

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
FINAL BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA**

**May 16, 2005**  
**REVISION 1**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:30 P.M.

**MINUTES:**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Items Not On Agenda

**PUBLIC HEARING:** **Ordinance Amendments**  
1. Subsection 16.13, Fences, Screening Walls, and Screening Structures of Article XVI

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** **Site Plan**  
~~1. Harrington Funeral Home - 07-13-351-002 - Final~~  
**ASKED TO BE REMOVED**

**NEW BUSINESS:** **Ordinance Amendments**  
1. Subsection 16.13, Fences, Screening Walls, and Screening Structures of Article XVI  
**Site Plan**  
1. Peter Carroll Industrial Building - **07-36-451-002** - Final  
2. Oakland County Parks - Barns Relocation - **07-20-201-016** - Final  
*Note: Please keep these plans or return them need for Town Board- Thank you*

**OTHER BUSINESS:** **Miscellaneous**  
1. Priority List  
2. Discussion Site Plans Reviews at Next Workshop

**NEXT MEETING DATE:** June 20, 2005 – Regular Business Meeting  
June 2, 2005 -- Workshop

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**The Mission of the Springfield Township Planning Commission is to guide and promote the efficient, coordinated development of the Township in a manner that will best promote the health, safety, and welfare of its people.**

**Springfield Township  
Planning Commission – Business Meeting  
Minutes of May 16, 2005**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the May 16, 2005 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

**Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present**

Roger Lamont  
John Steckling  
Paul Rabaut  
Dean Baker  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Bill Leddy

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

Chris Moore

**Consultants Present**

Randy Ford  
Sally Elmiger

**Staff Present**

Leon Genre  
Mary Blundy

**Approval of Minutes:**                      **None**

**Approval of Agenda:**

Chairperson Lamont noted that Harrington Funeral Home has asked to be removed from the agenda. A request was made to add under Other Business, discussing site plan reviews at the next Workshop meeting. There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as revised.

**Public Comment:**                              **None**

**Public Hearing:**

1.        Subsection 16.13, Fences, Screening Walls and Screening Structures of Article XVI.

**Chairperson Lamont opened the Public Hearing at 7:35 p.m.**

There were no public comments.

**Chairperson Lamont closed the Public Hearing at 7:36 p.m.**

**Unfinished Business:**                      **None**

**New Business:**

1. Subsection 16.13, Fences, Screening Walls and Screening Structures of Article XVI
  - **Commissioner Baker moved to recommend approval by the Township Board of the Amendments proposed to Section 16.13 of Article XVI of Ordinance 26 presented to the Planning Commission this evening. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Baker, Rabaut, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
2. Peter Carroll Industrial Building 07-36-451-002 Final

Mr. Scharl said there is an existing house on the site and that is why the building is set back at 29 feet rather than the requirements of the zoning. This is a maintenance and lawn care facility and the applicant does plan on leasing out space.

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman commented that she is curious about the building height and has asked for amended architectural drawings that meet the ordinance requirements. Regarding site access and circulation, Ms. Elmiger asked if vehicles will be stored outside or in the buildings? She is curious about loading and unloading requirements and if the applicant is leasing three spaces and using one or more personally? She commented on the size of the west drive but from a practical standpoint, most likely emergency vehicles can get in and out on the east drive. There is parking in the front greenbelt area which will require a variance. Ms. Elmiger said they did have comments regarding the storm water system, however, the soils are very sandy and felt that Mr. Scharl may want to explain further about that. After reviewing the ordinance, Carlisle/Wortman did describe some possible changes to the proposed storm water detention basin and questioned how much salt will be stored on site and if it is a good idea to store the salt next to the detention basin. She asked how sediments will be handled on the site as the storm water will be sheet-flowed across the parking area? Ms. Elmiger said she recommends that native vegetation be used to vegetate any storm water system and a maintenance program needs to be added. She did ask the applicant if there would be an irrigation system for the plants and also noted that no lighting or sign information was received.

Mr. Randy Ford said he found the plan to be pretty straight forward. The runoff, except for the westerly drive, the lions share of the increased runoff from the hard surface will be directed into the detention basin located on the east property line. The basin is sized accordingly and has a restricted outlet that will discharge into the Old White Lake Rd. site ditch. There is no ditch in existence at this time but the applicant will construct a ditch with culverts under both approaches. The applicant has flattened out the side slopes since the last review. This does satisfy the Township requirement for a non-fenced basin. In regard to roof conductors, the applicant did indicate locations that will be directed over into the detention basin. Mr. Ford said he does question the amount of grading shown on the adjacent property to the east. Soil erosion control measures are shown on the plan and HRC feels the applicant should wrap it around and carry it up the east property line along the detention basin and out along the edge of the grading activity

in order to control the runoff and sediment. In regard to road improvements, the applicant is required to address need for improvements. Mr. Ford said this is a dead-end cul-de-sac with little traffic and the road commission has approved the approaches as configured.

Commissioner Leddy said if the Township doesn't require a variance for the setback, he does not see why we have to have a setback for the parking spaces as the building would provide the same setback.

Commissioner Rabaut asked about the facade of the building? Mr. Carroll said it would be a beige-neutral building. He provided pictures and paint samples to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Steckling asked if there would be signage? Mr. Carroll said yes, there would be signage in the front and rear. Commissioner Steckling said it is important that the signage meets the Township requirements.

Commissioner Baker commented that he would like to see the lighting fixtures proposed. With regard to the ADA ramp, he would prefer a cut curb, flat section of concrete. Commissioner Baker asked if a sprinkler system would be installed? Mr. Carroll said no, but if one is desired he would do so. Commissioner Baker said he would feel better if the applicant continues the silt fence up the eastern side of the property.

Commissioner Leddy asked if the amount of asphalt pavement in the rear would be sufficient to handle 18-wheelers? Mr. Scharl said it would be to the Township requirements.

Commissioner Rabaut asked if a truck could turn around in the back parking lot? Mr. Carroll said they would find a way since their trailers separate.

Mr. Genre asked the applicant how often will trucks access that area? Mr. Carroll said about five to six times per year.

Commissioner Hines said she is concerned about the lighting with residents across the street. Mr. Carroll said he will put whatever lights up the Township wants. Commissioner Hines said, regarding the front yard setback, if the Township's position is that the applicant gets to maintain the 29 feet, then she thinks it would be unnecessary to require a variance for one parking space.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he agrees the 29 foot setback is not a problem. Engineering wise, he commented that he likes what he sees on these plans. Lighting plans have not been submitted but are required for a final site plan. Self-storage location does require an MDEQ permit which the applicant said he is willing to obtain. He would like to see for final the dimensions and height of the walls and how the applicant plans to hold drainage of salt brine. He concurs that signs must be below 100 square feet and comply with ordinance and not use neon lighting. He would like to see the grading easement with the adjacent property owner for final, and the grading plans should include off-site property that is intended to grade.

- **Commissioner Rabaut moved to table further discussion on the Peter Carroll Industrial Development project until the June 2, 2005 meeting to allow the**

**applicant to provide architectural and site design plans as outlined in Section 16.23. Also, at that time the applicant should address the following issues: lighting plan, salt storage plan, soil erosion permits and other permits needed, easement between the two property owners and handicapped ramp. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: None; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

3. Oakland County Parks Barn Relocation 07-20-201-016 Final

Ms. Elmiger said regarding protection of existing vegetation from construction activities, the barn is relatively close to some vegetation adjacent to a wetland. She would like to ensure the vegetation will be preserved. The greenhouse, parking area and 10-foot high fence comes close to existing vegetation that is part of the Shiawassee Lake MNFI area. Ms. Elmiger said she would like to know how large trailers will make the turn from the main asphalt drive into the barns? Regarding accel/decel lanes on Andersonville Rd., she would like the applicant to address the necessity. The plans identify a gravel path and she would like to know why there is no gate in the 10-foot high deer fence at this point in time? In regard to essential facilities, the greenhouse is proposing a propane tank and she would like to know what the use of the propane will be? Mr. Elmiger asked what water source will be utilized for the greenhouse and if the applicant will be stockpiling materials and chemicals? Mr. Elmiger said she recommends the parking lot landscaping and screening of the greenhouse be waived. She suggested after the barns are placed in this area, the screening along Hall Rd. be evaluated to ensure that it meets the requirements.

Mr. Ford said with respect to drainage, the applicant did provide necessary calculations but the detention volumes indicated are slightly less than what is required by Township ordinance. Nevertheless, they are small volumes. The applicant must provide cross-sectional information on the proposed gravel drive. He suggested that the applicant elevate the driveway coming in off Andersonville Rd. for a maintenance standpoint.

Mr. Donnellon and Mr. Scramlin said they are currently working out a storm water master plan for the entire site and it would be available in four to six weeks. Everything does flow to the east with regard to Barn D and he will clarify the storm pipes. The calculations used for detention volumes will be revised. In regard to the maintenance of the drive, he prefers not to ditch it because he would like to minimize the amount of grading and impact on the site itself. He would be adding tree protection for the natural vegetation. With regard to livestock, he submitted a letter indicating his intentions. Mr. Donnellon said Holly High School will be delivering 63 trees to the site and they would be utilizing those along the community service garden and Andersonville Rd., among various other places.

Commissioner Hines commented that she is in favor of the proposed plans. Commissioner Steckling said the plans are fine. Commissioner Rabaut said he would like to see the landscape plan updated to see what it will look like along Andersonville Rd.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he is concerned that the Phase II recommendations regarding planting areas as recommended by Carlisle/Wortman are followed. The lighting appears to comply with ordinance and he agrees we should waive the landscape requirements at the greenhouse and agrees with a Township review of the screening on Hall Rd. after construction. Chairperson Lamont said he believes there are quite a few engineering concerns. He recommended that items 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the HRC review be followed and item 1 for the greenhouse.

- **Commissioner Steckling moved to approve the application for final site plan approval for the Oakland County Parks based on the plans submitted to the Commission date stamped by the Township April 20, 2005. This recommendation for approval is based upon review of the foregoing submissions, as well as the written reviews of Township Planner, and Engineer, and a determination that the applicant has complied with Section 18.07.2 and all other applicable provisions of the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance, the Design and Construction Standards, and all other applicable ordinances, policies and standards. The following conditions are attached to this approval/recommendation: 1) Compliance be had with items 1, 2, 3 and 5 under the Maple Grange Barns section of the Hubbell, Roth & Clark letter dated May 9, 2005 and under community service garden, Section #1 and the recommendations #1, 5 and 6 under the Carlisle/Worman letter dated May 9, 2005 and that a revised landscape plan be provided to reflect the current standards and conditions. Compliance with the foregoing conditions as set forth in the consultants' review letters be undertaken on an administrative basis with the applicant working in conjunction with the Planning Director who may consult with others. Consideration of waiving the parking lot and greenbelt and landscaping and screening requirements of the greenhouse site. Further the Township review screening along Hall Rd. as against the ordinance requirements after the barns are erected. Chairperson Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Moore. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

### **Other Business:**

1. Priority List

Review Screening, Fences and Walls is complete. Review PL District and RC District is set for the July Workshop. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is TBD. Build Out/Traffic Study is TBD. Innovative Storm Water Management is TBD. Pathway Systems is set for the June 2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop. ZBA/PC Workshop with Greg Need is TBD. Lakeshore Protection Policy Discussion is added to the Priority List and a date is TBD.

2. Discussion Site Plans Reviews at Next Workshop

Mr. Genre explained that he has a request from Harrington Funeral Home to be placed on the Workshop Meeting. Mr. Carroll is already on the Workshop Agenda.

Mr. Scharl said he was not in a position to discuss Harrington at this meeting tonight and therefore, requested it be removed. Chairperson Lamont asked if the applicant would be able to have everything ready so the Commissioners would have time to review the plans? Mr. Scharl said he could make it work. Mr. Genre said he did not think there are enough days to make it work.

Chairperson Lamont suggested adding Harrington to the agenda and postponing the review of PL and RC districts if time starts running tight. The Commissioners had no objections.

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary