

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes December 16, 2014

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the December 16, 2014 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:

Dean Baker
Ruth Ann Hines
Bill Leddy
Kevin Sclesky
Neil Willson

Commissioners Absent

Dave Hopper
Linda Whiting

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Planner, Carlisle Wortman, Associates
Randy Ford, Hubble, Roth and Clark

Staff Present

Collin W. Walls, Supervisor

Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner Willson moved to approve the agenda as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the November 18, 2014 Planning Commission meeting

Commissioner Hines moved to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2014 meeting as amended removing Neil Willson from the “Commissioners Present” list and adding him to the “Commissioners Absent” list. Seconded by Commissioner Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None

New Business:

1. Final Site Plan Approval, Umbrella Holdings, Lots #18 & 19 of Valentines Industrial Subdivision, Andersonville Road, Parcel #'s 07-26-326-036/07-26-326-033

Mr. Jim Scharl introduced himself and the petitioners to the Commission. He stated that based on the review comments, they should be able to handle all items conditionally and he is able to provide answers for all items.

Mr. Lewan summarized his review dated December 3, 2014. He stated that they need clarification on the existing trees and vegetation along Andersonville Road. They would like to see the existing buffer remain as much as possible, but they need clarification on what is remaining and what is being cleared. They also need some documentation of Road Commission approval for the proposed drive entrance. The distance between the drives is approximately 160 feet as shown on the proposed plan and as per ordinance, it is supposed to be 275 feet and there is only supposed to be one drive per business. The Planning Commission may allow a waiver of the ordinance requirement for both the number of driveways and distance. If the property has more than 300 feet of frontage, the second driveway may be permitted by the Planning Commission. The combined lots have over 300 feet of frontage. The property is not located on a priority safety path area but they are supposed to provide an easement for future safety paths as found acceptable by the Township and this is not outlined on the proposed plan and needs to be addressed. Since it may be difficult to provide an onsite safety path, the applicant may ask that the safety path easement be provided within the right of way. There is a note on the site plan and it needs to be mutually agreed upon based on the requirements and needs to be addressed. He added that they would like to see an Oakland County Health Department review of the septic system on site. There are a number of standards that are required by ordinance regarding landscaping and the petitioner has done a pretty good job of addressing those requirements. The area is surrounded by industrial zoning and a lot of the buffering is not required at this site because of this. He reiterated that they need clarification of the landscaping along Andersonville Road regarding what is going to be left and what is going to be taken out. They would like to see all lighting poles reduced to 22 feet instead of 24 feet to adhere to ordinance requirements. No signage is proposed at the site and if the petitioner would like signage, they will have to submit signage plans. There is a discrepancy on the middle buildings regarding the doors on the west side. There is a plan note that says these doors will only be used in an emergency and then there is note submitted that said all doors will be utilized. The improvements are in general compliance with the Springfield Township Zoning Ordinance and after the items above are addressed to the Planning Commission's satisfaction, they have no problem recommending approval.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his report dated November 21, 2014. The petitioner addressed the Engineering Consultant's concerns from their previous review regarding storm water quality. The petitioners will need a permit from Road Commission for the two drive approaches and they would need to see evidence of that. The petitioner

indicated that the only stipulation in attaining that permit is that they have a continuous culvert and they were able to accomplish this which is reflected on the drawings. Traffic circulation works adequately for the site except for around the back of the easterly maintenance building where it is tight and a service truck or fire truck would extend beyond the asphalt when making a turn. Petitioner indicated that area would be kept as gravel area to accommodate this. The Engineering Consultant's recommendation is to maintain it as hard packed gravel and Mr. Ford added that he will need to see permit approval for both the septic and well systems.

Mr. Scharl confirmed that they are planning on removing as few as possible of the trees and bushes along Andersonville Road. There will be some ditch improvement that will need to be done. The question on the safety path is they have no problem granting the Township an easement but the easement will probably go in the first 10 or 15 feet of the property and there is already an easement there for storm sewer and a pipe under the ground. If an easement was to go in there and it needed to be cleared, it would certainly clear a lot of this area acting now as a buffer. If the easement was in the road right of way it would not be an easement at all. If this is a non priority area for a safety path it comes down to where they would like it because he doesn't believe it is going to be constructed. He can't say how many trees are going to be removed until they determine where the pathway easement is going to go. He has spoken to the Road Commission and the approved application is in the mail. The permit will not be pulled until the contractor provides required paperwork to the Road Commission. The necessity for the two drives is for the two uses of the property, the office and the service trucks which are part of their organization. The Health Department has sent the plans for the septic to MDEQ and Mr. Scharl spoke to someone today and was told that a permit will not be issued until the two properties are combined. After they receive approval, they will be applying to the Township to combine the two parcels into one. They can then send that new information to the MDEQ to get their permit. The petitioner has no problem reducing the light pole height by two feet. The doors that were in question on the maintenance building will only be used in case of emergency.

Chairperson Baker asked the Commissioners regarding their thoughts on the safety path. When he read the Planner's comments he assumed that the road right of way and the easement would not go together. He stated that he would like to take advantage of this opportunity to save some type of easement for a safety path. He doesn't want it cleared but it should state on the print that there is a place that will not be used by the landowner because it is set aside for the safety path. He stated that they can grant approval for the 2nd driveway because of the amount of road frontage. He suggested that after the driveway was done, they should do a final assessment of the vegetation and make sure that there is adequate screening. They should give the planner a chance to visit the site on their behalf. He asked the Commissioners if they would like to see an area set aside for the safety path easement which is an area separate from the area already set aside for the drainage easement. He asked Mr. Lewan about his thought regarding cohabitating safety path on a drainage easement.

Mr. Lewan answered that it is probably not a good idea.

Mr. Ford replied that when constructing safety paths, they try to meander paths around mature trees. There is 12 foot minimum setback distance for the face of the path from the white line on the roadway. The right of way is quite a distance back from the road edge. Plans to widen the road in the future could affect this distance. There are also overhead wires there and they should have a designated easement area but he has no problem with it being overlapping the drainage easement. This happens all of the time. There are power lines and wires that might have to be relocated. There is room in the road right of way to accomplish what they want to at this site.

Chairperson Baker reiterated that because of the extreme width of the road right of way, history with Road Commission says that they would be amenable to a safety path in this particular location because of the large amount of right of way separating the surface of the road from the property.

Mr. Ford stated that the Road Commission requires that if a community is going to install a safety path within their road right of way, the minimum setback standards would need to be met and they would at this site. The Road Commission requires that the Township accept responsibility and maintenance for the safety path if it is in the road right of way.

Mr. Scharl stated that between the two driveways, there is no open ditch. He confirmed that the plat has a 12 foot drainage easement across the front and in that easement is an 18 inch storm sewer. He doesn't think the developer would have a problem granting an easement over that 12 foot.

Chairperson Baker stated that he is not opposed to utilizing the same space. He would like to have it noted that this site could be used as a safety path as well as its current use as a drainage easement.

Commissioners agreed.

Chairperson Baker recommended no clearing except for what is necessary for the driveway and allow the planner to evaluate that there is proper screening.

Mr. Scharl concurred.

Mr. Lewan answered that they can also look at the greenbelt trees that are required and evaluate that they either meet ordinance or some need to be added.

Chairperson Baker stated that this is a suitable use and two driveways are substantiated. He summarized a letter from Commissioner Hopper offering his comments on the site plan approval including providing adequate screening and getting approval verification from MDEQ, Oakland County Health Department and Road Commission prior to the issuance of a building permit. Mr. Hopper also verified that they also needed to add the reduction of the parking lot light fixtures, clarification of the safety path easement, clarifying overhead door usage, the adjustment of the turning radius at the north east corner of the site for trucks and waiver of the driveway spacing.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if there was an intention of installing signs.

Petitioner replied no.

Chairperson Baker asked if the reduction of the pole height would still allow the adequate number of foot candles.

Mr. Scharl answered that reducing them by 2 feet would not have a monumental effect.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that it would help with offsite glare and it would meet the ordinance requirements.

Supervisor Walls asked about the question in the CWA review regarding hazardous substances stored on the site.

Mr. Scharl confirmed that there will be no hazardous substances stored on the site.

Commissioner Hines moved to grant Final Site Plan Approval to Umbrella Holdings Site Plan date stamped October 24, 2014, Lots 18 and 19 of Valentines Industrial Subdivision with the following conditions:

- 1. The Planner assess the screening along Andersonville Road after construction of the driveway and ditching to insure adequate screening remains to meet ordinance requirements.**
- 2. Plan Note be added that a Safety Path Easement will be granted to coexist within the 12 foot drainage easement**
- 3. Approval of the two (2) driveways as the frontage along Andersonville Road does exceed 300 feet**
- 4. The parking lot fixture height be reduced to meet ordinance requirements**
- 5. Contingent on approval and permits from the Oakland County Road Commission, Oakland County Health Department and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality**
- 6. 2 lots should be combined into a single parcel**

Seconded by Commissioner Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

2. 2015 Meeting Dates and Appointments of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

Commissioner Hines moved to set the Planning Commission meeting dates for the third Tuesday of each month at 7:30 pm for 2015. Seconded by Willson. Voted yes:

Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Commission Hines moved to appoint Dean Baker as Planning Commission Chairperson for 2015. Seconded by Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Baker moved to appoint Ruth Ann Hines as Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson for 2015. Seconded by Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Commissioner Baker moved to appoint Dave Hopper as Planning Commission Secretary for 2015. Seconded by Sclesky. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Old Business:

1. Temporary & Seasonal Sales & Community & Civic Events

Doug Lewan summarized the draft ordinance language dated December 5, 2014. He explained that he made changes based on the discussion at the November 18, 2014 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioners pointed out two grammatical errors and Supervisor Walls indicated that no signs are permitted anywhere in the public right of way and the language should reflect this.

Mr. Lewan concurred. He stated that he would make those changes to the document.

Other Business:

1. Priority List

Commissioners reviewed and made updates and revisions to the current Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:47 PM. Supported by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Leddy, Sclesky, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Hopper, Whiting. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary