

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL
MEETING AGENDA**

July 17, 2006

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

MINUTES: **June 19th, 2006 Business**

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Zoning Ordinance No. 26 Amendment: Section 2, 18.10 - Condominiums and Site Condominiums –Tabled until 8-3-06
2. Proposed Zoning Ordinance No. 26 Map Changes, PL, PR, PS & RC – Tabled until 8-3-06
3. Eagle’s Ridge Site Plan

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Springfield Oaks- Final Site Plan
2. Dixie Baptist Church – E. Holly Rd. – Concept Site Plan
3. Fire Station No. 2 Addition – Final Site Plan

OTHER BUSINESS:

Miscellaneous-

1. Dixie Corridor Study – Tabled until 8-3-06
2. Other Ordinances of Interest – Tabled until 8-3-06
3. Update Priority List - Tabled until 8-3-06
4. Section 18.07.4.b (6) - Expiration of Approval

NEXT MEETING DATE: August 21st, 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.

(Revised – 7-10-06)

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of July 17, 2006**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the July 17, 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
John Steckling
Bill Leddy
Dean Baker
Bill Champion
Paul Rabaut

Commissioner(s) Absent

Ruth Ann Hines

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Collin Walls
Nancy Strole

Approval of Minutes: June 19, 2006

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the minutes of June 19, 2006 as presented. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Leddy, Baker, Champion and Rabaut; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Steckling suggested amending the agenda by hearing items 1 and 2 of Unfinished Business and make them 4 and 5 under New Business and proceed immediately to the site plans.

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

Public Comment:

Clerk Strole commented about her meeting with state natural resource and wildlife resource experts. The experts are familiar with the Shiawassee Corridor and they commented to her that

they have looked all over the state of Michigan and this system along the Shiawassee Corridor is considered the finest example of its kind in the entire state.

Mr. Grant Ward provided a copy of an article regarding the fact that land is not a renewable resource. He stated that he has been preaching this for years and large lot sizes encourage urban sprawl and they drain other natural resources. Mr. Ward encouraged the Planning Commission to review the newspaper article.

Public Hearing: None

New Business:

1. Eagle's Ridge Site Plan

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman summarized her revised review dated June 14, 2006. She noted that the Master Deed provisions should include some limit to the amount of tree removal outside the building envelopes on noted parcels. She asked if the park would be protected by a conservation easement. Boundary markers are requested to be placed between the lots and the open space and the applicant has shown this on the plans. She further suggested that markers be provided at the corner of each lot. The on site septic facility for lot 3 is also designated as a stormwater retention easement and she asked how this would work. Regarding landscaping, Carlisle/Wortman recommends that the applicant use a native seed mix. The area between lot 1 and the road should be left in a natural state but the plans show a significant portion will be cleared and replanted. The area designated as lawn should be left undisturbed.

Mr. Ford of HRC summarized his review dated June 22, 2006. Mr. Ford noted that not much has changed by way of plan revisions however one discrepancy between the Exhibit B drawings and the construction plans regarding a culvert diameter does exist. Regarding grading and drainage, the Master Deed should clarify maintenance requirements and responsibilities for the retention and drainage easements. Regarding soil erosion, he noted that there is a designated area at the north end of the site that will be used as a borrow pit and the silt fence should surround that. There is also no indication of any mass grading in that area, so he assumes the applicant will match the existing grade. In regard to site access issues, he did confirm that the road complies with AASHTO guidelines.

Mr. Ward said regarding preservation of existing woodlands, he does have 55.9% of the site as open space/park and is exclusive of roadway. The perimeter of the site does have large areas of open space that will be left undisturbed. The woodland area is well preserved but he would entertain adding language to the Master Deed and By Laws. All the lots will be staked with signs at the angle points and the open space areas. He will use a 4x4 post at each lot corner to help delineate. The reserved septic area on lot 3 does show up in the easement. Regarding landscaping, he has proposed a pasture mix and there will be some amount of grade changes in the area noted by Mr. Ford. They chose that blend because it is hearty and stable and compatible with the existing grasses in this area. Mr. Ward said he would like to have a more attractive site

than what he has seen with native seed mixes before. Ms. Elmiger noted that this seed mix, while it has been around since the beginning of agriculture, this pasture seed mix is not native.

Commissioner Baker asked the applicant with regard to screening in the front, if he intends to leave it in a natural state as directed previously by the Planning Commission. Mr. Ward said what is there now is a pasture mixture but he thinks reseeding it as proposed and preserving what vegetation he can is more important and he does meet the open space requirement of the ordinance.

Commissioner Rabaut said he agrees that this property qualifies for cluster and agrees the density is appropriate and he supports the plan as proposed.

Commissioner Champion said he agrees as far as the seed mix and using the existing pasture mix. He would like to see language added to the limitation of tree removal.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he would support using Option B for the turn-around. He agrees with the need for preservation of existing woodland Master Deed provisions and fertilizer provisions. He also thinks we should include in any recommendation, a conservation easement or deed restriction for the park that homeowners cannot go beyond a possible outline for the future playground. He would like to make sure the entire open space doesn't turn into a playground. Regarding the location of the reserve septic system on lot 3, he asked if it could be relocated out of the retention area? Mr. Ford said the county requires the reserve septic be designated and he does not know what the county's position might be.

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to recommend the approval for final site plan of the Eagles Ridge according to plans and documentations submitted for review date stamped by the Township 7-10-06, this recommendation is based upon review of the forgoing submissions as well as the written reviews of township planner and engineer and a determination that the applicant has complied with Section 18.07.2 and all other applicable provisions of the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance, the Design and Construction Standards and all other applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following conditions are attached to this recommendation: 1) boundary markers will be placed at each lot corner and on the pathways for the common areas; 2) the area between lot 1 and the road will be left in a natural state after the final balancing is done; 3) we will be using option B for the turn-around currently shown on the latest submission; 4) correction on all documents of the engineering discrepancies as enumerated in the numerous reviews by HRC; 5) Master Deed provisions regarding woodland preservation, fertilization usage and appropriate conservation easements protecting the common elements will be adopted and submitted for review and approval by the Township Board; 6) final site work will conform with the drainage plan shown. Compliance of the forgoing conditions shall be undertaken on an administrative basis with the applicant working in conjunction with the Planning Director who may consult with others. Commissioner Baker supported the motion.**

- ★ **Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to include waiving the sidewalks. Commissioner Baker supported the amendment.**
- ★ **Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

2. Springfield Oaks – Final Site Plan

Ms. Elmiger summarized Carlisle/Wortman's review dated July 5, 2006. This is a proposal for a new 4-H office and restroom building and new 4-H horse barn. The existing administrative offices will be moved to this new office building and a large conference room will be used for 4-H fair, vendor booths and event restrooms and showers. The applicant is proposing to construct the shell of the building currently since office use currently is not an allowed use in this district. Regarding natural resources, the applicant should show proposed grades and contour lines. Final site plan review requires soil boring logs and information. In regard to site access and circulation, the new barn will be next to the existing roadway that is 30 feet wide and also being used for 90° parking which means the drive isle will only be 10 to 12 feet wide. She is suggesting the applicant increase the size of the paved area to meet the ordinance requirements for internal access to parking. There is a 600 parking space deficiency according to ordinance. Ms. Elmiger asked in her review if water will be available for fire suppression for both buildings. A new septic system will be installed for the office building and that information should be provided with the site plan submission. She would like to know how animal waste will be handled at the barn building, particularly if the barns are hosed out. Regarding landscaping, a specific plan has not been provided but the applicant indicates they want some foundation plantings around the office building, details should be reviewed. Tree requirements in parking areas are required but Carlisle/Wortman recommends this requirement be waived given the fact that it is gravel parking. The applicant should describe the current screening proposed from Hall Road. Lighting will be recessed at the office building and does meet ordinance requirements. Lighting for the new barns are wall pack style and the applicant has provided a detail of the fixtures. Ms. Elmiger said Carlisle/Wortman recommends approval once all comments of their review have been addressed.

Mr. Ford commented that his issues were all related to site drainage. The two facilities and the amount of runoff is rather minor. After reviewing the drainage plan provided, he has requested the applicant provide clarification that there is a defined outlet for the wetland system, otherwise the calculations equates to a higher volume. Mr. Ford said, more importantly than the volume is the water quality issues associated with the runoff. The applicant did indicate two drainage routes with it all outletting towards the large wetland system and construction of berms. He suggested that a more elaborate way as indicated in his review. He questioned how and when it would be implemented. Mr. Ford said, regarding drainage, storm sewers need to be profiled and several minor issues need to be detailed in the construction plans.

Mr. Mike Donnellon of Oakland County Parks commented that regarding grading, both sites are relatively flat with the exception of the barn and they do have to add a retaining wall. Soil information is provided on the plans and the township has on file the sanitary septic field with

soil boring locations. In regard to the driveway on the west side of the barn, the intended use is primarily for unloading and loading of horses. Mr. Donnellon said in regard to the number of parking spaces, they only have two events per year and they didn't think 600 more spaces was necessary. Fire suppression will be available where code requires. Animal waste management would be composted and the compost will be utilized in the community service garden. Regarding landscaping, they are proposing six trees around the facility with some minimal foundation plantings. With regard to lighting, the wall packs on the horse barn will be directed downward. The building will be indicative of what is on the site and they are asking the Planning Commission to accept the design as shown to match the existing facilities. There are existing dumpsters for refuse as raised in one report. The drainage for building E is intended to tap into the existing 4-inch pipe and no curbs are intended.

Commissioner Leddy said he questions whether the temporary campsite should be located near the residential area. He is concerned that this is starting to look like a set of warehouses rather than a natural setting for a farm or fair. Commissioner Leddy said he feels for this type of setting the wood barns as some already exist, would be more appealing to this area.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he would like the applicants to review the restroom facilities as he believes there should be more facilities for females than males. He noted that there are many issues that he believes still need to be resolved on this plan.

Commissioner Champion commented that he agrees with the steel siding building proposed and would agree with the recommendation to waive trees in the parking area. He also agrees that there is sufficient natural screening along Hall Road.

Commissioner Steckling commented that he questions where we delineate with screening between adjoining parcels and where we look at an overall Master Plan as to the drainage. He noted for example, if another building is constructed in the middle, screening would not be an issue. This is being developed in pieces but he thinks we should look at it as one big piece for purposes of ordinance compliance and plan ahead for drainage and such. Mr. Donnellon said, this plan is really the Master Plan for this site and they do have a Master stormwater plan and sanitary plan. Supervisor Walls suggested that the applicant present a Master Plan to the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission work cooperatively with Oakland County Parks before the next building is submitted.

Chairperson Lamont commented that regarding parking, he did not think two additional buildings would increase fair attendance and therefore more parking is not necessary. He believes the drainage issues should be handled now for future use.

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the application for final site plan approval for Oakland County Parks according to the plans and documentation submitted for review, date stamped by the Township July 6, 2006. This approval is based upon review of the foregoing submissions as well as the written reviews of the Township planner, and engineer and a determination that the applicant has complied with Section 18.07.2 and all other applicable provisions of the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance, the Design and Construction Standards and all other**

applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following additional findings of fact are relevant to this application: 1) Steel pre-fabricated construction is consistent with materials used in the area and on the site currently; 2) Parking spaces provided are adequate based upon the parcel and its usage; 3) Building colors proposed are in conformance with the ordinance and compatible with the surroundings. The following conditions are attached to this approval: 1) Satisfaction of items 1 through 4 on HRC's review letter of July 11, 2006 as well as the other two headings, one entitled Site Access Paving and Site Utilities; 2) Approved control and disposal of animal waste so as to ensure no onsite or off site leaching of waste into waterways or aquifers; 3) Screening according to ordinance requirements between all adjoining land uses. Compliance with the foregoing conditions shall be undertaken on an administrative basis, with the applicant working in conjunction with the Planning Director who may consult with others. The applicant shall not be required to provide the following items: 1) curbed islands in parking lots as they are not consistent with the rural setting; 2) roof pitch and the eave changes as shown on the attached drawings will be satisfactory even though they are not in conformance with the ordinance. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion.

Commissioner Rabaut asked to add that the adequacy of the ladies restroom be evaluated. Commissioner Champion asked to add that the applicant submit landscape plans.

- * Commissioner Steckling agreed to amend his motion as Commissioner Champion and Commissioner Rabaut stated.**

Supervisor Walls noted that the motion grants complete approval for Building E as presented which includes a use that the Planning Commission cannot approve.

- * Commissioner Steckling amended his motion to state that Building E would only be constructed as a shell at this time.**

Commissioner Steckling said he is still very uncomfortable with many loose ends on this plan.

- * Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker and Leddy; No: Champion; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 1 vote.**

3. Dixie Baptist Church – Concept Site Plan

Ms. Elmiger summarized Carlisle/Wortman's review dated June 14, 2006. The proposal is for a 122,000 square foot building to house a church, daycare center and elementary and high school on a 40-acre property. Ms. Elmiger said the plans do not show any acceleration or deceleration lanes to manage traffic on East Holly Road. She questions how the property will be used and how many people will be utilizing it. Regarding criteria about standards for grading and surface drainage, she suggests that the applicant review Section 17.11 to try to reduce impervious surfaces and therefore storm water runoff and direct storm water via above ground surface flow

to infiltration areas rather than the proposed design. Regarding natural features, there is an MNFI site on this property that does rank "7" which protects it into the resource protection overlay district; however the applicant is not proposing development for this section. She suggested a conservation easement to protect the woodland. Regarding storm water, she does not recommend directing stormwater to the wooded area as is shown on the plans. Regarding waste water treatment system, the existing location is 60 feet from the pond and the ordinance requires a minimum distance of 100 feet. She questions the criteria of storing hazardous materials and if this facility will be storing these items. Regarding SLU provisions, the standards have requirements for lot area and setback which this proposal meets. There are also requirements for the height of the building but at the time of this review she did not have that information. Carlisle/Wortman feels that the proposed church and school will be harmonious with the property to the east and west.

Mr. Ford noted that regarding site grading and drainage issues, there are several outlets for the proposed storm drainage. The applicant will have to provide detention and retention calculations in accordance with the Township standards. The applicant must address storm water quality issues associated with the improved site runoff into the ponds. The plans do not show a delineated wetland boundary as required. The proposed development must respect the natural topography to the maximum extent possible by minimizing cutting, filling and grading. The applicant does show some proposed spot grades, particularly along the south end of the site.

Mr. McNelly responded to the comments by the planner and engineer. As far as storm water quality, they will relocate things in the pond. The wetlands on the property do not come within 25 feet of the buildings and the wetlands have been surveyed and flagged since the proposal was submitted. The pond to the east is smaller than an acre and therefore not regulated by DEQ. They plan on changing the site a little bit to alleviate any water going into the woodlands to the south. Regarding topography, they wanted to get the building off the road and utilize the environmental issues that are there. The applicant is not sure if they will have one or two septic fields but they will be located as far as need be from the well. Regarding storm drainage, the applicant said they are trying to keep the same drainage pattern as currently exists. Mr. McNelly said the building is proposed to be 40 feet tall since they are 305 feet from the road. The church will house 500 to 800 people and the school currently has 160 enrolled students with 30 teachers and 150 enrolled in the daycare. They are proposing 219 parking spaces with banked parking. They are proposing two camping spots for visiting pastors but those will be out of the way and screened.

Commissioner Steckling said his difficulty is that the planner has indicated that the Master Plan indicates this corner of the township is planned for the least intensive development pattern and this is not least intensive in his opinion and he is disappointed to see the parking lot on the roadside.

Commissioner Champion said he concurs with Commissioner Steckling on the parking lot. He would like to see details to the campsites and picnic pavilion. Commissioner Champion asked if the ball fields would be lit? Mr. McNelly said, no lighting is proposed at this time. Commissioner Champion asked about the existing sign along I-75 and what is planned for it? Mr. McNelly said they have two options currently they are exploring. One option is to relocate it

along I-75 closer to their exit if they can find property that is amenable to moving it. The other option is to leave it where it stands.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that he has difficulty with the Special Land Use proposal because in his opinion, this is not enough acreage for a school and church as he reads the ordinance. In regard to setback requirements, he would like to know if the setbacks are met for all the different uses proposed. He would like to see a parking analysis since there is parking for 216 cars but the sanctuary will seat 500 people. Commissioner Rabaut said there must be some protection for the MNFI site. There should be acceleration and deceleration lanes. The signs must meet the ordinance or the applicant must obtain a variance. He concurs with the opinion that the parking lot not be noticeable from the road.

Commissioner Leddy commented that he is concerned with the drainage and the elevations on the building along with the drainage from the parking lot and pond.

Commissioner Baker commented that he would like to make sure the maintenance building is set up properly with collection facilities as they would be doing vehicle maintenance in there. He is in support of protecting the MNFI site through some type of conservation easement. He is not against the general layout of the plan at this point.

Chairperson Lamont commented that this site does qualify for Special Land Use. He encourage the applicant to compromise on the parking so perhaps not all of it is in the front. In regard to traffic, acceleration and deceleration lanes must be part of the plan. He encouraged the applicant to make the traffic island on the westerly most entrance disappear. In regard to the proposed campsites, Chairperson Lamont said he would like to see a complete detail analysis on the final site plan. Regarding the building height and steeple, he would like a complete artist rendering or elevation of the entire site would be appropriate. He would like details on delineating the natural areas and MNFI areas. Storage of chemicals should be listed in regard to the maintenance facility.

- * Chairperson Lamont moved to recommend that the Dixie Baptist Church on the south side of East Holly Road proposed tonight with a concept site plan review qualifies for Special Land Use at this location. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion.**
- * Commissioner Rabaut moved to table the motion until such time as we have a determination as to if the acreage qualifies for Special Land Use for the facilities being planned. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Rabaut and Champion; No: Lamont, Steckling, Baker and Leddy; Absent: Hines. The motion failed by a 4 to 2 vote.**
- * Commissioner Steckling asked to amend Chairperson Lamont's motion to include conditions: 1) approval based on the proposed use and any change in use and intensity would not be permitted; 2) the MNFI area will not be developed or altered without a new site plan; 3) drainage would be configured to be as non-invasive as possible and natural features be used and minimize the disruption to**

the existing site and vegetation. Chairperson Lamont amended his motion to include these conditions. Commissioner Leddy supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: Rabaut; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 5 to 1 vote.

- * Chairperson Lamont moved to continue the meeting to finish the site plans only as it is past the limited time. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

4. Fire Station No. 2 Addition – Final Site Plan

Ms. Elmiger summarized her review dated June 23, 2006. She stated that the proposed parking is appropriate and would like to confirm the building colors. Carlisle/Wortman recommends final site plan approval upon these issues being addressed.

Mr. Ford said the comments previously raised by HRC have all been addressed.

Supervisor Walls commented that there is a minor inconsistency between the architects plan and the engineers plan having to do with the maple tree in the northwest corner. They will do everything they can to try to save the maple tree.

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the application for final site plan approval for the Springfield Township Fire Department application according to plans and documents submitted for review date stamped June 19, 2006. This approval is based upon a review of the foregoing submissions as well as the written reviews of the Township planner and engineer and a determination that the applicant has complied with Section 18.07.2 and all other applicable provisions of the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance, Design and Construction Standards and all other applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following additional findings of fact are relevant to this application. The building colors are complimentary to the surroundings and meet the requirements of the ordinance; the amount of parking is in excess of that required however, is needed based on the intended usage of the parcel. The following conditions are attached to this approval: 1) subject to the applicant obtaining satisfactory approval from the ZBA or other appropriate township entities as to the intended use as it is not permitted currently under the ordinance; 2) It will provide an easement and suitable width and location to construct a safety path at the same time, in the future however, it shall not be required to construct the safety path currently. Compliance with the foregoing conditions shall be undertaken on an administrative basis with the applicant working in conjunction with the Planning Director who may consult with others. The applicant shall not be required to provide the following: 1) island landscaping in the parking areas beyond the three proposed shall not be required.**

Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Rabaut; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to hold an August 3, 2006 Workshop meeting to conduct the remainder of items of this meeting. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Leddy, Champion and Rabaut; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

Other Business: None

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 11:25 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary