

Springfield Township  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes February 19, 2019

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the February 19, 2019 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  
Dave Hopper  
George Mansour  
Jason Pliska  
Terry Rusnell  
Kevin Sclesky

Commissioners Absent

None

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Carlisle Wortman, Associates  
Randy Ford, Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.

Staff Present

Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

**Commissioner Hines moved to approve the agenda as presented. Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

**1. Minutes of the January 15, 2019 meeting**

**Commissioner Mansour moved to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2019 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Public Hearing:

None

Old Business:

None

New Business:

**1. Conceptual Site Plan – Springfield Pointe, Laurencelle Properties  
9741 Dixie Highway, .99 acres, C-2 zoning, Parcel #07-14-101-025**

Mr. Charlie Laurencelle, Developer, introduced himself, Pat Cleary, Boss Engineering and Marsha Horning, Jeffrey Scott Architects.

Mr. Cleary provided an overall summary of the project proposed for 9741 Dixie Highway. They are proposing a mixed use building with three tenants and is 5,000 square feet. The drive-thru tenant is proposed to be Dunkin' Donuts and the other tenants have not yet been determined. There is a reciprocal parking agreement with the rest of the adjacent facility. The plan was developed taking the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines and Dixie Highway Overlay District into account. He summarized aspects of the current site, utility requirements and proposed site improvements.

Marsha Horning explained the proposed architectural design and showed examples of proposed building materials.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated January 15, 2019. The applicant was short four parking spaces, so they will either need to provide parking spaces or show shared parking within 500 feet of one of the entrances. There is not a loading space on the site plan and this is required. The applicant should explain how they plan to handle loading on site. This loading should not interfere with parking or have negative impact on emergency access. The applicant shows the proper number of stacking spaces for drive-through, but the stacking space width is about a foot too narrow as figured out by scaling from the drawing. Applicant should increase the width by one foot. The escape lane will also have to be increased to 12 feet as per ordinance. Truck circulation templates should be placed on the site plan to show that trucks have adequate access, and this can be added to Final Site Plan.

A couple of pedestrian walkways are being added and they are re-configuring the pathway along Dixie Highway. He suggested that another ordinance recommendation is to provide good pedestrian access between facilities and he asked that the applicant look at some potential pedestrian linkages to the west so that people could safely walk from the spaces to the west to the subject site. He summarized the Final Site Plan items that will need to be addressed. The applicant should provide what architectural types they are proposing, and it should be included in Final Site Plan in written form. He summarized the two variances that were granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals in 2018. The applicant should add one community design feature since two are required. Fence detail

should be added to Final Site Plan. He summarized all eight items that would need to be address at Final Site Plan and added that it is a relatively clean review for a Conceptual Site Plan Review.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated January 15, 2019. He indicated that the plan provided is adequate for Conceptual Site Plan stage. Applicant should provide engineering information and reference drawings from the original site plan so he can make sure that the infrastructure including water main, storm sewer and septic system is adequate to service the proposed site plan. All driveway widths need to be increased to 12 foot which is the ordinance standard. Traffic circulation plan seems to be tight for a fire truck especially on the west side of the site without encroaching on the drive through lane. Mr. Laurencelle indicated to Mr. Ford that he will work with Boss Engineering to tweak the site to provide better access width and maneuverability. Mr. Ford stated that this site would be adding traffic into the que for the main entrance of Springfield Town Square. There are some criteria to determine if a traffic study is warranted. It is based on direction trips and the peak threshold is 100 trips, meaning 50 trips into the site and 50 out. If the anticipated trip generation exceeds that, the Planning Commission could request a traffic study. Before this point is reached, he would like to see the proposed trip generation numbers for the site which can be gained from the ITE Trip General Manual which bases it on square footage of the space. The traffic study could indicate that signal changes are needed and the Road Commission could set up cameras for traffic detection if there is a perceived problem. The north driveway at of the Kroger plaza is restricted for southbound only but it is painted. There are illegal left turns being made from that driveway and he suggested that perhaps a porkchop should be placed to force motorists to turn right only. This change would benefit the entire shopping center and possibly should be looked at further.

Mr. Cleary stated that he will review their response document which addresses the comments by both the Planner and Engineer. There is a reciprocal parking agreement that covers the parking spaces to the west and he will provide this. The applicant will add a loading space and loading times will be coordinated to avoid any conflicts. The lane widths on the west side will be clarified on the Final Site Plan and will be conforming. They will reduce the green area to accommodate the other lane. He pointed out the two pedestrian access points proposed. He pointed out an additional sidewalk that is existing on the site. There are mature shrubs along the north border that they would like to preserve and they don't want to take those out to put in sidewalk. They will add fencing detail in the Final Site Plan. He pointed out that there are benches for the community amenities and they will be adding a bike rack for the second amenity. They will provide the as-builts for the utilities as requested. He would like to explore the traffic impacts and the large vehicle circulation pattern. He stated that on Sheet 3A the proposed circulation pattern is shown going both clockwise and counter-clockwise. The template that was used was a large ladder truck. With the location of the dumpster, they tried to remove the garbage truck out of the equation because it can pull in and back out at the corner. The fire truck does work but does get into the drive-thru lane. If there is anyone in that space, the car would have to move. At the southwest corner, they can square it up a little bit but then there are getting into the setback distances.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he would like input from the Fire Chief regarding this item. The template used was a ladder truck and the Township does not have a ladder truck. He suggested that the applicant might have enough distance with the largest truck that Springfield has.

Mr. Cleary concurred. He stated that they would want to use the largest straight body truck as the template.

Mr. Ford stated that if the drive lane is open, there is room to negotiate the site. If there are vehicles in the drive-thru lane, he would like the Fire Department's input regarding having to use the drive-thru lane to meet the requirements.

Commissioner Hopper agreed.

Mr. Cleary stated that they will look at it more closely and agreed to get the Fire Chief's input.

Commissioner Pliska asked about the end parking spots closest to the ingress and egress point. He could see a scenario where those spots are taken by a large vehicle and they are in the way of the emergency access.

Mr. Cleary stated that the dimensions of those parking spaces are as per ordinance. He stated that they will look at it though.

Mr. Lewan stated that it would be helpful to hear from the Fire Department as to where they would park a fire truck because he is not sure they would use the internal drive.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the longest truck that the Township has is a tanker and they would not need to use a tanker here because there is a water source.

Mr. Cleary stated that the other item that they wanted to address is the traffic impacts. They do have specific projected numbers for Dunkin' Donuts and the TIS report from the Speedway proposal and the IT Manual. They used actual numbers where they could and looked at possible scenarios for the other two tenants. They used a fast food store without a drive-thru and an apparel or office use.

Mr. Laurencelle offered that the other two tenants would be low traffic generation uses like a vitamin shops, hair salon or dry cleaners.

Mr. Cleary stated that even taking the worst-case scenario and combining all the tenants, they are still about a third of the daily trips that the previous Kroger gas station generated. He stated that Dunkin' Donuts is busiest from 6 am to 9 am and then drops off considerably. The traffic that is going to be generated is less than what was there and then the entire intersection was reconfigured at that time. They are generating less than what was there, and they would like to avoid off-site traffic improvements.

Chairperson Baker stated that the applicant needs to share that information that led them to the conclusion that they have made regarding traffic.

Commissioner Hines indicated that there are already problems at that light trying to get out from the complex and go north.

Commissioner Sclesky concurred and indicated that the worst times are in the afternoon. He understands that this will not be during the Dunkin' Donuts busiest times but there may be another business that comes in to replace Dunkin' Donuts and they need to make sure that it is planned appropriately regarding safety and traffic flow.

Commissioner Hines stated that even though it is not as heavy as Kroger gas, there are still additional vehicles trying to get into that lane.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if there was a formula for the in and out numbers and does it take into consideration people that are already in the plaza to attend another business too.

Commissioner Pliska concurred; you would want to separate unique trips versus overlapping trips.

Mr. Cleary replied that right now they are assuming that Kroger traffic would be minimal at 6:00 am and will get worse in the later morning and afternoon. When the other traffic for the complex is increasing, the Dunkin' Donuts traffic would be decreasing and would not have an adverse impact.

Mr. Ford commented that maybe it is detection and getting a camera on the most congested drive to maybe increase the green time. RCOC would need to rebalance it with the green time on Dixie Highway.

Commissioner Rusnell agreed that the drive with the light does get very busy in the afternoon but Dunkin' Donuts will be busiest in the early morning hours.

Commissioner Hines stated that if there is another fast food, not a drive through, it will contribute to traffic in the evening.

Mr. Cleary stated that when you don't have a drive through, the actual trips based off the ITE drop significantly. According to the Speedway and the ITE, in comparison to a gas station or a gas station with a convenience store, that traffic is much higher than traffic that could be generated by this proposal.

Commissioner Hines stated that they will have a lot of visibility in front and it depends on the uses they get in there. She asked why the variance was granted for 25% increase in parking in the front. She wondered why this was granted when they do have a reciprocal parking agreement with the Kroger parking lot.

Chairperson Baker replied that the size of the structure that was being proposed to accommodate all the setback and spacing requirements would create a structure that was so small that it was not going to provide adequate usage for the property. The applicant made the case for this dimensioning as their building and its placement on the property allowed for adequate use of the site.

Mr. Cleary stated that the parallelogram shape of the site makes it difficult to apply setbacks so there are constraints present in the property shape. If they moved the parking closer to Dixie Highway, this sets off the trigger to provide more landscaping and fencing detail. Through the Dixie Highway Guidelines, they provided extras to get setback accommodation. This would be keeping within the intent of the Guidelines.

Commissioner Hines commented that she understands that this is the reasoning behind the reduced greenbelt, but what about the increased parking. She is opposed to allowing them 25% more parking in the front of the building. She understands this is already ruled on.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if they purchased the out lot.

Mr. Laurencelle replied yes. He stated that there is no question that something could happen to the Dunkin' Donuts business down the road but the individual that is opening this store has 200 Dunkin' Donuts throughout the country and he is signing a ten-year lease.

Commissioner Mansour asked about the height and depth of the canopy at the drive through.

Ms. Horning replied that the canopy height is 9'6" and they will look at this when they get the truck specifics. It has a depth of 3'6" to 4' from the facade. If it is incorrect, they will fix it for Final Site Plan and she will review to make sure it is correct.

Commissioner Mansour stated that he is concerned about the loading.

Mr. Cleary stated that they will designate a spot for loading and it will be next to the dumpster and he pointed the spot out on the plan.

Commissioner Mansour stated that he liked the positioning of the building on the site.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that the parking area between the subject site in the bank is never used and suggested that the applicant secure use of four spots in the area from the bank. He asked if this was part of the parking agreement.

Mr. Cleary replied no; the area covered by the reciprocal parking agreement is the parking area to the west of the subject site.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that if the applicant used the area by the bank, it would be safer because a pedestrian could utilize the sidewalk along Dixie Highway.

Commissioners commented that pedestrians would probably just cut through the island and not walk around.

Mr. Laurencelle stated that he will speak to the bank regarding possible shared access. He does not ever foresee an issue where they will not have enough parking.

Chairperson Baker stated that the Commission would like to hear about any options that the applicant could offer. He agrees that he doesn't foresee a time when someone will pull in and find every parking spot taken except for the four located adjacent to the bank.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that the applicant did a really nice job on architecture and reflecting the intent of the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. He thinks the facade and building materials will look very nice on that site.

Commissioner Mansour asked how tall the letters are on the Dunkin' Donuts.

Ms. Horning stated that the specific signage plan will be provided at Final Site Plan. They are looking to meet the ordinance standards and are not looking to get a variance. She reviewed the building materials selected.

Mr. Lewan stated that the rear of the building also has some of the same elements that they are showing on the front since the back of the building will be highly visible from all visitors to the Kroger store.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he was concerned about the appearance of the rear of the building as well. It is highly visible.

Commissioner Mansour concurred.

Chairperson Baker asked how Mr. Lewan was envisioning a pedestrian would cross into the new development from the existing parking area.

Mr. Lewan stated that he didn't have a good answer for this area of pedestrian access or he would have included it in his review. He assumes that they will walk in the driveway and find their way to the front but there is a dumpster and drive lane right there. He doesn't know how you would route people through safely and that was his concern.

Chairperson Baker agreed.

Commissioner Mansour agreed. The sidewalk is the safest route and he doesn't see another safe access point. The safest route is to follow the sidewalk on the gas station side and then cross where there is pedestrian access.

Commissioner Hines asked if it was one-way or two-way circulation.

Ms. Horning stated that she would correct the plan.

Mr. Cleary clarified that on the east side, the aisle is two-way. The only strictly one-way is the drive-thru access drive.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the dumpster access and he asked for clarification on how this was being done. He is assuming that the truck will follow the Fire Department route.

Chairperson Baker thanked the applicant and indicated that the Commission does not make a motion on Conceptual Site Plans; the applicant received comments and suggestions that he could use when he comes back for Final Site Plan.

**2. Ordinance Amendment – Sec. 40-628. - Automobile repair facility, minor; automobile filling/convenience station; automobile filling/mixed use station; and automobile filling/service station. – Discussion**

Mr. Lewan reviewed the memo and ordinance amendments suggested for Section 40-628 that was provided in the Commission packets. He asked the Commission if there is any other standard that should be observed in this amendment.

Commissioners did not have any items to add.

Mr. Lewan summarized the three exhibits, Section 40-628, the ordinance section regarding off street parking and the definition section, which he doesn't recommend any changes to. He stated that it was suggested that they make the canopy height higher and he has suggested 25 feet. This is the standard for building height in the C-2 district. Supervisor Walls provided comment on the proposed ordinance changes and specifically, he indicated that there should be language to require the roof to more closely match the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. He agrees with adding language which is tied to the Guidelines if that is what the Commission wants to do. Mr. Lewan deleted the section suggesting that the canopy structures be an integral part of the main building and eliminated the section on phone booths. He added three standards to the list, #10, #11 and #12 and he explained those additions. He added the number of disabled cars to the repair facility standards. Mr. Lewan used four disabled cars and Supervisor Walls suggested two. If the business does minor motor vehicle repair, they could have a tow truck and he added language that would allow one tow truck that is truly an accessory to the repair facility. They could also add language to monitor distance between these types of facilities.

Mr. Lewan continued with the summary of the Exhibit B ordinance amendments which is the Off-Street parking. The requirement currently is one parking space per pump unit and the definition of "pump unit" doesn't currently exist in the ordinance. He suggested that the language be changed to "fueling position", so it would be one parking space per

fueling position. He also thinks they should consider counting those fueling position as parking spaces because most people will go to a gas station and leave their car in the fueling spot while they run in to get a coffee. He is suggesting that they also have some parking outside for people to park and go into the convenience store without fueling first. Mr. Lewan summarized Supervisor Walls' communication that was delivered today including suggestions about driveway width. He stated that he would like to take the Commissioners' comments into consideration and come back next month with actual language.

Commissioner Hopper commented that the road has a minimum height for vehicles. The Kroger canopy is 15'6" which is adequate for anyone. He is concerned about canopies that are pushed up to 22 feet and have a 3-foot canopy. He would like to keep it compressed and understands that 14 feet is wrong.

Chairperson Baker commented that Commissioner Hopper is talking about an under-canopy clearance.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that 15'6" should be the minimum height underneath the canopy, this is the standard that they have already allowed to happen. The canopy at General RV is approximately 16 feet minimum and looks great tied into the roof.

Commissioner Hines commented that the ordinance requires the canopy roof to mimic the roof structure of the main building.

Mr. Lewan concurred.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that if the minimum to the bottom of the canopy is 15'6" and the total height is 25 feet, he would not approve of a big box structure sitting on top of the canopy and he is in favor of the roof style that would match the main building.

Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Hines asked about the frontage required for service stations and did it also apply to all the other categories.

Mr. Lewan replied that he would make sure that this 150-foot requirement applied to all the categories.

Commissioner Hines agreed with the width of the driveway change.

Commissioner Sclesky agreed.

Commissioner Mansour stated that the new language allows one sales rack at the end of the pumps. He commented on the racks at the current Kroger station.

Mr. Lewan replied that the language is in the current ordinance and he read the current language and if Kroger is in violation, they are in violation of the current ordinance.

Chairperson Baker asked about the difference between vending machine and cooler.

Commissioner Pliska asked if the number of disabled cars was for minor or major repair of cars.

Mr. Lewan replied only minor; this entire section re-write is for minor only.

Commissioner Pliska commented on cars waiting for parts and suggested adding wording that called out cars in the repair process.

Commissioner Mansour stated that disabled to him is the removal of an engine and it is undriveable.

Commissioner Rusnell commented that in this case a customer might have to wait a couple of days for parts.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that he was in favor of four disabled cars.

Commissioner Pliska commented that there also might be a certain amount of liability if a car needs brakes and is unsafe, but the parts cannot be attained for a couple of days. If the business owner sends the vehicle away because he cannot leave it in the parking lot and something happens, it might be a liability.

Commissioner Hines stated that in the language, there are four parking spots per each service stall and she suggested that they tie the number of cars that can be stored to the number of service bays available.

Commissioner Hopper stated that minor repair facilities cover tires and he named other car repairs that this could cover. Major repair includes taking the engine apart. He believes that 72 hours for minor is adequate but keep it at four vehicles.

Mr. Lewan stated that this would only come up if it was a frequent violation.

Commissioners discussed Bridge Lake Auto as a major auto repair facility and other current facilities in the Township.

Commissioners discussed a facility like Belle Tire and the cars that need to be stored overnight for work the next day and the fact that two cars would not be adequate.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that a facility like this is minor motor vehicle repair facility.

Commissioners discussed the possibility to allow the number of disabled cars stored as it was related to the number of bays. They discussed having the number of disabled cars be a percentage of the total service bays.

Commissioner Pliska suggested adding storage inside and behind the building when available. This is where the cars are stored at the Belle Tire on Dixie Highway.

Mr. Lewan stated that he would use one car per bay for forty-eight hours.

Commissioners concurred.

Mr. Lewan indicated that he would change it to one per bay for 72 hours.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that each fueling position should be counted as parking spaces.

Commissioners agreed with this and agreed that one tow truck would be appropriate.

Mr. Lewan asked about the minimum distance between facilities item. The Supervisor suggested that it be deleted, and he agrees. The Commissioner agreed with Mr. Lewan's other language changes.

Commissioners discussed the number of sales racks allowed and the definition of vending machine. It is currently one rack allowed and Kroger exceeds this.

Mr. Lewan stated that he will leave the language about the racks as it is in the ordinance now.

#### Old Business:

### **1. Ordinance Amendment – Zoning Lot – Discussion**

Mr. Lewan provided a document showing the existing Zoning Lot definition and three definition options for consideration: one he created for Scio Township, one from the American Planning Association Zoning Glossary and the third is from the Illustrated Book of Development Definitions. Greg Need also provided a definition which was included in the packets. He indicated that he was not expecting the Commission to decide tonight. Greg Need would have to review the presented definitions.

Commissioner Mansour asked why land separated by drive is excluded in the definition.

Mr. Lewan stated that it is in the current ordinance and this is so you don't have a lot split by a road.

Commissioner Hines asked about the lot of record.

Mr. Lewan stated that lot of record is a platted lot and somewhere along the way platted lots were combined into what is now the definition of lot.

Commissioner Mansour asked if he had twenty acres that were separated by a driveway easement, would the entire property be considered a lot.

Mr. Lewan replied a driveway is fine; the language speaks to separation by a public or private road. If it was a private road easement, you couldn't do that. Most of the time you are not going to have a driveway easement on your own property.

Commissioner Hines asked about providing an easement on a 20-acre parcel so you can build a house on the back area.

Mr. Lewan replied you couldn't do that. The ordinance has rules and regulations about access strips.

Commissioner Mansour stated that he likes the Scio Township definition.

Mr. Lewan stated that the reason behind the amendment is to get rid of the definition of zoning lot because it was causing confusion. He wanted to provide a definition of "lot".

Chairperson Baker stated that they are looking for something straightforward and easily understood by the applicant or whoever is referencing this. His eye went to the very last definition and he questioned if that was too simplistic.

Commissioners discussed the reason behind the definition amendment and the recent Al Deeby Zoning Board of Appeals case.

Mr. Lewan stated that Greg Need, Township Attorney, was working on this. He put these additional definitions together because he knew that the Commission was going to be talking about it. He can send the suggestions to Greg Need because he is going to be the one that ends up writing it.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that this is the logical next step.

Chairperson Baker replied that this is a good idea. Mr. Need is suggesting deleting the definition of zoning lot and create a definition with wording to be determined. Mr. Need suggested "lot of record." He agreed that they should provide these suggested definitions to Greg Need and see if he has any comment on them.

Mr. Lewan agreed.

## **2. Ordinance Amendment – Zoning Official – Discussion**

Commissioners agreed that they would like to use the Zoning Official, option #2 as prepared by Greg Need and included in the packet. They indicated that they would like to postpone setting a Public Hearing for this item, so they can do these two items together.

Other Business:

**1. Priority Task List**

Commissioners reviewed the Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

**Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:48 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Vote: Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Rusnell, Sclesky. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

---

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary