the establishment of Home Depot and Target. She asked for a berm and an 8-foot cement structure along the entire property line to protect them from the back ends of the trailers and also people. She asked if there was going to be protection in the laws so when they come to fight for their properties, values and peace and quiet and the loss of 159 beautiful oak trees. She asked if they could have a wall put up for their protection.

Chairperson Baker stated that they are collecting comment, this was not meant to be a conversation back and forth. He added that the Township currently has ordinances in place that dictate the screening requirements that are warranted and required by the Code of Ordinances to ensure that proper buffering takes place between different property uses. The property that the resident is describing is abutting other non-similarly zoned properties and there are obligations for screening. The methodology used is typically using berms or plantings but the utilization of walls is not really used in the community because it is more of an industrial approach. The Township's effort has been to use berms and plantings to create opacity and limited visibility between sites. The ordinance language being considered during this Public Hearing is beginning its process to be moved through the ordinance amendment process.

Ms. Merritt stated that she is interested in if there is something in place now concerning berms and walls. This will greatly affect their living and their property values will be affected by looking at a chain link fence and 150 RVs and people coming in and out. She stated that they would like to push for a wall for protection. General Motors protects the residents around with new construction using walls.

Chairperson Baker stated that General RV is not a part of the agenda, however buffering is.

Brian Dumas, 10300 Whistler Parkway, asked if there was a definition of evergreen. There are many evergreens that are dying due to a needle disease and he asked if the Board has thought about that.

Chairperson Baker commented that the species of plant that meets the criteria of evergreen is listed in the ordinance and all others too. There are also caliper dimensions mandated in the ordinance. In the past, the Township required trees of a certain size and diameter that would give an opacity of 80% when they were planted but the problem is sometimes the diameter is too large to properly allow the trees to tolerate the transplanting. These ordinance amendments reflect changes to the diameter of the trunk that allow the planting to acclimate itself to the surroundings and more quickly grow.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:46 pm

New Business:

**1. The Journey Church – Final Site Plan Review
Parcel ID # 07-09-127-004, I-75 and Rattalee Lake Road**

Jeff VanCamp, Creekwood Architecture, introduced himself to the Commission. He provided history of the project. He has reviewed the items from the Planner and the Engineer and he provided a summary as to how he is going to address those items.

Doug Lewan summarized his review dated March 28, 2018. The project has received Special Land Use approval from the Township Board and the conditions have been met regarding the special conditions. There needs to be clarification on trees to be preserved and trees to be cleared. He asked if curbing was going to be added to the Phase 1 parking lot. This site plan is only good for Phase 1 and since the Phase 1 parking lot is going to be expanded someday, it needs to be clear how that edge is treated; is it going to be curbed or left open? The applicant has sufficient parking but there is no loading space provided. The Planning Commission has the authority to waive loading spaces. A well permit from OCHD needs to be submitted. The applicant also should provide additional information about the trees that are to be preserved so it can be verified they will meet the minimum landscaping standards. The ground sign needs to be set back at least 15 feet from Rattalee Lake Road right-of-way.

Randy Ford summarized his review dated March 22, 2018. The applicant does show the proposed contours on the grading plans but it is unclear in certain areas how they would blend back into the existing elevation contours at the limits of the grading. The applicant has shown the detention calculations meet the ordinance requirements and MDOT requirements. MDOT is involved because the discharge from the basin is going into MDOT controlled right of way. He suggested that they need more definition on the driveway especially the finished grade around the building. The driveway as shown is elevated above the structure so it is suggested that they put drainage swales along the driveway to control the runoff. In past plans, they indicated that they were going to provide a permanent water feature with the detention pond; the current plan doesn't show that so clarification is needed. They also need clarification regarding the vegetation that will be established in the pond. HRC's Traffic Department reviewed the traffic study again and they feel that for Phase 1, there will be no improvements needed because of the traffic volumes along Rattalee Lake Road and the trip generation data. There are

indications that as they move to Phase 2 with ball fields, etc., an update to the Traffic Study will be required at Phase 2. The applicant needs to submit all the attachments for the Road Commission permit and the internal pavement section too. He checked the radius of the turnaround in the parking lot and it did not appear to meet the 50 foot on-site turn radius required by Road Commission standards for cul-de-sacs and turn arounds. This is appropriate for fire trucks to have that 50 foot radius. The applicant also needs to provide the well permit from OCHD.

Chairperson Baker asked Mr. Ford if the issues could be dealt with administratively.

Mr. Ford answered yes.

Mr. VanCamp replied to the comments. When the tree survey was done, they only looked at trees between 4-5 inches and above and this is what is noted on the plan. If needed, they can go back and give calipers of all trees. He will break out the tree removal on its own plan to make it clearer. He was not planning to provide curbing on the southern and western sides to allow for further expansion. Grass will be planted up to and adjacent to the asphalt. They are asking for a waiver for the loading space since the only delivery trucks to the site will be UPS—type trucks. The well permit will be provided to the Township and Township Engineer prior to construction. The ground sign will be revised to show it 15 feet back from the right of way. He will clean up the contours and make it clearer for Phase I and put additional notes regarding steeper slopes. They will give more detail regarding the drainage swale along the east side of the building and west side of the drive. They will also provide additional section cuts through the forebay swales to verify side slopes. They are not planning that the pond will hold water. There will be a note added for the use of a native seed mix for the pond as well as the additional landscaping requirement. The side slopes are 4:1 slopes and he will enlarge the pond area to provide additional information required. He will add the additional 50 foot turning radius to the west side of the parking lot to accommodate fire trucks. He will also clean up the paving details as requested.

Commissioner Hopper clarified that Mr. VanCamp will do the 50 foot radius. He spoke to the Fire Chief last week regarding this and he thought the longest vehicle required 50 feet.

Mr. VanCamp replied yes.

Commissioner Mansour asked about the traffic study being revisited at Phase 2. The intersection at Rattalee Lake Road and the property only has one exit and he is concerned about everyone leaving at the same time from one exit.

Mr. Ford replied that this is the reason behind the requirement for additional traffic study information for Phase 2. There is no basis for road improvements now at Phase I but in the future, they would have to look at additional trip generation information.

Commissioner Whiting asked where the dumpster will be located.

Mr. VanCamp pointed out the dumpster location on the plan; it is by the garage.

Commissioner Pliska asked about the lack of curbing. He asked if there was any concern that the lack of curbing could have a negative effect on drainage.

Mr. VanCamp replied they are carrying it to the southwest corner by the swale. The asphalt will be sloped so drainage will be held on the parking lot to that point. There will be temporary soil erosion control measures in place. The forebay purpose is to clean out the oils out of the discharge.

Mr. Lewan stated that he only needs the caliper information for the trees that they plan to keep, particularly the southern border. One of the Township Board's condition for the Special Land Use was that a Type 4 screen be provided along the east and the southern border and they want to make sure that a combination of what they will install plus the existing material will meet that screening requirement. This is not negotiable.

Mr. VanCamp concurred.

Commissioner Hopper stated that they are also using trees on the north side for street trees.

Mr. Lewan answered that wherever they intend to use the existing material, the calipers need to be provided

Commissioner Hopper stated that there are a lot of items that need to be provided. He would not be in favor leaving final review to the consultant; he would like to see the plan again because there are a lot of issues to be addressed. He would not vote for Final Site Plan approval.

Commissioner Hines concurred.

Commissioner Whiting asked if was going to the Township Board.

Supervisor Walls clarified that yes, as a Special Land Use the plan goes back to the Township Board for Final Site Plan approval.

Mr. Lewan replied that regardless of that, they should not necessarily rely on the Township Board.

Commissioner Whiting commented that if it must go to the Township Board, she trusts the administrative team to review it and make sure that their concerns are addressed.

Commissioner Mansour agreed. Administratively, before it gets to the Board level, they should have everything corrected.

Chairperson Baker stated that it sounds like the Commission is comfortable with collecting all the information necessary administratively. The expectation is that the plan will go back to the Township Board for final approval. He would support putting the provisions in the motion that the applicant needs to make all the corrections discussed and then the applicant will go to the Township Board.

Commissioner Pliska suggested having a conditional approval so that in order for it to be placed on an agenda, the consultants and the administrative team would have to be in agreement that those conditional items were met.

Chairperson Baker stated that the minutes of this meeting will accompany the plan to the Township Board. The Planning Commission can offer their comments and recommendation and they trust the applicant to recognize the judiciousness of following this advice.

Commissioner Whiting moved to recommend sending Final Site Plan for The Journey to the Township Board which the Township Board did approve for Special Land Use. This particular site plan consists of Phase I and it includes 144 seat auditorium, preschool and nursery, café and youth meeting room. The Planning Commission is recommending that it be sent to the Township Board for approval with the following conditions: waiving the loading requirements, conditions mentioned by the Township Planner and Township Engineer to address issues of gradation, landscaping delineation of trees that are going to be saved and used, specifying the caliper of the trees that are going to be used to meet the requirements that the Township has, and any other conditions that were mentioned in the consultants' reviews. The traffic study considered is valid for Phase I only, any subsequent phases would require additional traffic review. All permits are also required. Final review of amended plan will be required by the Township Engineer and Township Planner. Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: Hopper. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Supervisor Walls asked if the Planner and Engineer would review the changes prior to the plan going to the Township Board.

Commissioner Whiting and Commissioner Mansour replied yes.

**2. Eagle Ridge of Springfield – Conceptual Site Plan/Cluster Plan
Parcel ID # 07-31-300-021, 7150 Eagle Road**

Mr. Jim Scharl, Kieft Engineering, introduced himself to the Commission as representing Charles Bert, Better Built Homes. He provided an overview of the project. He provided a historical summary of a previous site plan submittal for the property in 2004. He explained that there is an expansive mobile home park to the south of the property and the plan tries to buffer the project as much as it can from the mobile home park. They are

utilizing the cluster option for this site and because of the configuration of the final plan, it qualifies by right to be a cluster option because it provides over 50% open space. He reviewed the Planner and Engineer reviews and he provided a response narrative to the Commissioners.

Mr. Doug Lewan provided a summary of his review letter dated March 20, 2018. His review comments primarily involve the density plan and making sure that the density plan could be built on its own. The cluster provisions allow an applicant to have a certain number of units based on the zoning but instead of having those units spread out across the property, they are clustered into a smaller part, preserving natural parts of the property. The cluster plan did not show storm water detention facilities which is required even if it is just conceptual, this would demonstrate that the project could be built if it was not being built as a cluster. Then length of the proposed cul-de-sac is 1500 linear feet and dead-end roads that exceed 1000 feet must have some type of turn around somewhere along the length as per Design and Construction Standards. The cluster plan shows 14 units in a layout that impacts the least number of features on the site. If the density plan has to change the number of lots, then the cluster plan may change as well. For cluster plans, there are certain setback requirements that have to be met that are less than required under normal plan and those are met. There is a small wetland on the property and he would like it shown on the site plan. There are some minor issues with green belts and transitional areas on the site. The area along Eagle Road should be increased or a waiver should be sought to address this distance. Whenever you have a residential development that is more intense than what is next to it, a certain kind of landscape buffer is required and in this case, buffer 1 or buffer 2. The cluster plan also shows a cul-de-sac length of 1240 feet so there will have to be some type of intermediate turn around area according to Design and Construction Standards. Applicant will also have to provide some easement language for pathway. There will be a review of Master Deed and By-Laws at the Final Site Plan review as is required with a site condo.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the greenbelt requirement of 100 feet along Eagle Road.

Mr. Lewan replied that the 100 feet is a cluster requirement. He explained that the Planning Commission can waive this requirement if they find it is appropriate.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated March 15, 2018. The applicant is proposing 20 foot roads with open ditch construction. The natural low area is at the front of the site. One of the biggest challenges will be storm drainage and still be able to accommodate the requirement for on-site detention without impacting the adjacent properties. Improvements along Eagle Road might be required here. The warrant charts provided by the Road Commission is based on Trip Generation and daily volume along the roadway. This will need to be addressed so the applicant can demonstrate if any of the improvements must be provided. There is a need for a turn around on a roadway when it exceeds 1000 feet for the cul-de-sac. There are requirements in instate the cluster plan density and one consideration is whether or the roadway on the density plan is achievable based on the grades and the vertical curves. This will be needed to justify the 14 building

sites on the cluster plan. The Oakland County Soil Survey should be provided which would give them a general indication of the on-site soils.

Mr. Scharl stated that he looked at the soil boring taken on this site for the previous development and the soil conditions are classified by OCHD as being poor filtering. This is a good thing because it means that the water passes through the ground so fast that it does not filter septic effluent. The density plan would not be a problem at all because they would take advantage of isolated lower areas. Given the amount of open space, large lot sizes and small increase in imperviousness, they could very easily demonstrate capacity within the depressions with the installation of a few isolated leeching basins. On the Cluster Plan, the intent is to use the rear of lots 10-14 because they are all walk-out sites and are all 18 feet above the low area in the back. He has no reservations about piping from unit 1 to that area and also providing leeching basins where appropriate. He provided an aerial photograph showing depressions throughout the site. There are no wetlands on the site; there are depressions which are heavily wooded. He does not feel storm drainage is an issue with this plan and it will all stay onsite.

Commissioner Whiting stated that concerning the greenbelt, 40 feet versus 100 feet is a big difference. She asked about this difference.

Mr. Scharl replied that there is a row of trees along the right of way. He does not have a problem heavily landscaping the area with a heavy row of spruce. He stated that they could slide everything back but that .73 acre park is there because of depth and to provide for extra buffering. The front yard setbacks are shown at 60 feet and the ordinance requires 50 feet to provide for septic areas in front yards.

Mr. Lewan stated that the setback is 40 feet and the road right of way in that area is 33 feet.

Mr. Scharl stated that they are proposing another 40 foot open space beyond the road right of way. He stated that it ends up being 67 feet from the right of way which is where the trees are. The property to the north has a barn that is visible on the aerial photograph. He showed the aerial photograph to the Commissioners.

Supervisor Walls stated that the Township has not adopted Oakland County's right of way plan. The ordinance requires a setback from the existing right of way, not Oakland County's proposed right of way.

Mr. Scharl stated that if that is the case, it is a 33 ½ foot width right of way and they are proposing 67 feet.

Supervisor Walls confirmed that generally the setback starts 33 ½ feet from the center line of the road.

Mr. Scharl confirmed that their proposed greenbelt is 67 feet instead of 100 feet. He stated that they can utilize the .73 park lot for a turnaround if required.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that the turnaround required is part of the Design and Construction Standards and would require a variance from the Township Board.

Chairperson Baker commented that part of the Commission's duty is to determine if the density could be reached using normal methodology because that tells them the number of lots that can be developed using the cluster option. If there was a non-buildable area due to lakes, ponds, etc. that should be factored in. Mr. Scharl has provided information about soils and how the soils do not require any land to be dedicated to water control.

Mr. Scharl replied that there would be easements. If there needed to be any type of storm water management, it would be provided for on easements on the units. Since the units are 2.5 acres, that is possible.

Chairperson Baker confirmed that Mr. Scharl was saying that if detaining water was necessary, it would be done individually on each site.

Mr. Scharl replied no; he would design a facility that would satisfy storm drainage for the road because that it is only improvement that has to be satisfied. This could be easily satisfied with a few storm water easements on the units.

Mr. Ford stated that there are certain volumes that have to be achieved and how and where that would be done would have to be shown. The Township has requirements for the vertical alignment of the proposed roadway to make sure that the sags and crests are not too sharp and that it meets ASTO guidelines. The cluster plan looks fine because it is relatively flat. The density plan shows a lot more crests and valleys and the applicant has to demonstrate that he could design a road to meet ASTO requirements.

Mr. Scharl replied that some grading would be required but he is sure that they can build the road. The necessity for a turn around could easily be put in on the south side between units 13 and 12.

Chairperson Baker replied that the demonstration of this construction would be valuable. He heard from Mr. Ford's commentary that he is looking for some more demonstration to allow for and to agree that 14 units is the appropriate number.

Mr. Ford stated that he cannot tell how much grading outside of the right of way would or would not have to be done in order to accomplish that.

Mr. Scharl replied that it can be done. If Mr. Ford needs see a preliminary profile, he will do that.

Mr. Ford answered that Mr. Scharl's explanation is true. He explained the different grades on the site.

Commissioner Mansour commented that he does not see a problem with the 14 sites. His issue is with the cluster plan. They are missing an opportunity with this site where they can still accomplish preserving natural area and still give the builder a chance to make more money when he builds these houses. This will also give the homeowner a bigger benefit to have a lot that is not up against the property line but is more like the density plan. The density plan provides lots that are into the woods and still preserving the entire back row of the property from units 8-14. He suggested creating a buffer on the north side.

Mr. Scharl answered that Commissioner Mansour is describing the plan that was approved before which was not acceptable to the current owner. The developer is looking at it in terms of cost.

Commissioner Mansour suggested building the road like it is shown in the cluster plan but have it go around the same route as the density plan.

Mr. Scharl replied that this is not on the table for this developer and this is why they had a pre-application meeting to explore other options. They could not apply as a PUD because they could not answer the required questions in the ordinance. So, they went with this plan utilizing the cluster housing provisions.

Commissioner Mansour reiterated his suggestion about the plan. He stated that the developer would make up the cost of development on the price of the lots.

Commissioner Whiting commented that she is not sure that larger lots would work with this development based on the location off a gravel road.

Mr. Scharl replied that there is an economic range that makes sense in this development and the developer knows his limitations to get the right amount for the right size house and lot.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he lives in a cluster development where at least 90% of the lots have direct access to open space and he likes this feature. He suggested a type 1 or type 2 buffer along the north side. He understands avoiding the south end from the environment standpoint but he concurred with Commission Mansour that they can pull a couple out and put in shared driveways.

Mr. Lewan stated that he is satisfied with the cluster plan because he looks at it based on preservation of what is going to be left. If the road is moved much further south, they are getting into mature hardwood area that would have to be removed.

Chairperson Baker confirmed that they needed to agree on number of units so they could approve the clustering. They already looked at the difference in elevations at the road and the end of the road and Mr. Scharl made comments regarding run off being minimal. He asked if there was more information needed on Mr. Scharl's part to offer an opinion on the density.

Commissioner Mansour asked Mr. Scharl how difficult it would be to show more detail on storm water detention.

Mr. Scharl replied it is not a problem. He would add existing conditions and grades and show where drainage was going to go.

Mr. Ford stated that he would show the low areas and the open ditch and drainage being directed to those areas and rough calculations of how much storage is available. This would suffice.

Mr. Scharl stated that he will also include soil boring information.

Chairperson Baker commented that they would accept this as a next step. The Commission will make a recommendation regarding density suitability to the Township Board.

Mr. Lewan replied that this is a different circumstance where a permitted use by right goes to the Township Board.

Chairperson Baker stated that with Mr. Scharl's information they will be able to comment on the density. He asked Mr. Ford if he thought this additional information should come back to the Commission or directly to the Township Board.

Mr. Ford stated that he can look at what Mr. Scharl provides and provide a review letter giving his opinion regarding the roadway and its constructability and drainage.

Commissioner Hopper stated that through a Concept review, they provide the applicants their thoughts and opinions. However, the density is what they have to offer confirmation on.

Commissioners concluded that Mr. Ford will give feedback on the information that Mr. Scharl provides and this will go to the Township Board. Applicant needs to demonstrate that the property can support 14 units and if Mr. Ford concurs, then the next step is to go to the Township Board.

Mr. Ford advised applicant that all submittals should come through the Supervisor's office.

Commissioner Hopper moved to move the Eagle Ridge of Springfield Concept Plan and Density Plan to the Township Board showing that the density is achievable at 14 units upon verification of forthcoming information from the Township Engineer. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Supervisor Walls confirmed to Mr. Scharl that he is addressing the Planning Commission comments before it goes to the Township Board.

3. Quarry Ridge – Conceptual Site Plan/Cluster Plan/Special Land Use Parcel ID # 07-26-126-020, East side of Andersonville Road and Big Lake Road

Mr. Jim Scharl provided an overview of the project, Quarry Ridge.

Mr. Doug Lewan provided a summary of his review letter dated March 20, 2018. This project does not include more than 50% open space, they have 25%, so it is a Special Land Use. He reviewed the Cluster Development Criteria for Special Land Use review and approval and there are seven items that need to be addressed. There are also four Special Land Use criteria. The Planning Commission must decide that the criteria have been met. He stated that the applicant needs to add detail as to how storm water management would occur on site. The lots for a cluster plan have to have 120 foot lot width and there are a couple sites that are under that and they would need to be altered to make sure they can meet that width. There is some open water on site and the Township has a 50 foot setback from open water requirement and this affects a couple of sites. There are also a couple dimensional issues on the Cluster Plan. If it is shown that proper setbacks cannot be observed, the number of units might have to be reduced.

The number of lots in the Density Plan need to be acceptable to the Planning Commission. The Township's Cluster provisions have specific setbacks and they are different from standard R-2 zoning. All the setbacks shown on the plan meet ordinance standards. The applicant is proposing 25% open space and they have some concern over the designation of open space areas. Open space shall include greenbelts but may not include road right of way or areas under water. The plan calculations include 1.53 acres of the larger water bodies and this area should be revised to remove the areas under water and to include greenbelt areas. He suggested that the applicant increase the greenbelt width along Andersonville Road and Big Lake Road or seek Planning Commission waiver and should consider landscape buffering options 1 or 2 on the north and west property lines. The landscape plan should be included in the Final Site Plan submittal. There is a T turnaround shown on the plan. The access for a T turnaround is not as good as a cul-de-sac turn around and there are concerns with T turnarounds related to emergency vehicle access. He would like the Township Engineer and the Fire Chief to comment on this. If it is the applicant's desire to extend that road at some point, sometimes roads are stubbed right up against a property line because they are planning to extend the road. A cul-de-sac would provide a better turning capability for this project. Because this is a Special Land Use, the Planning Commission should make a recommendation if this project meets the criteria for Special Land Use approval. Applicant should modify the concept plan with regard to storm water, address the 120 lot width for all of the units in the density plan, make sure that the building envelopes are all 50 feet from any water body and if necessary, revise the total number of lots. Applicant should adjust the open space calculation with regard to water on site, increase the greenbelt along Andersonville Road and Big Lake Road and update the Concept plan

showing reasonable storm water management on the site. Applicant should also address the T turnaround.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated March 15, 2018. There are opportunities for detention on site with the system of ponds and his expectation is to create a side yard drainage easement for a couple of the units to take the drainage toward the ponds. This will have to be detailed moving forward. Onsite runoff is apparent in both the cluster and density plans. The applicant needs to examine the Road Commission warrant charts for the accel and decel land improvements factoring in the trip generation for the development and the average daily traffic volume for Andersonville Road. They will then be able to decide whether it meets the warrants for the improvements at the access roads. The decision on the T turnaround needs input from the Fire Chief as to whether or not it is acceptable. There will be individual wells and septs for each of the lots and there should be a copy of the Oakland County Soil Survey map included in the plan.

Mr. Scharl stated that the ponds and the lakes are all groundwater that has been generated by the mining operation to the east which is why the areas around these ponds have been kept as park areas. He will utilize those ponds for drainage. He agreed that unit 5 was too narrow; he will narrow unit 7, move the line down 10 feet and done the same thing on unit 6 so he will be able to meet the setback requirements. Mr. Lewan said that unit 20 on the Density Plan didn't meet the width requirement but it does. He stated that the 50 foot distance from water can be shown to justify the Density Plan and Cluster Plan. He has modified the calculations to 8.63 acres for only land area open space which would be 23.1% taking out the two ponds. He stated that they are asking for a modification to the front greenbelt area for both of the roads because they are dealing with a 33 foot road. This area will be heavily landscaped which will be shown on the final plans. He proposed the T turnaround because they recognize that the area to the east of it is eventually going to be developed and would not have access to Andersonville Road unless through this development. If they put a cul-de-sac in, it would be cumbersome to get rid of the island when the road is extended. He thinks that it is good idea to leave it planned for future extension. This large piece of property cannot go to Big Lake Road because there is a pond that extends all along the frontage. He stated that the Cluster Plan eliminates all the driveways going out on to Andersonville Road so he believes more road is justified on the Cluster Plan. The soils conditions are well suited for building sites and absorption. All the storm water will go to the ponds. All the accel and decel information will be reviewed and they will provide what is necessary by Road Commission standards. Commissioner Mansour asked if they extended the cul-de-sac and had it touch the property, would that help?

Mr. Scharl stated that this could happen but the road would still have to be re-built when the road is extended. He stated that it makes sense to stub it to the adjoining piece of property.

Commissioner Mansour suggested improvements to unit 23 and unit 24. He also suggested lot line extensions on lot 3 and lot 4.

Mr. Scharl concurred. He suggested extending the rear property line where it hits unit 3 and unit 4 to the point.

Commissioner Mansour suggested improvements on unit 8 and unit 9.

Mr. Scharl answered that this change wasn't as solvable as the suggestion for unit 3 and unit 4.

Commissioner Mansour stated that he likes the layout.

Commissioner Hopper stated that because of the amount of traffic that goes up and down Andersonville Road, someone is going to turn into the development and not be able to turn around to get back to Andersonville Road. He expressed his concerns about the T turnaround.

Mr. Scharl responded that it is easily modified and he can end it in a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that his issues with the lots have been addressed by Mr. Scharl.

Mr. Scharl confirmed that lot 5 is too short on the Density Plan, but he will fix it. Lot #20 is fine.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that lot width is measured at the front yard setback.

Mr. Ford confirmed that 30 units is achievable.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Commissioners agreed that the plan should be recommended for Special Land Use.

Commissioners agreed that they are in favor of the cul-de-sac instead of the T turnaround.

Mr. Scharl concurred.

Commissioner Hines moved that the Planning Commission finds the proposed Special Land Use and Concept Plan request for Quarry Ridge meets the standards in Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Section 40-145, Special Land Use. This development will not be detrimental and will be in harmony with the surrounding area and the Planning Commission recommends to the Township Board that they approve the Special Land Use. Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Whiting moved to recommend to the Township Board the Quarry Ridge plan that it achieves the density of 30 lots including and executing changes discussed in Lots 5, 6 and 7 to be minimum lot width requirements. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Mansour stated that on Lot #20, if Mr. Scharl adjusts the back lot line a little bit more, he will achieve a better build site.

Mr. Scharl concurred.

Old Business:

1. Ordinance Amendments – Section 40-721 Landscaping Greenbelts and Buffers, and Screening

Commissioners discussed the ordinance amendments to Section 40-721 that were prepared by Mr. Doug Lewan. They pointed out that the key on the Proposed Buffer Zone sketches list, “Large Deciduous Tree” twice and determined that the second “Large Deciduous Tree” should be “Large Evergreen”. The discussed the inclusion of the sketches in the ordinance, or if they should be handouts that are not included in the ordinance as they were not included in the noticing of this item.

Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend that the Township Board amend Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Section 40-721, Landscaping Greenbelts and Buffers, and Screening as presented with the correction in the plant key to “Large Evergreen Tree” from the redundant “Large Deciduous Tree.” Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and made changes to the Priority Task List.

2. Pathway Committee Update and information

Commissioner Pliska provided an update regarding the recent actions of the Pathway Committee. Commissioners concluded that they would like to see the Pathway Plan on the agenda again next month.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:34 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary