

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes November 16, 2009**

Call to Order: Chair John Steckling called the November 16, 2009 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
Dean Baker
Roger Lamont
Bill Leddy
John Steckling
Neil Willson
Ruth Ann Hines

Commissioners Absent:

None

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the Agenda as presented. Vote on the motion: Ayes Aiello, Baker, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Willson and Hines. Nays: None. Motion Carried.

Public Comment: None.

Consent Agenda:

Consent Agenda: Minutes of the October 19th meeting minutes changes as referenced by Dean Baker: 8th page, 2nd line- “come form” changed to “come from”, 10th page-comment by “Commissioner Vallad” changed to “Trustee Vallad”, 11th page-change Grant Ward’s statement “his system works” changed to “his septic system works.” Commissioner Lamont moved to approve the Minutes of October 19th with Commissioner Baker’s comments/corrections. Support by Commissioner Hines. Vote on the motion: Ayes: Aiello, Baker, Lamont, Leddy, Steckling, Willson and Hines. Nays: None. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None.

Old Business:

1. Revisions to CIP.

Mike Trout stated that he wants to revise the document by our next meeting. All Commissioners have a copy of the current CIP in their packet. The current CIP contains several wording changes and some reduction in project costs, particularly in the Dixie Corridor improvements. The infrastructure and those types of improvements will focus more on things that we are able to obtain grants for and other types of improvements. Supervisor Trout stated he does not want to keep repeating one million dollars a year needed for Dixie Corridor. This is not realistic. Supervisor Trout stated that he included the Dixie Corridor for next year. He left it as a capital improvement, but not an ongoing type of project. He stated that our focus would get more into the sewer and water type of issues. Supervisor Trout stated that this is one of the changes that he made under infrastructure, speaking about the sewer and water issues. He stated that this is where the bulk of our energy is going to go. Supervisor Trout stated that this project will evolve as more items are discussed. He stated that he also included pathways in the parks line which he believes needs to be one of our highest priorities. He stated that he included that and he stated that this has a good placeholder value. He stated that he also adjusted the vehicle information. Supervisor Trout said that the CIP has evolved to the current copy, although he is still looking at energy conversion systems, recycling, and other types of green technology that will probably become more defined as we go into the next couple of years. Supervisor Trout stated that the Capital Improvement Plan is a seven page document that presents what our priorities are. Supervisor Trout stated that when the discussion takes place about our planning effort, some of that information needs to be included. Supervisor Trout stated that this should be updated every year to show what progress we are making and to define our commitments.

Commissioner Steckling asks for questions. No questions were presented by the Commission.

2. Temporary Sign Permit Discussion.

Planner Brian Oppmann stated that the last discussion (October 16, 2009) indicated that the sizes and length of time need to be decreased from the sample given at the last meeting. Brian Oppmann stated that he decreased the time allotment to 30 days in a full year. He also stated that the model presented to the Commissioners in their packet gave a size of 4 square feet per side in a residential area and 16 square feet in a commercial area, basically a four feet by four feet sign. Mr. Oppmann also stated that the restricted banner size would be 25 square feet, typically they are 4 feet by 8 feet. Mr. Oppmann presented the current model ordinance and asked Commissioners for their comments. He also stated that having a temporary sign permit process would make it easier for enforcement purposes, as well as being able to collect fees.

Commissioner Hines questioned who “the director” is as presented throughout the model.

Brian Oppmann stated that “the director” would be Supervisor Trout. He also stated that in the temporary sign section, the intent is for everything to go through the building department. He stated that we are trying to change that process in the Township so that more things start in the building department and then the next steps take place, such as ZBA.

Supervisor Trout stated that he is the Planning and Zoning Director.

Brian Oppmann stated that he thought there was an amendment that was added last year that would change everything to Township as a broad definition.

Commissioner Lamont stated that there were some ordinances that were looked at or passed that the Township was responsible, or some wording like this. Commissioner Lamont suggested that Brian Oppmann look into this item further to see which one is more appropriate. He suggested that we should look into this to see which language would be defensible in court.

Commissioner Aiello agreed.

Commissioner Steckling suggested a generic amendment so that we would not have to go through every section and modify each section individually. Several commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Hines referenced #3 on the second page of the temporary sign permit. She stated that it says “temporary signs shall remain in place no longer than a period of 30 days in a calendar year.” And then, if an organization holds a number of events throughout the calendar year such as an event not later than 40 days prior to the event. So, if Dixie Baptist Church, for instance, puts up a sign for vacation bible school, she asked how long can they have a sign up at one period of time and how many signs can they have under this temporary sign permit? Commissioner Hines asked for clarification.

Planner Brian Oppmann stated that this is phrased as more of an annual permit process so that if a business comes in next year and applies for a sign permit and following the law, it is up for 30 days, or twice for 15 days would also be permitted. If the same business comes back to the Township in 2011 and applies for a sign permit, this information would be checked to make sure that all events are listed at least 14 days prior to the event. The business is checked to make sure that there are no violations written and the Township can then decide to grant a permit.

Commissioner Hines clarified that it could be 1 sign, 1 day times 30.

Planner Brian Oppmann stated that if the business has regular occurring events, it is to give the Township a listing of all events with dates, this way the Township can enforce it.

Commissioner Hines stated that the Renaissance Festival which can advertise, for example, can have a sign for 30 days, prior to or during the event and that this is the only time that they get to advertise for the whole year.

Commissioner Aiello stated that this sign language is unclear at this time and that the language needs to be tightened up. He stated that the language in #3 needs to be changed to make it clear that a user can only have a temporary sign for 30 days out of the year, whether that be 30 one-day signs, or whether that be one 30-day sign, that would be all that the business is entitled to. It would be a cumulative 30 days. Commissioner Aiello stated that if this is not the intent, more discussion is needed. If this is the intent, it needs to be clearer. Commissioner Aiello also referenced the annual permit section #5. He stated that it is necessary to say that group approval is possible, but all the other provisions of the ordinance still apply, for example the 30 day restriction still applies, as well as the area provision still applies. He stated that he does not believe that this is clear.

Supervisor Trout questioned the presence of the temporary sign by Divine Mercy that is placed out every week. He stated that the placement seems fine in the manner in which it is placed. He questioned when it is placed, Friday or Saturday. He suggested using the fee schedule to discourage anyone in town having an annual permit. He suggested that a business having a weekly event could have an annual temporary sign permit that is in conjunction with the schedule of your event.

Clerk Moreau suggested distinguishing between profit and non-profit organizations.

Commissioner Lamont stated that Bordines has a sign with replaceable letters instead of LED. He stated that they can change their wording and they do frequently as part of their approved sign. He suggested that there should be something in the ordinance that would enable a business, or a non-profit organization, to get their message out on a regular, routine basis. He stated that in most cases this would be a part of their permanent sign and separate from temporary. He stated that Dixie Auto has “junk cars wanted” signs, as well as “we buy autos” signs which are represented on 3 or 4 different signs, all of which are nonconforming. He stated that businesses do need a way to get their message out. He stated that this is no different than the gas price sign on Kroger gas; they get their message out with their price everyday as part of their sign. He suggested that a provision should be in the temporary sign ordinance to take care of places like Divine Mercy, or a church that has vacation bible school, and would 30 days be sufficient. He stated that Divine Mercy is putting out a temporary sign 3 days out of the week, which is 150 days a year.

Commissioner Frank Aiello stated that if it was 14 days per sign, with the posting of any temporary signs on the property not to exceed more than 60 days per calendar year or something like that. He suggested having both a per sign limitation and then a total days per year limitation.

Clerk Laura Moreau asked if this would clarify consecutive days.

Commissioner Frank Aiello stated that he did not clarify, but it probably should.

Commissioners agreed that they are speaking about #3 in the model ordinance.

Commissioner Steckling asked if there are any further questions.

Commissioner Aiello stated that there is a differentiation presented between commercial areas and residential areas. He suggested replacing the “ands” in these spots to “ors”. He stated that a temporary sign should have a maximum height of 4 feet in residential areas or 6 feet in commercial areas.

Commissioner Steckling stated that when the model says from the natural grade to the base of the sign. He asked if this means to the top of the sign.

Brian Oppmann states that this is to the top of the sign.

Commissioner Aiello suggested that in C.1 the model stated that the temporary sign shall have a maximum height of 4 feet in residential areas, or 6 feet in commercial areas. On item #3, he suggested wording like, except as otherwise provided in this ordinance, each temporary sign shall remain in place no more than 14 consecutive days with the posting of any temporary sign on the property not to exceed more than 60 days per calendar year.

Commissioner Lamont stated that this would allow a business such as Bordines to have 4 separate sales per year for 2 weeks each.

Commissioner Leddy stated that in paragraph #5, the model stated that events shall not be interpreted to mean sale.

Brian Oppmann stated that this was intended for events such as vacation bible school, or a business that has a number of events. The business should provide a listing to the Township of all of these events so that the Township can determine which 3 or 4 the business can have temporary signage for. He stated that a business does not have to come in and pull separate permits, the business only has to come in once.

Commissioner Leddy questioned if a business could put signage on other property.

Commissioner Steckling stated that a business could put signage on other property with permission, except the right-of-way. He stated that the right-of-way is greatly different in different areas of the Township. He stated that it takes up ½ of his front yard in front of his business. He stated that the differentiation of right-of-way is a separate discussion.

Commissioner Baker questioned whether or not sign placement would be part of the process for a business requesting a sign permit. He stated that the Township should administratively review the right-of-way to make sure that the sign is out of the right-of-way. He stated that certain administrative capabilities were granted to the officer without

necessarily going to zoning approval. This would allow the officer to make some administrative interpretation.

Commissioner Aiello stated that this was limited to site plan approval.

Commissioners agree that this is limited to site plan approval.

Commissioner Baker stated that the Township should be able to inform the individual what restrictions they had and the administrator should have some discretion to grant signage with proper restrictions.

Commissioner Hines stated that the Road Commission would have people contacting them to put a sign out.

Commissioner Baker stated that he did not think about the Road Commission playing a role.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this requirement is not clear. He stated that limitations are needed for safety reasons.

Commissioner Leddy stated that we put banners across the street in Downtown Davisburg which are in the right-of-way. He stated that we would not want to pass a regular ruling that would keep those from going into effect.

Supervisor Trout stated that as part of the permit application, we can require the applicant to submit a sketch to show where the sign would be and what it would look like.

Commissioner Hines stated if Supervisor Trout would approve something in the road right-of-way.

Supervisor Trout stated that we would not approve anything in the right-of-way.

Commissioner Steckling asked if there were any other comments. He stated that we need to focus on key elements: size, length of time and conditions for length of time, and whether we discriminate for church, or similar non-profit, as opposed to a business. He stated that all of these elements have been touched on; he suggested that they need to be focused in on more to give Brian Oppmann some possible changes. He stated that the Commissioners seem to be comfortable with the sizes stated in the model. The only other variation he noted was if there were size variation, this could be dependent on the purpose. He stated that this could be over-complicated. He stated that the length of time is probably the biggest point of contention. He stated that Clerk Moreau's example of the church and the Hosler Dealership are examples of banners and signs that might be allowed. He stated that it is a balance between giving each organization a fair chance at business versus their perceived visual pollution. He suggested Commissioner Aiello's suggestion was good for language.

Commissioner Lamont asked Clerk Moreau why the sign for Divine Mercy was a temporary instead of a permanent sign.

Clerk Moreau stated that they do not have a church building, but services are held in the elementary school on the weekend. She stated that this would be under #5, they would apply for an annual permit.

Commissioner Hines stated that this is providing that such organization has been in compliance with the provisions of this ordinance which does provide a timeframe.

Supervisor Trout stated that maybe there should be some discretion in the annual permits based on the request. He suggested that perhaps annual permits come back to the Township.

Commissioner Steckling stated that if you give it to one person, then you have to give it to everyone. He suggested that the Township have rules that could be administratively handled.

Commissioner Baker mentioned Divine Mercy and Dixie Baptist are organizations that have signs out for vacation bible school and school enrollment, guest speakers, fundraising events, charity work. He suggested having provisions for the non-profits. He suggested that the Commission may need to count the non-profit groups in a different fashion and then give that discretion to the administrator. The size and placement still need to be set. He suggested that the non-profit organizations be treated differently from Renaissance Festival, etc.

Supervisor Trout stated that the organization should need to explain why they cannot apply for or have a normal sign. They should need to make a case for having a temporary sign instead of a permanent sign.

Commissioner Aiello stated that a clear definition of good case and bad case needs to be determined.

Commissioner Hines stated that to a business owner, advertising is critical, just as it is for a church concert.

Supervisor Trout questioned Brian Oppmann about the Independence Township sign ordinance.

Brian Oppmann stated that Independence just modified their sign ordinance to give some flexibility on Dixie Highway. They had a 14 or 15 day timeframe.

Commissioner Lamont questioned the maximum time allowed per year.

Brian Oppmann stated that there is not a maximum time allowed per year in Independence Township. Every 2 weeks a business owner needs to come in for approval and to pay a new sign fee.

Commissioner Steckling asked Brian Oppmann if he represents White Lake Township. He states that a church on M-59 next to Home Depot and Walmart has an electronic sign with a scrolling feature. He questions whether we should consider it because having this feature available to businesses would eliminate the need for a lot of temporary signs for businesses if they could go to something that was more upgraded and would allow them to change the message and put specials on. He stated that this would possibly eliminate the banners and the other types of signage.

Brian Oppmann stated that the option is to look at some LED language for a changeable copy type sign or electronic sign and not do anything with temporary signs if the desire is to eliminate temporary signage and force people to do changeable copy.

Commissioner Steckling suggested that the Township should do both. This is similar to taking the Bordines sign and doing it electronically. He stated that there is still a need for event signage such as Renaissance Festival and other annual events. He stated that the electronic signage is another idea to alter the landscape. He stated that length of time is still an issue, whether it is an overall cumulative length under the #5 annual provision. Also, under #3 or, as Brian Oppmann has suggested, as Independence Township has done, put it on a per exposure item and have an unlimited number of those. He stated that there are two ways to solve the problem.

Commissioner Aiello stated that a total maximum number is preferable. He stated that otherwise someone can manipulate the ordinance to always have a temporary sign. He stated that the goal is to make temporary signs temporary.

Commissioners discussed the definition of temporary and how temporary signs could defeat the purpose of the regular sign ordinance if they are not controlled.

Supervisor Mike Trout stated that 100 days is an acceptable period of time per year. He stated that the Commission should suggest a schedule, perhaps in table form.

Commissioner Baker stated that Divine Mercy is a unique thing because they do not have a structure. They cannot put a sign on the Davisburg Elementary property and have it be a fixed sign. They have an event, such as a farmer's market is an event. A building is not constructed for this event. He suggested that an oil change business was permitted; a certain number of square feet was allotted when the building was built. This type of temporary sign would be in a different category than Divine Mercy, or a farmer's market.

Commissioner Steckling suggested that this information be sent to Brian Oppmann and he will use this input to improve the initial proposed ordinance language.

Supervisor Trout stated that any comments or suggestions can be sent to him and it will be worked on further.

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

Commissioner Steckling stated that this was set for public hearing and based on ongoing conversation; it has been changed by Brian Oppmann. He stated that according to Commissioner Aiello's request, the state's sample of Wind Energy was provided by Brian Oppmann to the Commissioners. He stated that there are a couple of options. The Commission can discuss it during this meeting, or conduct an in depth discussion after the public hearing is held.

Brian Oppmann stated that the migratory birds and avian study was discussed. On page five, he stated that the language is loosened by stating "a study" instead of "an avian study". He also added to the end, "bats and any other species." He stated that this opens up the ordinance to include other things, including all types of wildlife. He stated that he also provided the sample ordinance at Commissioner Aiello's request. He stated that there is a lot of text contained in this document. He stated that if there are items contained in the sample that should be included, now is the time to discuss them.

Commissioner Hines stated that there were a lot of definitions included in the sample.

Commissioner Steckling asked the other Commissioners if they wanted to discuss the ordinance.

Clerk Laura Moreau stated that it could be set for public hearing for December, but it was optional.

All Commissioners agreed that they will take time to read the sample, and decide if any other concepts or ideas should be integrated and wait for the public hearing.

Commissioner Hines asked Brian Oppmann if there were items in the sample that he feels should be included in the Springfield Township ordinance.

Brian Oppmann stated that his office developed a model ordinance that was similar to the State's after talking to energy experts. He stated that there are some things in the model language that gives provisions for a temporary structure. He stated that a temporary structure can be set on a trailer to gather wind speed information. However, it is hard to set a time frame for this temporary structure because energy experts agree that this temporary structure should be up all year to gain adequate knowledge about the wind patterns. He stated that the Commission may want to consider temporary structures. He stated that there is a type of tower that is primarily a utility tower. He stated that this type of tower probably will not be seen in the Township. He suggested that maybe the language should be changed to include a utility grid system.

Commissioner Lamont noted that the state model included size over a certain kilowatt became commercial. He suggested that there has been some research to come up with the numbers.

Commissioner Aiello requested that the Commissioners be sent electronic copies of the documents so if they have thoughts or language, it can be changed. He stated that he wanted the document as a Word document.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the ordinance has only included towers which do not include the roof top systems. He suggested that this should be looked into.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this ordinance was a work in progress and the language would change as the technology changed.

Brian Oppmann stated that the roof top system was not recommended when it first came out. The systems that were attached to a chimney or structure were not recommended, but since costs have escalated for the systems, people are reverting back to rooftop systems. He stated that these were more economical and that these should perhaps be considered. He stated that there are new structures which are cylindrical/spherical-looking shapes which are built in Michigan.

Commissioner Lamont stated that he read about a new system that could generate a return on an investment at 2 mile per hour average wind speed.

Commissioner Steckling stated that this discussion was deferred until next meeting where the issues will be brought up again and the public hearing will be held.

New Business:

1. Dixie corridor study update-discussion.

Supervisor Trout stated that all Commissioners should have received Dick Carlisle's memo regarding the joint meeting. He stated that the Commissioners could go through the elements of the scope of the proposal and refine, change, and agree on the proposal language that the Commission would be comfortable asking the Township Board for. He stated that he was very encouraged by the meeting that was held, and he thanked everyone for coming. He suggested that the Commission come up with a long-term goal of the study. He suggested a development manual, set of instructions for potential developers and the Commission's idea of the corridor improvements that should be done. He stated that the Commission should be clear on a proposal and what was required of Carlisle.

Commissioner Aiello asked if the Township has thought about any other planning consultants for this project and would there be an advantage to doing this, perhaps gaining a different perspective. If this were done, would there be a greater degree of cost

that makes it not worthwhile. He stated that this was a distinct project and he suggested that it might be an interesting time to get a different perspective. He stated that if Carlisle & Wortman were used for financial reasons, he totally agreed.

Supervisor Trout stated that no, the Township has not thought about using other planning consultants. He stated that he does see some value of additional input, but he believes that Carlisle is best suited for this project given their historical knowledge and the work that they are doing in Independence Township which is relevant to Springfield Township. He stated that efforts have been made to involve the County and they could have someone that is better suited to a particular element of this, possibly the wastewater elements that could add value. He stated that it is always a good idea to have a different perspective.

Brian Oppmann stated that this is a similar work plan to the Dixie Highway study being done in Independence Township currently. He stated that a sub-consultant was used, a local landscape architect in Clarkston that did the drawings. He stated that three properties were selected and 3-D images were created. He stated that these three properties were selected to show redevelopment or possible reinvestment. He stated that they would use this sub-consultant again for this same exercise because it worked well.

Commissioner Aiello stated that the visioning of the planning was very important, but the other piece that needs help is the financing strategies, funding, and matching funds. He wondered if we have a strategic plan for getting funds and do we have the expertise to get that funding. How do we set ourselves up for the matching funds? He stated that he does not know if that piece is included, maybe that is a different consultant, or different effort. He stated when looking at the project obstacles, part of it is having a unified vision, but where the money comes from is the bigger part of it.

Clerk Moreau stated that she completely agrees with that and explained that this is why she and Supervisor Trout have been talking to the County, Water Resource Commission and Oakland County Planning to gain their support.

Brian Oppmann stated that Hubbell, Roth & Clark could be helpful as well. They have the engineering contacts and are able to help in that effort. He also stated that the County has a grant writer which could be helpful. The grant writer works in PEDS-Planning and Economic Development which the Township might want to check into for assistance or offer services. He stated that once a design plan is done and you figure out where you want to go, then implementation is next.

Commissioner Aiello stated that at the end of the process, it would be great to have a 5-year and 10-year development plan; in a year, to have the design done. Three years from now, secure so much grant funding, or have tried to secure grant funding and have set aside funds in the budget. He states that this dovetails with the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan. What is the funding required and where it is going to come from. He questioned whether or not it is realistic. He stated that this is the level of granular detail that the Commission needs to get to.

Supervisor Trout stated that the meeting with the County is on November 24th and that this meeting is key. He stated that the suggestion about creating the utility district was clear and valuable. He stated that this project possibly should be phased and that the Commission should formulate the study that's going to take place.

Commissioner Hines questioned if the meeting on November 24th was with the Water Resource Commission.

Supervisor Trout replied yes. He stated that Commissioner Steckling should be involved if he was available.

Commissioner Steckling stated that he wanted to be present at the meeting.

Supervisor Trout stated that now was the time for all of the Commissioners to look at the Dixie Corridor study for additions, changes, and deletions.

Commissioner Baker questioned if there was an attempt to try to capture any other infrastructure needs such as sewer in this process. He stated if future uses are being determined, he wondered how the utilities are going to be managed for those uses.

Brian Oppmann stated that any kind of waste water system is going to have to be considered through the design concepts. The attempt behind showing a potential design concept for sections of the corridor and specific properties is to give developers what the Township envisions for this corridor and what kind of development they are looking for. In any kind of design concept, you have to plan for wastewater.

Commissioner Aiello stated that part of the product by CWA will be the requirements that need to be met.

Brian Oppmann stated that this is the idea behind a design plan.

Commissioner Baker stated that he did not see the mention of a sewer in the plan. In the plan, the corridor was gone through with the various parcels identified and zoning for each. The optional structures that would be possible were also identified. He stated that he wanted the connection identified between what was on the surface, the building and the architecture and the land use, but also all of the facilities that are necessary to support whatever is proposed. He stated that he did not see it called out.

Commissioner Steckling questioned whether the item that says, "prepare for design workshop at the Township Board and Planning Commission" is for the joint meeting that was already held. This is the fourth item down. He stated whether the \$2,500.00 that Dick Carlisle is asking for is including this workshop and the summary of the results.

Brian Oppmann stated that Dick Carlisle was taking that \$2,500.00 and allocating that towards the workshop and was proposing \$7,000.00 to finish the job.

Clerk Moreau stated that there was more than just the workshop included in the \$2,500.00 fee.

Brian Oppmann stated that there was work done on other components of the plan.

Commissioner Steckling stated that he expected some conclusions and recommendations. He questioned whether the focus was going to be general, or was it going to hone in on specifics. He questioned if the Commission wanted to direct it in one way or another, such as focus on these particular items.

Brian Oppmann stated that he and Dick Carlisle have not talked about where it is going. He has not talked to him much about it since the workshop. He stated that at the workshop there were some clear themes that came out of it, maybe through the visual preferences survey that was done. He stated that there were some pretty conclusive themes that were agreed on. He also stated that through the discussions, especially the small group sessions, many ideas were generated. The next step is to take this information and formulate it into some kind of implementation and recommendations. He stated that there needs to be more input from the Planning Commission. He stated that he does not know the exact direction that Dick Carlisle is going, but he is aware of the process because he is doing the same thing presently for Independence Township.

Commissioner Hines questioned the next step.

Brian Oppmann stated that the next step would be talking about design concepts for the corridor, using the Redico property for example. Key property uses need to be identified such as outdoor gathering spaces and outdoor entertainment, for example.

Commissioner Hines questioned if they would use four different properties.

Brian Oppmann stated that the particular parcels would need to be identified through background information, zoning and land use, property lines, and property sizes. Some of the background work needs to be finished then go into the design phase.

Commissioner Aiello stated if it would be inappropriate for the Commission to see a similar type of work product that Brian Oppmann has done in another context. He wondered if it would be possible to see the draft Independence Township plan right now and see what the Commission would be paying for.

Brian Oppmann stated that the project is modeled after the D19 plan, which could be emailed. He stated that the layout is very similar.

Commissioner Aiello stated that, if provided, the Commission would have a sense of what this scope would provide and if that is what Springfield Township is looking for.

Supervisor Trout stated that this plan could be sent out.

Commissioner Lamont questioned if what is proposed is primarily based on architectural design and expectations, or is it a combination of architectural design expectations and how this would blend into our infrastructure needs as well as the infrastructure feasibility. He suggested that there are limitations, such as water, storm sewer, as well as sanitary sewer. He questioned whether a whole package is what they are looking for, or just architectural design and expectations by parcel or by area.

Brian Oppmann stated that in Springfield Township, by knowing the limitations, you must consider the utility issues.

Commissioner Lamont questioned if the study would blend all of that in.

Brian Oppmann stated that it has to.

Commissioner Lamont questioned whether the ultimate goal is for the Township to try to create zoning that would enable this to happen.

Brian Oppmann stated that a major implementation of this would be looking at the overlay district as it is written and modifying it so that you can see the vision happen; working out flexible zoning standards is the most important component.

Clerk Moreau questioned whether the Planning Commission and the Township Board have an interest to look at some sort of utility district for water, wastewater and stormwater. She noted that we must determine what the utility options are before a vision plan can be created. The purpose of the joint meeting was to determine if the Planning Commission and Board had similar goals for the corridor so that we could provide direction to our planners. But if our goals require sewer or a wastewater system, we need to know our options before we get too far along in the visioning process. For example, we need to know if connecting to the interceptor is an option or not.

Brian Oppmann stated that the problem with connecting to the interceptor is that every community needs to sign off in order to tap into that interceptor.

Commissioner Lamont stated that the Township has not tried, no communication has been started. He stated that economic times are ripe for the Township to try it. He stated that the Township first needs to decide if that is what they want to do. He stated that there are no new demands on the sanitary sewers for the Detroit water supply right now.

Commissioners discuss that beginning this communication would be important.

Commissioner Hines questioned who would need to be contacted first.

Brian Oppmann stated that Mr. McCulloch's office would know.

Supervisor Trout stated that the Commission has to have an idea of what they want to do so that they can identify the limitations on a parcel by parcel basis. There will be options identified by investigation, and there will be costs associated with these obstacles on each parcel, depending on what is built. He suggested that these items go hand in hand.

Commissioner Lamont stated that when Oakland County wanted to tap into the sewer interceptor for Bavarian Village, it happened without question or problem and there was room because the only option was to renew a wastewater treatment plant. It was more expensive to renew than to tap in. He stated that if the Township had a utility district with defined lines and came with a proposal that was limited in scope, he stated that the odds of the Township getting it would be good.

Brian Oppmann stated that this is the same methodology that was used to connect Holly Township to Genesee County's system. He stated that there were two defined areas and one was coming out of the village, and one was up in the northeast corner along Dixie Highway and Genesee County approved a certain number of units in a Township agreement. It started by being on a future land use map.

Commissioner Steckling questioned what to do with Dick Carlisle's letter.

Supervisor Trout stated that after hearing the comments, after the meeting, he would work with Brian, Dick and Laura to come up with a revised item and a Phase II. He stated that he would come up with another proposal by the next meeting.

Commissioner Steckling agreed.

Commissioner Hines asked if it would include setting up a utility district on Dixie Highway.

Brian Oppmann agreed that this was part of the implementation of this plan to set up a district. He agreed that this was one of the implementation steps.

Supervisor Trout agreed. He stated that a model would be provided of a similar project that was done somewhere else and that the next step could be reached.

All Commissioners agreed.

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List.

Supervisor Trout stated that we do not have one this month, but that everything is done.

Clerk Moreau stated that the Site Plan Review will be set for December.

Public Comment:

Alice Spurgeon, 13137 Andersonville Road, stated that she wanted to speak about the business signs and timelines. She does not have a business in town, but she has had two businesses, one in Waterford and one in Holly. She stated that there are many obstacles to getting a sign including the permits and paperwork.. She stated that the timelines for signs do not encourage business in town. She stated that growth should be encouraged in Davisburg. She stated that if a new business owner finds out that they cannot put up a sign for more than 60 days per year, they are not going to be interested, not with the economy the way that it is. She stated that she does not feel that it is right to separate the Renaissance Festival, it is a money making event. She stated that this is not right to the business owners in town that they have to pay fees and be limited to 60 days a year. She stated that this is damaging business. She stated that flexibility is needed to grow the town and the Township, especially in the number of days. She stated that it is hard enough to get the permits. She stated 60 days is too limiting and that the timeline needs to be looked at by the Board. They must be fair to the business owners, if they are going to be fair to the churches and the 4-H fair with all year events. If they get by with it, it is not fair to the business people in town. She stated that the Dixie businesses could be de-cluttered for signage, and size of signs. She stated that sixty days is not enough per year to have advertising.

Adjournment:

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

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary