

Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes January 18, 2010

Call to Order: Chair John Steckling called the January 18, 2010 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:

Frank Aiello
Roger Lamont
Bill Leddy
John Steckling
Neil Willson
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioners Absent:

Dean Baker

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the Agenda with one change. He moved to place the Section 18.07.4.b – Site Plan Review Procedures to #1 under New Business and then the Meeting Dates for 2010 will be #2. Vote on the motion: Ayes Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Willson and Hines. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

Public Comment:

Alice Spurgeon, 13137 Andersonville Road, Davisburg, MI 48350. She stated that she had a 3 part question that went with the Township's future plans for the lumberyard property and septic system. She stated that she wondered how much the Planning Commission was involved in working to see that all things are followed through with such as future wells and septic systems. She stated that she wondered if they were watching for the water table right underneath the ground. She stated that some elderly residents that she spoke to were concerned that a big septic system would disturb the water table and they are also concerned about their wells.

Commissioner Steckling stated that these matters will be addressed. He stated that there was not a formal plan at this time. The Planning Commission has simply been exploring different approaches. He deferred to the Township officials present for comment.

Supervisor Trout stated that the property has some issues and the Township is still working on the purchase. He stated that the Commission is well aware of the water table.

He stated that at this point it is ~~immature~~ premature to look at a formal plan, but that the Commission is aware of it.

Consent Agenda:

Consent Agenda: Minutes of the November 16th, 2009. Commissioner Aiello moved to approve the Minutes of November 16th, 2009 as presented. Support by Commissioner Lamont. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Willson and Hines. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

1. Section 18.07.4.b. – Site Plan Review Procedures.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this will streamline the process and remove some of the approvals that we had asked the applicant to obtain as part of the site plan review process. He stated that we have removed them because they are out of the Commission's jurisdiction and some of the approvals were premature, unnecessary, added to the cost and slowed things down.

Mr. Oppmann agreed.

Commissioner Steckling opened the public hearing at 7:36 and closed the public hearing at 7:36 and 15 seconds with no comment from those present.

Old Business:

1. Revisions to CIP.

Mike Trout stated that he revised the document since the last meeting. He stated that it should be considered a draft. He stated that he only listed the projects. He stated that work has been done in signalization and the project has been initiated. He stated that fencing and some downtown Davisburg improvements have been worked on. He stated that they have been talking about the Dixie Corridor update that they are going to be doing. He stated that quite a few technology upgrades have been done from computers to printers and copy machines in the Township. He stated that the Rose Township property acquisition is nearly complete with just a couple of details including Rose Township Board approval. He stated that if we look at the list of projects that we had back in November, the Commission should probably come up with the projects that they want to work on this year. He stated that Dixie and Davisburg will always be at the top of the list, but we also need to concentrate on our pathways plan and make that a high priority for this body and for the Township as a whole. He stated that he believes this is an achievable goal in the next couple of years. He stated that a plan is in effect, however the plan needs to be prioritized into segments to work on. He stated that we should look for funding options and in conjunction with the signalization improvement at Dixie and Davisburg Road, he believes that the entire intersection has potential for some improvement and upgrade similar to some seen along M-59

in Waterford Township. He stated that the corners should be looked at for improvements. He stated that we could make this a focal point and work the pathway plan away from that intersection in either direction that we choose. He stated that the pathway plan should provide linkage to something and in the big picture, we should work with Independence Township to link some parts of Clarkston to Davisburg. He stated that this is achievable and that the Commission should spend time on this. He stated that he would like to work with Brian Oppmann to put together an overview of our pathways plan and break it up into mile-long segments so cost can be defined along with the intersection improvement that needs to be developed. He stated that we are focusing this year on maintenance. He stated that there is still potential in that area. He stated that he does not know what is going to happen with the sewers. He also stated that the Dixie Corridor plan has a lot of potential as well.

Commissioner Aiello questioned the scope of the improvements planned for the Dixie Davisburg intersection.

Supervisor Trout stated that he has seen examples at Seymour Lake or Crescent Lake Road and M-59 where there is a CVS and Kroger. He stated that brick pavers and benches are present with street lighting going around the corners that enhances the look of the whole area. He stated that he believes that the Dixie and Davisburg Road intersection could be viewed as the center of the Township and that we can work from this point out. He stated that Kroger is there and that some of the comment during approval of the signalization project questioned why we were putting in these approaches and sidewalk approaches without sidewalks. He stated that even if approaches are put in from Pebble Creek to Kroger, this would be a benefit. He stated that a plan should be made on paper while we are working on this project; it makes sense to do it now. He stated that there is a pretty substantial right of way in this area, especially in the south-west corner which probably needs as much work as any other part of the intersection.

Commissioner Aiello stated that his route to work takes him by the corner of Opdyke and Featherstone and it is similar there. He stated that it is an urban area but corner improvements such as trees have really improved the area despite the fact that you would not expect it there.

Supervisor Trout stated that it is a chance for the Township to be creative and he believes that there is enhancement or other types of grant money that can be attained to come up with a plan.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he gives “hats off” to the author of the new Springfield CIP cover sheet, definitions and index. He stated that it is an awesome document because it actually spells out what the Township’s goals and objectives are with the CIP so anyone looking at the spreadsheet and cover document will have an exact vision about what the Township’s intentions are. He stated reading the spreadsheet alone would cause questions about how the Township would get

the money for this or that, or how they would do this or that. He stated that the cover document really spells out the details nicely. He stated in regard to the Dixie and Davisburg signalization project, you have got to start somewhere. He stated that this was the Township Board's intention when this was passed and as Commissioner Aiello confirmed, you may not expect it there, but who knows what will come if you have something to start with. He stated that we are on the right track.

2. Temporary Sign Permit Discussion.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this subject was discussed at the last meeting and Planner Oppmann was asked to give the Commission some more ideas about permits and lengths of posted time.. He stated that Mr. Oppmann had given the Commission draft language to mull over.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he made simple text edits, but that the key item was #3, page 2, where he did insert the provision based on the comments at the last meeting that "each temporary sign shall remain in place no longer that 14 consecutive days" and "any temporary sign on a property longer than 60 days within a calendar year." He stated that he believed that this was the consensus based on previous discussions, but this is a sticking point with this language, how long do we want to have it for? He stated the question is how much flexibility do we want to give property owners in being able to place signage. He stated that he also made some cleanups dealing with enforcement and some simple changes. He stated that time frames need to be determined to move forward.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the Commission had talked in some depth about the difference between non-profit and businesses and it is not addressed in the sample given. He asked if any wording was considered that would clarify that.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he did not because he is not sure that you can actually differentiate between the two. He stated that there could be some constitutionality issues with that and he would have to do some research. He stated that he does not believe that you can differentiate between a church and a business. He stated that this is a tough road to go down, but further research can be done to find out.

Commissioner Leddy stated that it would always be possible to present to the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow certain things to be brought in that are non-confirming with this ruling. He stated that Divine Mercy is an example of an organization having to put up a sign every Saturday and Sunday because they are renting the building. He stated that we could not tell them that they could only do this 14 days of the year, or a limited number of days.

Commissioner Hines asked when their sign goes up.

Commissioner Leddy stated that Divine Mercy puts their sign up Friday evening and takes it down Sunday by noon.

Commissioner Hines asked when the services are held.

Commissioner Leddy stated that services are held Saturday and Sunday, so the sign is put up a day ahead of time.

Commissioners have a discussion about how many days total Divine Mercy would have per year.

Clerk Moreau stated that the issue arose because Divine Mercy does not have a regular sign. She stated that this is not a case of a business or a non-profit that has their stand alone approved sign and then an additional temporary sign. She stated that Divine Mercy does not have a regular sign, so it is a slightly different case and this is why it was brought up. She stated that maybe they could go through a process getting approval for a regular sign.

Mr. Oppmann stated that in this case, the Township would want Divine Mercy to get a permanent sign placed out there if possible. He stated that the way the language reads now in the sample, if they were to put out a sign every Friday through Sunday, they could have it for a maximum of 60 days. He stated that they could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and state their reasons why they would need a sign for 52 weeks times 3 days; this issue could be appealed. He stated that the Township should encourage them to get a permanent sign.

Clerk Moreau stated that this is a unique situation that she does not know if the Commission needs to worry about putting into this ordinance.

Commissioner Leddy stated that this is a temporary situation.

Commissioner Hines stated that there was another church that was trying to meet in the Hart Center and they were putting out signs on the weekend. She stated that this should be considered because that is 2 examples in the last year.

Supervisor Trout stated that this would be more applicable to having an event in addition to their services and that if they wanted to have a banner out for a week, that might fall under the temporary sign provision; whereas the other weekly sign might apply to their weekly usage permitted.

Commissioner Hines questioned if the school on the weekend could change their sign to reflect Divine Mercy's meeting.

Commissioners have a discussion about why the school cannot promote a religious organization.

Clerk Moreau stated that Divine Mercy's need for a sign out every weekend for an unspecified amount of time goes beyond a temporary sign. She stated that she would like to see something more permanent.

Commissioner Willson stated that this is not the church's permanent resident and they do not occupy it Monday through Friday.

Mr. Oppmann agreed.

Commissioner Leddy stated that he believes that these types of things can be worked out administratively.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this situation is a candidate for going to the Zoning Board of Appeals and getting a special approval based on the unique circumstances.

Commissioner Lamont stated that the Board of Appeals would be the best legal alternative to protect the Township because each case is heard individually. He stated that there is a one-time fee and the ruling can stand indefinitely until the church finds a permanent location.

Commissioner Aiello questioned section C3, it was written 60/30 because the Commission would weigh in on this?

Mr. Oppmann stated that originally it was 30, and then it was brought up that it should be expanded and then increased to 60.

Commissioners stated that different versions of the document were received; some more easily readable than others.

Commissioner Aiello suggested adding before the word sixty, "consecutive days in the posting of any temporary sign on the property", insert "shall not cumulatively exceed 60 days within any calendar year." He stated that this should be added for clarification.

Commissioners agreed on this change.

Commissioner Aiello stated that in 5A, he stated that there is an exception to the 14 day requirement that the Township can allow. He suggested adding, "provided all other requirements of the Ordinance are complied with, or satisfied."

Mr. Oppmann stated that this already was added.

Commissioner Aiello stated that this was good.

Commissioner Lamont stated that this version seemed to reflect all of the Commission's prior comments. He stated that in 5B, the Building Department needs to be changed to something else.

Mr. Oppmann suggests changing "Building Department" to "Township".

Commissioner Lamont agrees, but with the consensus of the Commission and the Township Board. He commented that he does not like A-frame or sandwich signs and he would like this removed, unless it needs to be spelled out that they are not permitted. He stated that with the size limitations that we have, frequently they are flopped over.

Commissioner Hines stated that the Candle Factory downtown uses such a sign.

Commissioner Lamont questioned what can be worded into any sign ordinance to prevent people holding temporary signs.

Mr. Oppmann stated that communities are working on this. He stated that he will do some research and get back to the Commission regarding this request because this is something that should be curtailed before it becomes a regular occurrence. He stated that this is apparent throughout Waterford Township.

Commissioner Leddy stated that in the ordinance now, these temporary signs cannot be in the right-of-way.

Mr. Oppmann stated that sometimes it can be a difficult issue because frequently these signs use the sidewalk, but he will look into it.

Commissioner Lamont stated that this should not hold up what they are doing. He stated that this was just a comment for the future.

Commissioner Hines stated that she had not thought about this issue before.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he would add it to the priority list.

Commissioner Willson stated that he did not have time to look at it, he questioned if the Township charged a different amount for sign permits for businesses or non-profits.

Mr. Oppmann stated that no, any Building Department fees are the same as approved by the Township, it does not matter who the applicant is.

Supervisor Trout stated that the fee is \$50.00 for a non-illuminated sign, and \$100.00 for an illuminated sign; this is a one-time fee.

Mr. Oppmann stated that perhaps the Township wants to create a temporary sign fee and that Supervisor Trout would talk to the Building Department about this. This fee would cover the Township's expense in enforcing it.

Commissioner Willson questioned if 60 days is commonly used in other Townships.

Mr. Oppmann stated that it ranges between 30 and 90 days. He stated that he has seen some even shorter. He stated that 60 days seemed fair.

Commissioner Willson asked Commissioner Steckling his opinion since he currently owns a business in the Township.

Commissioner Steckling stated that he has been thinking about this for the last several months and feels that if a poll was done, each Commissioner would have a different feeling about what was in good taste. He stated that this is a really subjective issue. He stated that as you drive down Dixie Highway, there are many businesses that have all of their windows unfortunately filled with large signs and an example is at the corner of Davisburg and Dixie. He stated that all of the signs in the window are in violation of our ordinance. He stated that these are not really temporary signs, this is in violation of our current allowed signage. He stated that he would like to see changeable signs and that currently these are not allowed in our ordinance. He stated that he was not sure of what the answer is but currently you would need to go to each business and ask them to take all of this signage down, because it was a violation of the current ordinance.

Commissioner Willson stated that if we force the businesses to take down this signage, he questioned if 60 days is fair.

Commissioner Steckling stated that 60 days becomes a mute point because the businesses do this year round. He stated that what is visually offensive is different for each person. He asked what right do we have to intrude upon the business, versus weighing the rights of the community. He stated that he does not have an answer for this. He stated that perhaps in return for not putting all of this extraneous signage up, maybe we should increase the amount of signage that they are allowed overall. He stated that when driving down Dixie Highway, many signs are unreadable. He stated that there should be a balance between having a pretty building with signage that cannot be read and having a business with gaudy signs and announcements. He suggests that enforcement is an issue and that currently we are not enforcing the sign ordinance that we have now, if we were, most of the signs out there would not be there.

Commissioner Hines stated that the Curves business owner was concerned about not being able to put signs in their windows. She stated that with this business advertising opportunity was minimal because they are down below and while traveling at 50 miles per hour, it is difficult to see and many people do not know it

is there. She stated that she lived here for a long time before she knew Curves was there. She stated that the Kroger gas price is difficult to read while driving by because it is back from the road and covered by landscaping. She stated that if businesses are to succeed, we have to make sure people know that they exist.

Commissioner Willson stated that to change the signs in front, we have to change the current sign ordinance to allow the signs to be bigger than they are now.

Commissioner Hines stated that we have to be smart about the landscaping that we require around signs and in front of businesses so that they do not obscure being able to see the sign because it is so beautifully landscaped.

Commissioner Willson stated that he is not sure that 60 is enough and we may want to look at currently allowable signage on the building.

Commissioner Aiello stated that we are setting the tone for development for the future. He stated that he would like the signage along Dixie Highway to look like Kroger, and not the party store. He stated that while the owner of Curves may object, and he can understand that, he stated that maybe there is a middle ground that is possible. He stated that we are creating a business district that is going to be vibrant so that the owner of Curves has a lot of customers and it is an area that people go because they want to do business there and they feel comfortable there. He is concerned that if we start changing the current signage ordinance, we have failed to set the tone for the type of development that we want in the future. He stated that in Independence, on Sashabaw, it is just as conservative as what Springfield Township requires if not more so. He stated that this is a thriving commercial corridor and it is doing well.

Commissioner Hines stated that a business on Sashabaw cannot be found unless you are driving really, really slow.

Commissioner Willson stated that a problem on Dixie is that the speed is consistently 60 miles per hour. He stated that perhaps something can be done about slowing traffic down, perhaps adding a couple of traffic signals.

Commissioner Hines stated that there must be a balance to have viable businesses.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he concurred with Commissioner Aiello. He stated that we are looking at two different things here. The first is the temporary ordinance in front of us. He stated that if we want to look at permanent and look at it on the agenda of things to do in the future, perhaps in conjunction with continuing to work on a temporary ordinance. He stated that he agrees with Commissioner Aiello, he is not stuck on 60 days, if the Commission feels that more is necessary. He stated that the reason the temporary ordinance is in front of the Commission is because the Township currently has businesses like party stores and Dixie Auto which show a tremendous amount of violations that take

potentially nicely developed property with nice signs like Kroger and puts them at a disadvantage because there are other businesses taking advantage of the laws. He stated that our enforcement work needs to be stepped up and corrected, but a temporary sign ordinance gives the Township the chance to send the message to the businesses that we are going to have a sign ordinance that will enable businesses to do business, that will enable the people that drive the speed limit to see the signs, and the people that drive too fast miss the signs, but this is their problem. He stated that we could also look at the permanent sign ordinance to clean it up. He stated that in defense of Kroger, the Planning Commission approved what was brought before them as far as signs. The shortcomings in visibility from the road was their engineering and design company's fault. He stated that the Planning Commission did not determine where to put the signs and actually, they did not say how brightly the signs should be backlit. He stated that he does not believe the gas station bulbs have ever been changed in their backlighting and states that this is a problem. He stated that they have some maintenance work that they should do. He stated that we should look at the temporary sign ordinance and possibly put the permanent ordinance on the future list of things to do. He stated that the Township does not want businesses to be at a disadvantage. He stated that we want to provide a nice place for people to potentially develop their businesses, have a chance to succeed and want to do business here. He stated that this might mean that the Township might have to consider the newer, high-tech signs that are available. He stated that from the Township Board's perspective there is a proposal for Dixie Market and Curves to be able to upgrade their sign and make the sign more consumer friendly and visible.

Commissioner Aiello moved to set up the Temporary Sign Ordinance for public hearing with the two revisions that he suggested: "not cumulatively to exceed 60 days within a calendar year" and "Building Department" changed to "Township." Support by Commissioner Willson. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Wilson and Hines. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion carried.

3. Zoning Ordinance No. 26, Section 16.26-Wind Energy

Commissioner Steckling stated that this has taken to public hearing and the last discussion involving migratory animals.

Mr. Oppmann stated that at the last meeting he had indicated that he would send it to all of the Commissioners as a Word document so that revisions and changes could be made easily by the Commissioners. He stated that he sent it and asked if the Commissioners had some corrected copies that we could look at.

Commissioner Aiello stated that he brought corrections to go over. He stated that the version that they most recently received did not have definitions with it. He

stated that he would like to add to the private WEC's definition, "a private WEC shall include a WEC that provides power to an electric utility grid as a function secondary to supporting electricity to the principal dwelling." So, he stated that if someone has a wind energy system in their home, and they want to feedback or sell power back to the grid that that is okay, as long as it is secondary to the use for their residence. The commercial WEC was also changed. He believes he changed the word an. In subsection 2 of the actual ordinance section, he stated that a private WEC has to get a permit from the Building Department and a commercial WEC has to get a special land use permit. In subsection 3B, the language said "private structure", but he stated that the "private WEC" definition would work there. In subsection C, it was stated "measured from the base of the structure to the highest reach of its blade", he stated that the highest point must exceed the blade. In subsection G, he stated that the language of "non-safety signage"; he changed it to "including signage for purposes other than safety". In subsection F, he noted that we give the applicant the ability to determine what sort of security that they are going to provide for later removal, if it is required for failure to use. He questioned if the applicant would not always choose to have the recorded document instead of a letter of credit or cash. He stated that he does not believe any applicant would ever choose to provide a letter of credit or cash. He also stated that the term "promise" should be change to "obligation." Subsection 5 was still titled "migratory birds" even though it had been changed. He stated that he changed it to "ecological impact" and deleted the word "affected."

Commissioner Steckling stated that house located (roof-mounted) units are becoming more popular. He stated that these units are not addressed in the ordinance.

Commissioner Hines questioned how large the roof-mounted units are.

Commissioner Steckling stated that the size varies, some are like a TV antenna on top of a chimney.

Commissioner Hines questioned if this comes into a conflict with the Township's current height restriction.

Commissioner Steckling stated that potentially it could. He stated that it could conflict with subdivision restrictions.

Mr. Oppmann stated that it could possibly be added to the list of exemptions like church steeples, etc. He stated that it would be difficult on a two-story house and the Township would probably want to add it to the list of exemptions and then question if it falls within the setback. He stated that typically the private structures are only a meter in diameter. He stated that the technology is changing so rapidly that now there are cylindrical devices. He stated that things are changing quickly so it is better to cover all bases now.

Clerk Moreau stated that she would rather see them add something for the roof-top now instead of waiting.

Commissioner Aiello stated that the model ordinance that was distributed to the Commission does not address that issue at all.

Mr. Oppmann stated that when these devices first came out, they were not recommended for roof-top use.

Commissioner Steckling stated that the ordinance could state that the roof-top is a suitable location provided all other conditions of the ordinance are met, then it would be evaluated by the zoning conditions.

Commissioner Aiello stated that the exceptions to the height ordinance, like steeples, still have finite limits. He suggested looking at these and that these might be adequate.

Commissioner Lamont suggested that Commissioner Aiello's comments are added into the ordinance and then send it to Mr. Oppmann to add language for roof-mounted systems.

Commissioners have a discussion about the difference between private and commercial in reference to a system at Grange Hall and Fish Lake Road. They determine that you can have a private system on a commercial building.

Commissioner Willson questioned Commissioner Aiello on the difference between private and secondary usage.

Commissioner Aiello stated that if the primary purpose of the unit is to feed power to the grid and to make money from that enterprise, then it is not a private WEC. But, if the primary purpose is to provide electricity for the home and then it is only generating limited electricity back to the grid, then it can be considered a secondary usage.

Commissioner Lamont suggested that the definitions should be included.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the definitions are in the ordinance, that is where they are placed. He stated that when he gave the Commissioners the cleaned up copy with the most recent changes reflected; he negated to include the definitions on their copy. He stated that it was his fault that they were not included in this most recent copy.

Commissioner Lamont made a motion to send the current Ordinance back to Mr. Oppmann to add Commissioner Aiello's language suggestions, and for Mr. Oppmann to evaluate and add language to include roof-top mounted private and commercial WECs. Seconded by Commissioner Aiello. Vote on

**the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Wilson and Hines.
Nayes: None. Absent: Baker. Motion carried.**

4. Dixie corridor study update-discussion

Commissioner Steckling stated that this was discussed last time as to the depth to which we are going to have Carlisle Wortman proceed and it was left that Supervisor Trout was going to come with some information and ideas for this meeting.

Supervisor Trout stated that he and Clerk Moreau met with Dick Carlisle and talked about this and some other things and the summary was distributed to the Commissioners. This is a timeline and goals that he would like the Commission to consider. He stated that some parts of this were contained on a prior proposal.

Clerk Moreau stated that the information presented to the Commissioners is what happens next.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the sheet provided to the Commissioners is the components of the plan itself. He stated that there are 3 components: a land use section, the design section and the implementation. He stated that this is the plan divided into 3 major sections.

Clerk Moreau questioned Supervisor Trout if he was saying that some of the work has already been done? She stated that the joint meeting of the Township Board and Planning Commission has already taken place, so much of the background work and the input has already been done.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the previous proposal stated that most of the preliminary background work has already been completed. He stated that Carlisle Wortman is working towards presenting in February a finalized copy of all of the background materials and a summarization of the joint meeting. He stated that this will be provided next month. He stated that the schedule shown is aggressive to get this moving. He stated that this is how Carlisle Wortman wants to proceed.

Supervisor Trout stated that if the Planning Commission agrees with this approach, then they need to recommend that this approach be developed into the proposal that the Township Board can approve for the cost associated with this, and then move forward.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the proposal suggested was within the previous budget request for the corridor.

Supervisor Trout stated that there were other things presented in the proposal. He stated that he would like to clean that up.

Clerk Moreau stated that what was presented was still within that budget. She stated that this proposal was a plan of attack, who is doing what, and when. She stated that the Township received the original budget proposal from Dick Carlisle and he actually reduced the price a little bit. She stated that she felt good about it. She stated that putting the chart together was based on eliminating the confusion.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the chart was like an outline of how the plan is going to be laid out, and the next steps. He stated that it was put together in a letter form, but the chart simplified it.

Commissioner Aiello stated that at the last meeting he had requested an example, perhaps Independence Township, or another to look at. He questioned whether or not this was ever received.

Clerk Moreau stated that the proposal for D-19 was received.

Commissioner Aiello stated that perhaps he did get it; he just did not realize what it was when he received it.

Commissioner Steckling asked the Commission how they wanted to proceed.

Supervisor Trout stated that if the Commission had concerns about signage, this would be an appropriate time to look at signage on Dixie as well. He stated that this would be an opportunity.

Clerk Moreau stated that it be added under the heading of March 15th, under design details. She stated that other items include design details, safety paths, parking, lighting, and signage would be appropriate. She stated that the idea when she and Supervisor Trout met with Dick Carlisle was that there are so many things that the Township wants to accomplish, how should it be chunked out. She stated that establishing long range goals was the primary focus and then they zeroed in on the details. She stated that Supervisor Trout and she had talked quite a bit about implementation and how it was important to not have a Dixie Corridor plan that would sit on a shelf somewhere, but it should really be a tool and be used to communicate to developers and property owners about what the opportunities are here and what our goals are including funding and investment opportunities.

Commissioner Aiello questioned whether the funding and investment implementation will be a big part of this plan.

Clerk Moreau stated that it was definitely part of the process.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this is a component of the implementation. He stated that the other component is actually implementing the potential zoning changes. He stated that this is really the Planning Commission's focus. He stated that the

Township Board's responsibility to work on how to get investment and funding and matching of grants. He stated that it all would be in the implementation steps.

Commissioner Aiello stated that he can appreciate that the financial aspect would be more the Township Board's role, but he stated that as a citizen and Planning Commissioner, he feels that this is the missing piece for the Township. He stated that the only way that the infrastructure needs are going to be met for serious development is if the Township gets funding. He stated that there is no big mystery here, the zoning ordinance for the corridor is good, maybe with a few improvements. He stated that it could be a little more developer friendly with a vision. He stated that this is all great to do. He stated that a key element is having a list of funding sources and a plan is needed to implement the infrastructure. He stated that he has not heard this in the plan.

Supervisor Trout stated that the implementation can be broken into transportation funds, enhancement funds, environmental funds, etc. He stated that the background for the grant application should be right in the plan.

Clerk Moreau stated that in the last line under funding and investment, perhaps something needs to be added to clarify that this is being done.

Commissioner Aiello stated that he does not like that it is listed as the last item, and that it is listed as ongoing. It makes it sound like it is not a deliverable.

Clerk Moreau stated that the plan is not ongoing; the effort of going after the funds is ongoing.

Commissioner Aiello stated that there should be a deliverable date whereby Carlisle Wortman has assisted us to identify these funding sources. He stated that this does not mean approved grants, but that this is where you go, these are the criteria, and this is what they are going to be looking for. He stated that he is looking for a checklist of funding sources that Carlisle Wortman feel are valuable and also that this plan has been designed with the idea of being bold on the sustainability and environmental piece. He stated that this plan maybe should be designed with that in mind so that when the Township approaches the county for funds, it is bold, creative and interesting. He stated that he does not want the Township to spend money to spin their wheels. He stated that he wants this to be a step forward.

Commissioner Steckling asked Commissioners for any other comments or changes other than what is proposed. He stated that the Commission will proceed with the proposal.

New Business:

1. Section 18.07.4.b. – Site Plan Review Procedures

Commissioner Hines made a motion to recommend to the Township Board this amendment to Section 18.07.4b. be adopted as prepared by Carlisle Wortman. Supported by Commissioner Leddy. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Wilson and Hines. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion carried.

2. 2010 Business Meeting Dates Approval

Commissioner Aiello makes a motion to approve the 2010 Business Meeting Dates as presented. Seconded by Willson. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Wilson and Hines. Nays: None. Absent: Baker. Motion carried.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List.

Supervisor Trout stated he and Mr. Oppmann are still working on administrative amendments and the adult foster care item. He stated that the soil erosion sedimentary control went to the Township Board for discussion last month and they presented questions about fees, and who would be doing it. He stated that is a lengthy ordinance that is still being reviewed. He stated that he believes that there is some opportunity for the Township to make some money and to provide better service. He stated that when dealing with the County, residents are being asked to renew in the middle of winter and there are problems to which we cannot make any adjustments. He stated that we are working on it. He stated that the Township Board also approved moving forward on a codification process for our ordinances and stated that this is exciting for what this might mean for usefulness and how this tool can be used by the residents to access the ordinances and do key word searches.

Commissioner Aiello asked for explanation of the change.

Clerk Moreau stated that the Township will go through the process of codifying the ordinances through the services of Municipal Code Corporation. She stated that they will put all of the ordinances together; they do a complete legal review which our attorney and our Planning Consultants would be involved in. She stated that this would include our Zoning Ordinance. She stated that Dick Carlisle had expressed some concern in the way that this is being done and that he wanted to be involved in this process. She said that the Township Board has not said an absolute yes yet. She stated that a presentation is planned for the March Board meeting and once that is confirmed, she stated that she would encourage all of the

Planning Commission to attend. She stated that the ordinances would be arranged by key words, or areas so that if you were to look up signs, it would cross reference all areas, include Township Board requirements, etc. She stated that it would be user friendly with searches by alphabet letter and definable page numbers and sections to go to. She stated that it would change the way that the ordinances would be organized.

Commissioner Aiello questioned if there would be language changes.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he went through this process in Independence. He stated that when it was done in Independence, sections were shifted around, re-numbered, and the references redone. He stated that he did not like how it flowed because they tried to move things together with common themes and the Ordinance was changed.

Clerk Moreau stated that this was a re-codification for Independence Township. She stated that Springfield Township has never gone through the process and she stated that the legal review process alone is necessary. She stated that all of the citations would be put in. She stated that she was glad that she spoke to Dick Carlisle and he advised her to be careful and she assured him that he would be involved in the process. She stated that every time there is an amendment, there is a cost to add it to the codified Ordinance. She stated that any resident can do searches through the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Oppmann stated that it will put the entire Township set of Ordinances in one book which sometimes is beneficial from a Zoning perspective.

Supervisor Trout stated that regarding Safety Paths, that next month the Commission should look at the plan, maybe look at a map and talk about it in more detail. He suggested prioritizing our plan, he stated that the Commission should focus in on where they want to start and then go from there. He stated that the studies are ongoing. He stated that if the Commission wants anything added, including the signs. He stated that a changeable sign is something to look at; this would be something that would address many needs.

Commissioner Steckling stated that he believes that the changeable sign would address many needs.

Supervisor Trout stated that these changeable signs would allow businesses to advertise the secondary activities going on to the primary business.

Clerk Moreau questioned if anything had been heard from the downtown Davisburg business owners.

Supervisor Trout stated that he has not heard anything from Mr. Strelchuk. He stated that some other things have taken a priority.

Commissioner Aiello stated that the Election of Officers should be on next month's agenda to be in compliance with the by-laws.

Public Comment:

Alice Spurgeon, 13137 Andersonville Road, Davisburg, MI 48350. She stated that she worked at a car dealership for over 12 years. She stated that the banners that the dealership displays come from the dealership corporation and these are received for every holiday. She stated that if the Commission cuts 30 days or 60 day, this is cutting out a lot of their business. She stated that they get these right from the corporation as advertisement. She stated that the cars on the lots are normal and should be considered part of the business. She stated that 90 days is fair, one quarter of your business year.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Steckling moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.