

**Final**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**TENATIVE BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA**

**January 16, 2006**

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

**MINUTES:** November 21, 2005 Business Meeting  
December 1, 2005 Workshop Meeting

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Items Not On Agenda

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

1. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article IV & Article V
2. Safety Pathways
  - a.) Revised Map
  - b.) Design & Construction Standard – recommended changes.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Eagle Ridge – 07-31-300-021 Concept
2. 2006 Priority Development
3. Election of Officers - 2006

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Miscellaneous**

1. Planning Commission operating procedures.

**NEXT MEETING DATE:** ??? To be set by Planning Commission

**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 January 16, 2006**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the January 16, 2006 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

**Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present**

Roger Lamont  
John Steckling  
Paul Rabaut  
Dean Baker  
Bill Champion  
Bill Leddy

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

Ruth Ann Hines

**Consultants Present**

Randy Ford  
Sally Elmiger

**Staff Present**

Collin Walls  
Leon Genre  
Nancy Strole

**Approval of Minutes:** November 21, 2005 Business Meeting  
December 1, 2005 Workshop Meeting

- \* Commissioner Baker moved to approve the minutes of November 21, 2005 and December 1, 2005 as presented. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Champion and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

**Approval of Agenda:**

Commissioner Steckling asked to move Item #1 of New Business: Eagle Ridge Concept as the first item of the meeting.

Ms. Elmiger asked to discuss Safety Pathways as the first item under Unfinished Business. There were no objections to the requested changes.

**Public Comment:           None**

**Public Hearing:             None**

**New Business:**

1. Eagle Ridge Concept – Parcel I.D. # 07-3-300-021

Commissioner Steckling asked if this is the density plan or the cluster plan? Chairperson Lamont said we have both before us but if we grant density, it does not restrict the Planning Commission from making comments on the cluster plan.

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC summarized his review dated December 7, 2005. He noted that with respect to drainage, the overall proposal is to direct the drainage to several pockets in low areas. Mr. Ford said he is satisfied that there will be good percolation in these areas and it is a good way to approach drainage. Mr. Ford said he thinks the road location works pretty well with the existing topography and he believes the applicant will be able to minimize any mass grading. Regarding the access to Eagle Road, it is fairly low traffic volume and he does not believe a passing lane will be necessary but that would ultimately be up to the Road Commission. The road does meet the county criteria except for the five foot gravel shoulder requirement. Mr. Ford noted that he did not check density.

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman commented that some adjustment needs to be made to lots 5, 6 and 7; they are not quite meeting the depth to width ratio. She believes that access to lots 4, 5 and 13 will be tricky because of the slopes and asks that the applicant provide additional information. Ms. Elmiger said the site is good for clustering and would support waiving the sidewalk requirement.

Mr. Grant Ward, the surveyor, commented that they have a 21 acre park proposed which amounts to 56% of the site. Very little mass grading is proposed and there is a natural area that he took advantage of. He tried to move the turn around to save some oak trees but that would not work. Mr. Ward said some of the sites are a challenge, he believes in regard to lot 13, he can come in off the lot and make it a buildable site. As for the width to depth ratios, he believes they are correct they way he computed them.

Commissioner Rabaut asked where Eagle Ridge Park is accessed? Mr. Ward said there are a number of places including in between lots 2 and 3 and between lots 13 and 12. All of the lots back up directly to the park.

Commissioner Champion asked if there is anything to prevent storm water runoff directly across from lot 2? Mr. Ward said the road drainage will be stopped by the berm and then there would be about 200 feet of storm sewer to pick up the low point.

Commissioner Baker commented that he is hesitant to move forward approving a density that he is not sure that some sites have met the requirements. He appreciates the clustering option and believes it is appropriate for this site. He is also in agreement of waiving the sidewalk requirement.

Chairperson Lamont commented regarding density, he believes it is achievable; it may not be exact to scale but overall it is tight, but achievable.

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Township Board that, based on the matters presented in the reviews of the consultants, that the density plan as prepared for Eagle Ridge Condominium according to the site plan date stamped January 4, 2006 shows that 13 lots are achievable density for this parcel. Commissioner Leddy supported the motion.**

Commissioner Rabaut commented that from his perspective, we have a position from our planner that says this does not meet the density requirements because of the lot width to depth ratio problem and he would have difficulty supporting the motion.

- \* Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Champion and Leddy; No: Baker and Rabaut; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 4 to 2 vote.**

In regard to the cluster plan, Commissioner Steckling said he believes the general layout is fine. In terms of lot 13, he thinks it is a nice building site and would leave it where it is. Commissioner Rabaut said the cluster plan is a good plan and would support clustering as it makes sense for this spot. He would support waiving the sidewalks and believes lot 13 should stay where it is proposed. Chairperson Lamont commented that the cluster plan is designed very nicely, it minimizes mass grading, takes the natural topography into consideration and the drainage plan does take into account the natural topography and keeps the drainage in a natural area.

### **Unfinished Business:**

1. Safety Pathways
  - a) Revised Map
  - b) Design & Construction Standard – recommended changes

Supervisor Walls commented that these are items that he suggests that the Planning Commission deal with zoning ordinances and not the Design Standards. Those should be left to engineers and the Township Board.

Ms. Elmiger said the Design & Construction Standard changes are being proposed here because this is where we talk about how sidewalks and safety paths should be designed. The standards are saying that a developer will be instructed to install a safety path for a development, if they cannot do it during the development process then they would be required to provide funds to the Township to do it through escrow. The developer would also provide an easement for the construction. Ms. Elmiger noted that item #10 on page 3 states that all paths shall be 8 feet wide and built within the AASHTO guidelines. She noted that our guidelines are not AASHTO guidelines.

Mr. Ford commented that he does not believe the Township should lock into an 8 foot wide path because it will not necessarily work in every area. Supervisor Walls said these proposed changes

are not put together with our entire Design & Construction Standards in mind. It duplicates things and conflicts with things and needs to mesh properly.

Chairperson Lamont said he would support turning this over to Randy Ford to work on the Design & Construction end of it. Mr. Genre said he thinks we should still look back to the Master Plan to prioritize our paths and even to the point of what developments we should look at possibly requiring certain routes but the Design & Construction Standards should stay in it.

Commissioner Rabaut commented that paths benefit everyone and asked if there is some reason we could not ask developers to contribute? Supervisor Walls said that is a question for Greg Need to answer.

Commissioner Steckling said he believes the zoning ordinance is easier to amend than the Master Plan.

Chairperson Lamont commented that he would concur with Supervisor Walls that Design & Construction should stay with Design & Construction and we should not start backpeddling after 20 years of work to separate the two. He believes we should turn the Design & Construction portion over to the Building/Planning Director. There were no objections to this suggestion. Chairperson Lamont asked the Commissioners if we should adopt this proposed plan? Commissioner Baker said he sees this plan as presented this evening as the foundation of where to begin approaching developers. As far as prioritization, he thinks we should be thinking about working with the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Commissioner Steckling said the Township Board should be dealing with the expenditures of money and they could go to the Park Commission to do whatever. From a planning standpoint, he believes we need to get this presented and we should deal with both items.

Commissioner Leddy suggested that we add potential pathways down Ormond Road and down Andersonville Road.

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that the Planning Commission consult with the necessary parties, being the planner, the attorney, engineer if necessary and towards the end of adopting an ordinance amendment that will allow for the construction of safety paths within the Township and also towards the end of requiring future developments to provide for safety paths with the actual roadways to be determined as a part of this study. Commissioner Baker supported the motion.**

Chairperson Lamont said he did not understand the motion totally and asked if it is his intent on this ordinance amendment motion would be to require developers that are fronting the pathway plan system to either put in a pathway or put monies in an escrow account for a pathway if it is not to be built within 10 years similarly to the ordinance that we have in the Dixie Highway Overlay District? Commissioner Steckling said, yes, his goal is to leave it fairly broad to discuss and explore all possibilities.

Chairperson Lamont commented that we spent a lot of time developing this plan and if we are going to create any ordinance that goes outside the plan we've already developed, he could not support it. We are looking at the ordinance amendment by the motion first, prior to looking at the pathway priorities but in his mind, he believes the two need to go together. Commissioner Steckling said he wants them to go together as well and that is his intent.

Commissioner Baker asked Commissioner Steckling if he is proposing a methodology or ordinance language yet to be developed, that would take all future developments and create some methodology of collecting money or permitting them to build the safety path regardless if it fronts on the green lines on the map or not? Commissioner Steckling said he would like to be able to have the consultant give language that we can consider and incorporate in our zoning ordinance by way of amendment and he would like to bring into consideration all of the things we've been discussing but he would like it to be very general initially.

Supervisor Walls asked what the Planning Commission wants the consultants to do? He said, until the Planning Commission determines their basic goals, then it cannot be turned over to a consultant. Chairperson Lamont said he agrees that we need to be direct as to what we are asking the consultants to do.

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

**\* Commissioner Rabaut moved that in response of the request by the Township, the Planning Commission recommend that safety paths are contained in the map dated October 21, 2005, the priority pathways are identified in green and this map will be corrected to show the change on Tindall Road and Andersonville Road south of Davisburg Road. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Champion and Leddy; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

2. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Article IV & Article V

Chairperson Lamont said the use of the fairgrounds has not yet been put into this amendment. Ms. Elmiger said Mr. Carlisle suggested keeping agriculture in because of the "Right To Farm Act." They also revised the draft to ensure that they had all the existing ordinance language in.

Chairperson Lamont asked how the uses that go on at the fairgrounds are incorporated into the amendment. Ms. Elmiger said this is the first time she has heard of it but if she is provided with a list of those items, she would ask Dick Carlisle and make the proper amendments.

Chairperson Lamont suggested looking at the rest of the ordinance and provide feedback to Ms. Elmiger to give her a clear, concise target with what the Planning Commission feels are the shortcomings of this ordinance amendments.

Commissioner Champion said on page 5, paragraph C makes reference to screening for storage, service and maintenance buildings, he said there is no screening requirement in page 8 for what he believes is the same type of building. Ms. Elmiger said the language in PR could be stricken.

Supervisor Walls commented that in regard to Resource Conservation District mentioned in the Intent Paragraph of Section 4.0, the very end of the sentence should be in the Parks and Recreation District. Supervisor Walls said he believes the Retail Sales statement #5 should not be deleted from page 1. He does not see anything wrong with someone selling what is grown on their property. Chairperson Lamont agreed with Supervisor Walls. Supervisor Walls said on page 7, paragraph 6, Wildlife Preserve could be better served in Resource Conservation or both. Ms. Elmiger said it is allowed under Resource Conservation as well.

Ms. Elmiger summarized, page 1, 4.0 she is deleting almost everything on the last line. She will retain #5 under Section 4.01. Page 3, she will not delete #8. Page 5, 1.c will be repeated in the PS District and under Cemeteries on page 8 and under Equestrian Facilities on page 9. Page 5, item 4.d, there was a suggestion to modify it to say "licensed campgrounds." Ms. Elmiger said she would review materials to see if there are any activities that the fairgrounds will propose that the Planning Commission needs to consider. In regard to Equestrian facilities, she will look to see if there is anything that has not been considered.

Commissioner Rabaut said the original RC had a provision for schools that included private schools. It was deleted and moved to PS but the "private school" was dropped. Supervisor Walls said schools are allowed in residential, commercial and office districts and private schools are not publicly owned. Ms. Elmiger said she would leave it in RC and call it "Resource Based Private." The Planning Commissioners agreed.

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that everything given to Sally to make by way of changes to the zoning ordinance amendment, Article IV Resource Conservation District and the new PR Article V, Parks and Recreation District and the Article V A Public Service District be changed. Commissioner Champion supported the motion.**
- \* Chairperson Lamont asked to amend the motion to state "as recapped by Ms. Elmiger." Commissioner Steckling agreed. Commissioner Champion supported the amended motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

## **New Business:**

### 2. 2006 Priority Development

Supervisor Walls said if the Planning Commissioners provide their priority lists and comments in writing he would have them compiled for the next meeting. The Planning Commissioners agreed.

## **Other Business:**

### 1. Planning Commission Operating Procedures

Chairperson Lamont summarized his memo to the Planning Commission dated January 16, 2006 regarding the priorities of the Planning Commission and criteria for how something should be placed on the priority list. Chairperson Lamont said his memo of January 16<sup>th</sup> will be part of the compiled list by Supervisor Walls.

### 2. Election of Officers

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved that Roger Lamont be the Chairperson of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. Commissioner Rabaut supported the motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
- \* Commissioner Rabaut moved that John Steckling be the Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. Chairperson Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
- \* Commissioner Lamont moved that Dean Baker be the Secretary of the Planning Commission for the year 2006. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the amended motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Absent: Hines. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

### 3. Next Meeting Date

The Planning Commission agreed not to hold any February meetings due to the fact that there are no plans ready to be brought forth and the work to be done by the consultants will not be available that quickly. The Planning Commission agreed that two meetings in March would most likely be necessary.

### 4. Priority List

Review PL and RC Districts to be brought back by Carlisle/Wortman at a date to be determined. Review Waste Water Treatment Ordinance is deleted. Build Out Traffic Study Budget is set for March 2, 2006. Innovative Storm Water Management is set for March 2, 2006. Pathway Systems will be brought back by Carlisle/Wortman. Existing, Non-conforming setbacks is set for the April Workshop meeting.

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary