

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission – Business Meeting  
Minutes December 20, 2010

Call to Order: Chairman Commissioner Steckling called the December 20, 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:

Ruth Ann Hines  
Bill Leddy  
John Steckling  
Beverly Shaver  
Neil Willson

Commissioners Absent:

Dean Baker  
Roger Lamont

Staff Present

Mike Trout, Supervisor  
Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer

Consultants Present

Brian Oppmann, Planner  
Randy Ford, Engineer

Approval of Agenda: Approved with change.

**Chairman Steckling moved to approve the agenda with one change: Move Old Business item #1 to New Business #3. Support by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

Public Comment: None.

Consent Agenda: Minutes of the November 15, 2010 meeting.

**Commissioner Shaver moved to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2010 meeting as presented. Support by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing: None.

Old Business:

**1. The River-Conceptual Site Plan and Special Use Plan.**

Chairperson Steckling stated that all Commissioners had received a letter from Mr. Oppmann stating that they had no further information from The River Church, nor had an application been filed.

Supervisor Trout stated that The River organization came to him and asked him to look at the plan for preliminary review and he wanted to get the Commission's feedback before they went through the concept review process. He stated that it would benefit the applicant and the township in the long run if the Commission reviewed what they were proposing and the Commission provided direction. The applicant would then move forward to submitting the conceptual site plan for review.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the Commission would proceed on this basis and the Commission would focus strictly on the concept plan and not get into the special use issue.

Mike Powell, Civil Engineer and designer for the River site, thanked the Planning Commission. He stated that there are two issues that the church would like some input on; he understands that they would like to hold on the special use, but he would like to have feedback on it. He stated before they submit a full blown site plan that requires full engineering work including storm water calculations, etc. he wanted to make sure that they were on the right path and any suggestions that the Planning Commission could make would be beneficial. He stated even slight changes in parking, etc. change significantly the storm water calculations, etc. He presented two drawings and pointed out the conceptual site plan that eventually they would like to submit for site plan review. He reiterated the existing building that is being used for the church which is the building in front that used to be the showroom for the House of Denmark with an access drive off of East Holly Road. He pointed out the existing parking area, indicated as a gray shaded area. He stated that this was on the approved original site plan. He stated that they are holding 3 services in the front building: 450 people at the 10:30 am service, 200-250 people at the 9:00 am service and 150 people at the 7:00 pm service. This timing gives them enough time to allow traffic to come and go so the existing parking area is not overloaded. He stated that there are also Sunday school rooms, youth activities and evening activities during the week including W.O.W. (Women of the Word), etc. He stated that the Township also gave the church permission to use the 7,000 square foot office area in the larger rear building. He stated that this is only used for offices: the secretaries, the youth pastors, and the other pastors are all there. Church business is run out of this section of the larger building. He stated that the rest of the big building used to be the warehouse for the House of Denmark and had pallets and full storage shelves from floor to ceiling approximately 25-30 feet up. He stated that the church has now removed the racks out of the building and the inside is now being cleaned up and the intent

is to leave it as a big, open area. The conceptual site plan is for this whole rest of the building to eventually be the church sanctuary, Sunday school rooms, a café for Sunday coffee ministry, and other church related activities. He stated that this is part of a five year program. He stated that they expect to outgrow the current facility and they want to move all the church activities into this larger building. He stated that this will be utilizing some mezzanine areas, which will include all church activities except the current building will remain as the youth activity center. He stated that the main entry area would be in the center of the building and the church offices will remain where they are. He stated that there is a great deal of engineering to design the parking areas for this final location. He pointed out the existing parking that is really meant for about 600 places. He stated that there is only enough parking to operate at their current maximum load of 600 people. He stated that they have added additional parking which he pointed out on the plan. He pointed out the additional 60 acres that the church owns to the west and the division line that is between the two parcels. The two parcels are both owned by the River church, but have 2 different sidwell numbers. He stated that they are looking to combine these two parcels as part of the site plan. He stated in order to go to the next step; he would like to be aware of anything that the Planning Commission sees that would assist them. He stated that the new entrance coming off of East Holly Road would act as the main entrance and the existing entrance would be more of secondary access. He stated that stacking room at this entrance was limited. He pointed out an existing house that is being used for the H.I.M. (Hogs in Ministry), a motorcycle outreach group. He stated that they would like use this building for the H.I.M. headquarters; it is a 1600 square foot house that burned down about a year ago and they are about ready to finish the repairs inside. He stated that since most of the racks have been sold from the big building, they now have a large building that is heated. The fire department has been through it and it is fully fire protected. He stated that the tests need to be run, but since they do have a big building, they would like to be able to utilize it for youth activities right now. He stated that the church currently uses the College Street building in downtown Holly for some youth activities, but they would like to relocate them to this large building including indoor basketball courts, field hockey and an inside jogging track for the members. He stated no outside activities, or for hire sporting events will be held there. He stated that this is the special use they are asking for. He stated that they were hoping to use the building in January. He stated that they have a lot of work to do to bring it to site plan approval stage.

He stated that in all parking areas they are looking to use rain gardens to deal with the storm water issue. He stated they want to run the storm water off into the island areas and lower areas that are lined with stone bedding. He stated that it will be picked up by piping which will allow it to perk into the ground, be stored in the stone, and eventually, if necessary, outlet into an existing pond on the property. He pointed out the storm water management system on the diagram provided.

He stated as per the former site plan approval, there was landscaping that they needed to do and parking improvements that needed to be done. He stated that just before the weather turned bad, the paving was completed. He stated that all landscaping has been placed per the approved plan, except for the landscaping requirements in the parking areas that he pointed out on the diagram. He stated that it didn't make any sense for them to plant these trees and then get a conceptual site plan approval to have to remove all of the trees that they had put in. He stated that they wanted to jump to the next stage and submit a conceptual site plan to show their five year plan. He stated they are aware that they have to work with the Road Commission on acceleration and deceleration lanes. He stated that they are looking for the Commission's comments and if anything jumped out at them from an ordinance or a site plan standpoint.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Oppmann about the zoning for the parcels.

Mr. Oppmann confirmed that the zoning was C-2 for the parcel that currently holds the sanctuary building.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this creates an issue because the two parcels would have to be combined and the two different zoning categories would have to be resolved.

Mr. Oppmann stated that since the main portion is zoned C-2, the old warehouse used for indoor recreation is a permitted use. He stated that he is confused what the special use is for. He stated that the house is set up to be a gathering space right now. It is zoned residential and he is not sure how that would be utilized because it is zoned residential and it would be used for office space or assembly. He stated that the parcel may need to be rezoned.

Chairperson Steckling stated that church is a permitted use under the residential zoning according to our ordinance. It falls under the principal uses permitted subject to special conditions. He stated that this would require the special use procedure of our ordinance. He stated that the two properties will have to be combined, and the zoning issues resolved.

Commissioner Shaver stated that 1/3 of the area is in Groveland Township and she asked where the boundary line was located.

Mr. Powell showed on the drawing where the line separating Groveland Township was located. He stated that the complication is that whatever is done on the Groveland portion has to come through Springfield Township first. He stated that the Groveland property is hilly and it is being used now for bow and arrow practice and various outdoor activities that can utilize this hilly terrain. He stated that everything that is being proposed is on the Springfield Township side.

Commissioner Shaver asked if there was a mezzanine in the proposed recreation building now.

Mr. Powell stated yes and pointed out the mezzanine area on the diagram. He also pointed out the proposed Sunday school area and the area that is currently being used for offices.

Commissioner Shaver asked if the current septic was just servicing the warehouse.

Mr. Powell stated that the septic is servicing the warehouse, offices, and also the existing church building. He stated that during the site plan approval process, they worked with the Oakland County Health Department to enlarge the field to service the sanctuary area, warehouse, and offices. He stated any additional use would require the health department's blessing. He stated that the diversified time of the proposed new activities wouldn't overuse the field.

Commissioner Shaver asked about the existing pond shown on the diagram. She indicated that the introduction of more asphalt would cause more run off than in the past. She asked what it was going to do to the connecting parcel below.

Mr. Powell stated that they are going to use rain gardens to try to minimize the storm water runoff. The retention pond overflows into a storm water system that crosses the road and goes off to the side. He pointed out a naturally flowing area that goes to a pond that will raise up the flood stage. They will put in an outlet on the other side in which it will continue on its route to the southwest under a culvert and to the rest of the property on the site. He pointed out a 2 ½ acre parcel that is privately owned by an attorney in the Detroit area. He stated that they will have to get his permission to run storm water on the property since it is jointly owned.

Commissioner Leddy reiterated that he was going to ask if permission had been granted by the owner for the pond usage.

Mr. Powell stated that they have talked to the owner, but no agreements have been reached yet.

Commissioner Leddy asked if the storm water was going to run across the road, wouldn't they need the permission of that land owner.

Mr. Powell stated that they really didn't have to, the law is such that you cannot change the amount of runoff, or the rate that the run off flows on someone's property. This is the reason that they have detention ponds. He stated that the water that they see will not change from the water that they see now, the intensity cannot change.

Commissioner Hines asked if they intended to use the warehouse building for recreational use. She asked what the parking/paving implications were of using that currently. She asked if it could be used by utilizing the parking that they currently have.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he didn't know, because he has not had the time to do the calculations. He would guess that the demands wouldn't be as great.

Commissioner Hines asked if the paving and parking changes needed to take place before they could use this building for basketball in the evenings, etc.

Mr. Oppmann stated that he believes the original site plan had banked parking, and he doesn't know if the entire area was paved. This is the first that he has heard tonight that the paving was done because the building inspector was out there a few weeks ago and it was not done at that point. He stated that it must have gotten done right before the snow hit. He stated that the demands would be less.

Commissioner Hines asked what the Commission would be approving.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they would be approving the expansion of the parking area on the commercial piece and the use of indoor recreation. He stated that it was like a phase II project of a site plan, or amended site plan approval at this point.

Commissioner Hines asked if the work on the residential piece would be phase III.

Mr. Powell stated that it would probably end up being more phases than that. He stated that the parking calculations are on the special use diagram provided and they do not even come close to utilizing all of the parking areas after hours. They need approximately 100 spaces and they have 240 spaces. He stated that they are looking to use the existing parking for the recreational use of the large building. He asked if it was a permitted use in C-2, it would not need a special use, it would need an amended site plan approval to use it as an accessory use to the church.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this is what it seems like to him, just with the information provided. He stated that he would approach it as an amended site plan in front of the Planning Commission. He stated that church is permitted in C-2, so there are no issues with the extension of the special land use.

Commissioner Hines asked what they needed to do for an amended site plan.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they still have to meet the required landscaping requirements. If the intention is to pave the parking areas between the two buildings, then they need to provide updated storm water calculations for the

township Engineer. They must meet lighting standards, typical standards for a site plan review.

Commissioner Hines asked if they are not required to do any additional parking, what do they need to do for an amended site plan.

Mr. Oppmann stated there are still landscaping issues because they have not planted the trees required.

Mr. Powell stated that 90% of the trees had been planted. He stated that they would need to do an amended landscape plan in the areas where the future parking may be. They probably should move those trees around so they are not planting right where they will be paving. He stated that there will be an adjustment on the landscape plan showing what has been planted, what has not been planted and how this might be mitigated in the areas that will not be paved even in a conceptual plan.

Supervisor Trout stated that the landscaping was 90% done and the township has spoken to the church on the last things that need to be completed. He stated that he definitely wants those completed so they get final approval. He stated that he is glad the exact process is being outlined so that the River can see what they need to do and that they were on the right track. He stated that it seems like he can submit what he has now, and we can work with Brian to address the concerns that he has.

Mr. Powell stated that it now makes more sense to submit an amended site plan instead of a special use for the recreational use in the large building. They also need to submit a conceptual plan of what the dreams are of the property and the best ideas of phasing and scheduling for different phases.

Commissioner Leddy asked if they were doing anything on the residential piece.

Mr. Powell answered no; not even the entry way. He stated that the residential structure on the property is not really a home; it is used as an assembly area a couple of times a month to bring people together. If the church wants to utilize the 60 acres, it is a special use in a residentially zoned piece of property. He stated that he could use some guidance as to the best way to bring before the Planning Commission a special use for the little building on 60 acres.

Commissioner Shaver asked if this building was not used for H.I.M., would it ever be used for a parsonage or living quarters.

Mr. Powell stated that it is living quality, it has a kitchen, bedrooms, etc. He stated that parsonages are things of the past. Pastors don't want to live on site because they want to be able to take care of their families. He doesn't foresee it ever being used as a parsonage.

Commissioner Willson asked what they are being asked to approve.

Mr. Powell stated that the previous site plan given to the administration, in the Spring of 2008, the 60 acres was proposed to have a Sunday school and the main sanctuary, and various other amenities. Now that they own the old House of Denmark property, the dream has changed. He stated that they have a master plan that involves the 60 acres, but he wouldn't want to confuse the issues because it is so far away. He asked if the Commission would like to see all of the proposed amenities on the properties far out in the future. He asked if this would be confusing and if they should try to stay within the five year or ten year range.

Chairperson Steckling stated that they should stay with what they want to approve right now, today. He stated that the future is too speculative and ends up being conjecture. He stated to narrow it to the vision today and look to the ordinance to see what is allowed, keep it within this framework.

Mr. Powell asked Mr. Oppmann the best way to add parking on the residential piece.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they should start with the recreational use first, then tackle the residential piece and structure later. He stated that there are ways to overcome the two parcels, perhaps combining them, or shared parking areas. It is essentially one large zoning lot. He would like to focus on the warehouse now, and then the residential issue.

Mr. Powell stated that any construction won't be until the spring anyway. He stated that the members are expressing that the walk to the parking areas is too far. He stated that they will start the warehouse issue first, and then right after that they will address the parking issues to allow the people to come in and out more easily.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the parking lot shown on the diagram is huge. He stated that the general consensus is the less asphalt, the better. He is a believer in a more utilitarian layout rather than tree lines and boulevards. He would like to see the parking area smaller and banked, with a grassy area for overflow. He stated that they could probably make a long row of parking and skip all of the little rows, etc. and it would take up less land and accomplish the same things. He stated that it has to be done within the constraints of the ordinance. He stated that for projects in the past, the Commission has waived the requirements for islands and other obstructions in the parking lots because it unnecessarily expands the area of the parking lot.

Commissioner Hines concurred.

Mr. Powell stated that this is helpful. In the proposed conceptual site plan he will address the growing nature of the required parking areas.

Chairperson Steckling recommended that Mr. Powell talk with Randy Ford to eliminate a lot of changes. He stated that he is not sure how many spaces the current ordinance requires, but the Commission believes the less parking, the better.

Randy Ford, Engineer, stated that the ordinance does outline grading impacts on the existing terrain. He noticed that there is a substantial hill present on the property. He stated that it is possible to grade some of those slopes.

Mr. Powell stated that there is not one proposed contour on the site diagram submitted. He stated that they tried to isolate the slopes and work around them. He pointed out contours on the property as shown on the diagram.

Commission Shaver stated that she does like the idea of moving the entrance down from the main on/off ramp for I-75.

Mr. Powell stated that it gives them a lot more stacking room.

Mr. Powell thanked the Commission.

## **2. AT & T Tower-concept plan review.**

Anthony Amine, Amine & Associates, 101 West Big Beaver Road, Suite #1800, Troy, MI introduced himself to the Commission as appearing on behalf of AT&T mobility. AT & T is currently providing service throughout the metro Detroit area.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this is a request for installation of a cell tower in a residential area. He stated that our ordinance does not permit it as a matter of right, there would have to be a special land use consideration. There are two obstacles to overcome. The first is the special use, which has been mirrored in language in a letter from Brian Oppmann to the Commission. All Commission members received a copy of Mr. Oppmann's review of this special land use prior to the meeting. The second obstacle is compliance with the wireless communication facilities portion of the ordinance, 16.09.05 which is another set of procedures. He stated that he would like to address the special use first, because if this hurdle cannot be overcome, it is a mute point.

Mr. Amine stated that he does not have a copy of Brian's report, so if the Commission would like to ask him some questions, he could address the issues.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the map received showed a color depiction map. He stated that the areas shown in red are areas not served by the 226B site shown

as (MI2226B active coverage). He stated that under “recommendations”, the document states “do not approve this candidate, lacking coverage on Ormond Road.” He asked for clarification of this point in the information provided.

Mr. Amine stated that after a search of property owners in the area, the former consultant was unable to come up with a lease for a reasonable piece of property. Once this project was handed over to Mr. Amine, he met with Mr. Trout and he showed him the search ring which would show the perfect spot for the tower. He stated that it is a grid network, and if you move the tower too far to the East or the West, you cause holes in the coverage. He stated that 226B is the Township property and when they first met with Mr. Trout, they wanted to place the new tower on Township property so the revenue would be generated for the Township and the residents. 226B showed that if they had put the tower there, there would be a hole created in coverage. He stated that he did have a conversation with Mr. Carlisle and he mentioned that you had to show why this spot was chosen and why you couldn't go to one of the other areas where cell towers were permitted. He stated if you look at the zoning in the property where the cell tower needs to be from an ideal coverage point of view, it is all R1 or R1A. He stated that the other properties are further to the north. He stated that the propagation map that the AT & T engineer provided showed that if they did go to the closer portion of property that is zoned properly, there would be a hole in the system and they would have to come back and do it again.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the special use conditions would have to be complied with. He stated that the first condition is that the proposed use, or uses shall be of such a location, size and character as to be in harmony with the surrounding property and orderly development of the zoning district and shall not be detrimental to the orderly development of adjacent districts.

Mr. Amine stated that by the photo provided on page 2 of Brian's report, you can see the subject lease area off the southwest corner of the property. The property is owned by American Aggregates and is approximately a 500 acre parcel. He stated that the tower would be located there because of the ordinance setbacks, AT & T is proposing a 195 foot monopole. The plans show that the tower was being located more than 195 feet from any property line. There is also a letter provided by an engineer stating that in the unlikely event that the tower was to fall, it would collapse within 196 feet of the base of the tower. The second item is that the area is very flat, there are not a lot of trees, there are some natural trees in the proposed location to provide some type of natural shelter for the equipment shelter, etc. He stated that the proposed location was chosen so that if you were driving down Ormond Road, it is not just flat and open; it is obstructed a little by vegetation. Because of the coverage that AT & T is trying to obtain from this tower, they were not able to put in into an industrial area so it could be blended behind a factory.

Commissioner Leddy asked how far it could be moved and still get the same coverage.

Mr. Amine stated that possibly within a ½ mile. He stated that they tried to move it 1.5 miles north of this area to Township property and it was too far. He stated that if they were to move it .5 miles to the north, they would still be on the American Aggregates property and it would be flat and open and more visible. He stated that American Aggregates wanted to put the proposed tower in an area that would not interfere with any proposed development down the road.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he was uncomfortable proceeding with this issue. He stated that the Commission needed the time to process and examine the request in order to recommend or not recommend the request to the Township Board based on whether or not it conforms to the special land use. He stated that Mr. Amine's answer to the first question didn't cover it and in all fairness, he hasn't had time to review the request. He stated that the Commission has to affirmatively say that it meets all criteria in order to recommend it to the Township Board. He stated that he would rather Mr. Amine come back and address each item saying that yes it complies and here is why. He stated that this information is subjective. He stated that all issues and sections of the ordinance need to be dealt with in their entirety.

Commissioner Leddy stated they are not able to hide the tower out in the field.

Mr. Amine stated he understood that. That in a perfect world, if they could locate this tower wherever they wanted, they could find the perfect area and place it on the Township property. However, the design criteria in putting it in an area where the coverage is required, there is only a certain area in which it can be located. If it is not located properly, it would require them to come back and put another tower up, or put up two towers instead of one because it doesn't cover what it needs to. He stated that this is the challenge.

Chairperson Steckling asked the Commission if they wanted to go through each item one by one or did they want to ask them to address all areas completely and come back.

Commissioner Willson concurred. He stated they should ask them to come back. He stated he is not comfortable enough with the current information to even consider sending it to the Township Board at this point.

Mr. Amine stated he will do all due diligence and turn it around as quickly as possible. He stated that he will stay and answer any questions that the Commissioners might have so they could do this properly. He stated that he would prefer the chance to respond properly rather than discussing it now.

Mr. Trout stated that the selection of that site is probably the most important. He stated that those determinations are critical.

Chairperson Steckling stated that their job is to deal with the ordinance. Personally, he has no problem, it is a welcome addition. However, they need to comply with the ordinance. The special land use, 16.09 spells out all items in order to move it forward. The other item deals with wireless communication; this is also a part of the ordinance. He stated that the ordinance was just amended. He stated that they have the ability to narrow the footprint that they need. He stated that he would like to deal with it next month.

Mr. Oppmann stated there is a tower along I-75 back where Mt. Zion church is. He stated this was approved this way for a reason. He stated if they explore some additional properties to the west that are extensively wooded, that would help. He stated that traveling on Ormond Road, this tower would be clearly visible heading south, whereas heading north you wouldn't see it because of the trees. He stated that the applicant should consider areas slightly off the map that Mr. Oppmann provided, or at least look at other areas in this general location. There may be a better site, but detailed site evaluation should be included in their application.

Commissioner Leddy concurred. It would be more appropriate to put it in a wooded area and use the camouflage type pole that would hide it.

Mr. Amine stated that this looks horrible in the winter standing out all by itself.

Commissioner Leddy concurred. He stated that this is why he suggests a wooded area.

Chairperson Steckling disagreed. He stated that if they choose this location, bring it in next month and they will look at it. He asked the applicant to respond to all points.

**Commissioner Hines moved to table the site plan application for AT & T giving them the opportunity to respond to the ordinance requirements for the special land use as outlined in a Carlisle/Wortman and Associates letter. Support by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

### **3. Transient and Seasonal Sales-discussion.**

Mr. Oppmann stated that he put all of the comments from last month into the draft allowing it to be more flexible. He stated that he choose the transient terminology and changed it throughout. He stated that they changed it from being only allowed in C-1 and C-2, to being allowed in any non-residential zoning district. He stated that on the second page, currently what is allowed is a temporary promotional sign. He stated that he looked at other communities seasonal sales ordinances and all of them refer back to the sign section, so that is what he did.

Commissioner Hines asked if Bordines selling Christmas trees would fall under this.

Mr. Oppmann stated yes.

Commissioner Hines asked if Kroger selling patio furniture or mums falls under the transient sales permitting.

Mr. Oppmann stated yes.

Commissioner Hines stated unless they have it on their site plan.

Mr. Oppmann stated that most communities will allow some type of outdoor display provided that it is tied to the site plan and sometimes there are special use requirements. He stated that he is not sure about Kroger.

Commissioner Hines asked if Kroger had to come in every 30 days and get a permit.

Supervisor Trout stated that this might be part of the original site plan.

Mr. Oppmann stated that unless it was part of the site plan approval, it would require a permit.

Supervisor Trout stated that it doesn't cover special events and he wants the language added to make it a little broader. So basically, it would be the seasonal and temporary display of products, materials intended for sale and special events. He stated that this would cover the car dealerships a little better and the things that they do to promote sales. He stated that churches fall outside of this.

Mr. Oppmann stated since they didn't adopt the temporary sign language, it would need to be revisited.

Commissioner Shaver asked if a church revival two times a year would be a special event.

Supervisor Trout stated that he thinks so. He would like a broader spectrum to deal with these events. He stated that it would be temporary signage, but it would be allowed in the size and location of a normal sign. He stated that it needs to be clarified.

Greg Kazmierski, Ordinance Officer, stated that there are many sign ordinance violations that he sees. He stated it frequently was not the property owner, but it was the business owner that was in violation. He stated that various businesses use things for advertising that were not acceptable as defined in the ordinance. He

stated that his intent if he were writing the ordinance would be to force the business to get their plan approved by the Township whereby they could describe their plan prior to implementation. Therefore, you are supporting your local businesses, but you are regulating the activities also.

Supervisor Trout asked if the Township could enact special penalties. He stated that the temporary businesses are here and gone in three days. He asked if there could be a special provision written into the ordinance whereby if you violated the ordinance for one day, you would get a ticket. There has to be a way to enforce short term things without having to go through the noticing procedure. He stated that this would be beneficial to the Township in these situations.

Chairperson Steckling stated that they could not do this within the Ordinance; it had to be a separate issue. He stated that his tolerance for what is permissible is higher than others on the Commission, it is a subjective thing. He stated that they need a way to evaluate the process.

Greg Kazmierski stated that it is important for the Township to support local businesses, especially now. He stated that it is really difficult to regulate on one hand and support them on the other.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he would like to set some of those guidelines and then go to the business owners and ask them what their plans are. He stated that it has to be observed the same for all businesses.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the things on sale at Kroger block the sidewalk.

Commissioner Hines stated that no closer to the road right-of-way than the front setback of the building, or whatever is less. This would eliminate the cars being parked on the green belt.

Mr. Oppmann stated that they are not allowed to park on the greenbelt.

Commissioner Hines stated that she did not feel that this was offensive. She stated that they should not write ordinances that they are going to turn a blind eye to. She stated that they can't enforce parts of the ordinance as it is.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the Dixie Highway right of way is very large. This causes a lot of problems with signage and usage.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this was a lot of the same discussion that they had when they were considering new sign language.

Supervisor Trout stated that the Dodge dealership is obstructed by bushes. The cars cannot be seen behind the bushes. Under the language developed by Brian, he suggested changing the word "structures" to "items".

Commissioner Shaver stated that the car dealerships have constant sales and they would be petitioning every few weeks because there would be a new reason for a sale.

Chairperson Steckling stated that maybe they should solicit from the business owners what they want to do, and then try it and be open to changes.

Supervisor Trout stated that something should be done about the wide differing widths of the right-of-way on Dixie Highway. He suggested that perhaps that the distance is measured from the center, or from the edge of the road to establish a consistent distance that can be measured.

Chairperson Steckling stated that the edge of the road is consistent.

Supervisor Trout stated that this should apply to our sign ordinance as well.

Commissioner Leddy asked if this meant that the car dealerships could then park on the grass.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he did not have a problem with that.

Commissioner Leddy stated that if that happens all of the time then pretty soon you won't have grass which would not be within the original site plan landscaping.

Commissioner Hines stated that the businesses probably don't want their property to look trashy.

Commissioner Leddy stated that if you drive further down Dixie Highway you can see what happens; gravel to the right-of-way and cars all over the place. He stated that he does not think that this is what we want for Springfield.

Chairperson Steckling asked the Commission how they wanted to proceed.

Commissioner Hines asked if this was allowing the businesses and or organizations advertising for special events, for example the renaissance festival, putting up banners for their event.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this applies to on site sale of something.

Greg Kazmierski stated that according to the ordinance, you can't advertise the renaissance festival at the BP gas station. You can only advertise for the renaissance festival at the property that has the renaissance festival.

Commissioner Hines stated that the banners are a violation every year.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this transient sales did not provide for that. He stated that the banners are a sign ordinance issue. The transient sale is for when Bordines wants to sell Christmas trees.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this deals with the sale of something on the property such as pumpkins, trees, etc.

Commissioner Shaver stated that the church has summer camp for 6 weeks in the summer. She asked if this would apply.

Supervisor Trout stated that we probably could handle that event under the transient sales.

Chairperson Steckling stated that this is how the entire thing with the sign ordinance began. He stated that we are back at the beginning and feel like they should be kept separate and deal with these events under the sign ordinance.

Supervisor Trout stated that he would go back and look at it with Brian Oppmann before the next meeting.

Chairperson Steckling stated that there still can be the temporary signs because there is a need for signage for church camps, bake sales, temporary use of the school by the church. All of this needs to be addressed in the sign ordinance.

Commissioner Willson asked if that intended sales language was in the draft.

Chairperson Steckling stated yes.

Commissioner Willson stated that maybe it should be clearer that it is for items that are for sale on the property.

Chairperson Steckling stated that Supervisor Trout and Mr. Oppmann will amend the language and work on another draft for the next meeting.

Commissioner Hines stated that Kroger could use this transient sales permit for the outside sales.

Chairperson Steckling stated that he would like the businesses to come in and outline a plan for the year which could be discussed and they could map out the course of the year. He stated that at this time you could discuss the scope and length of time.

Commissioner Willson stated that a store the size of Kroger probably has a sales plan; we just have not asked them for it yet. He stated that the displays are out for longer than 30 days, so they might give some pushback.

Chairperson Steckling stated that we could work out a happy medium with the businesses.

**4. Site plan administrative review-discussion.**

Chairperson Steckling stated that when he read it, this is not what he expected that the Planning Commission was going to do. He stated that he is still looking for a pre-approved site plan that has run out of time.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this renewal is in the ordinance already; a site plan can be renewed multiple times. He stated that he will look at it again if Mr. Steckling is talking about site plan extensions being handled administratively. He stated that this issue tonight came up because one of the existing business owners wanted to do a small addition. He stated that since it was bigger than 10% of the total area, it would require a site plan approval. He stated that the business owner decided it was not worth it. He stated that he looked at what Independence Township used; it gives the Township flexibility. He stated that the latest example wanted to increase the square footage to allow for cold storage, this is essentially an accessory use to the primary use and as long as the parking requirements were met, the Township should be able to administratively approve it. He stated that Mike would get a site plan and would give it to Randy Ford and himself to look at to provide feedback and then Mike could be the administrator to approve it. He stated that this is the intent behind this; Independence Township has used this many times and it seems to work well.

Commissioner Hines asked if the River could use this for the utilization of the large building for recreation.

Chairperson Steckling stated no. The River could use this to add another building on as long as it followed all of the rules and was within the side yard setbacks and didn't increase the parking.

Mr. Oppmann stated that the River would require a Planning Commission review for the change of use of the building. He stated it would be a total change of use according to building code. He stated that the indoor recreation is a complete change of use; he stated that this is under the criteria for site plan review, whether it is an addition, enlargement over 10%, or change of use. He stated that they would need to come to the Commission.

Commissioner Shaver stated that the more that can be done administratively, the better it is for the commercial owners. She stated that she would hate to discourage them from anything at this point.

Mr. Oppmann stated that this was the problem with the business owner that he spoke with on the phone. He told the business owner that he was bound by the

ordinance, but we would certainly look into it and look for changes that would be more accommodating.

Supervisor Trout stated that this is a prime example of someone wanting to do something and the process and the cost discouraged a simple addition to a building. He stated that they forget it before they get started and everyone loses.

Commissioner Leddy agreed. He stated that simple changes could be made administratively as long as they are within the boundaries of the code. He does not think that everything has to come before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hines and Willson concurred.

**Chairperson Steckling made a motion to put the administrative approval addition to section 18.07.4 (c) up for a public hearing at the earliest possible hearing date. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: none. Voted no: all. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion denied.**

Chairperson Steckling stated that they should hold off for public hearing until February. It should appear as an agenda item in January to include the other section which Mr. Oppmann will bring language for. Then, hold off for a public hearing at the same time for both in February.

Supervisor Trout stated that they should address #1 under this section as well.

Chairperson Steckling asked Mr. Oppmann to prepare this amendment to make it fit, modify the other sections, and the other aspect of existing plans.

## **5. 2011 Meeting Dates.**

**Commissioner Shaver moved to adopt the proposed meeting dates for 2011, which would be the third Monday of the month at 7:30 pm. Supported by Commissioner Willson. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion carried.**

## **6. Election of Officers.**

**Commissioner Hines moved to nominate Commissioner Steckling to hold the office of Chairman. Supported by Commissioner Shaver. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

**Commissioner Leddy moved to nominate Commissioner Baker to hold the office of Vice-Chairman. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

**Commissioner Willson moved to nominate Commissioner Hines to hold the office of Secretary. Supported by Commissioner Shaver. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

New Business:

**1. None.**

Other Business:

**1. Priority Task List/CIP-discussion.**

Supervisor Trout stated that they are moving along on the items outlined on the priority task list. There is a meeting of the Downtown Davisburg business owners in January. He stated that Brian's office helped them apply for a tree grant which will add to the Dixie and Davisburg corner improvements.

Public Comment: None

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 pm. Supported by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Leddy, Shaver, Hines, Steckling, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Lamont, Baker. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin Mattice, Recording Secretary