

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes March 18, 2014

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the March 18, 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
Dave Hopper
Bill Leddy
Linda Whiting
Neil Willson

Commissioners Absent

Kevin Sclesky

Consultants Present

Doug Lewan, Planner, Carlisle Wortman, Associates

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

Public Comment: None

Consent Agenda:

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

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2014 meeting as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing: None

New Business:

1. Ellis Barn – Final Site Plan – Parcel ID #07-20-201-016

Jennifer Myers, Oakland County Parks Structural Engineer, summarized the Final Site Plan package. She stated that this is to use the Ellis Barn for special events such as weddings, antique shows and the Oakland County Fair. Preliminary site plan approval was already granted and since then they have completed some construction changes last year and they are planning to implement the final phase of construction modifications in the next couple of months.

Mr. Lewan summarized his review and analysis dated February 24, 2014. He stated that this project received Special Land Use approval with a number of conditions and all conditions are summarized in his analysis. He stated that the applicant has revised their plan since the initial submission and has made an attempt to fix some of the issues. Mr. Lewan stated that one of the conditions of Special Land Use approval was waiver of parking. The Planning Commission has the right to waive the paved parking requirement if conditions are met and those conditions are the parking lot is not going to receive daily use and it will not create dust issues for the neighbors. He stated that he has no problem with the waiving of the paved parking requirement and they recommend it be in the motion. He stated that due to the Special Lane Use approval, there will be special events at the site and a certain number of the attendees will be handicapped. The applicant is proposing 18 barrier free spaces and based on Mr. Lewan's calculations, it actually only requires 7 and they are recommending that these 7 barrier free spaces be paved. The applicant indicated that they would do this if required.

In previous discussions, there was discussion regarding restrooms and it was decided that the existing permanent restrooms would be used unless there is a large event at the site. If there is a large event, portable restrooms would be used. This needs to be approved by the Health Department. It appears that portable restrooms will be used throughout the summer and Mr. Lewan is recommending that the portable facilities be located on hard surface, whether it be pavement or compacted gravel. He suggested that this be in the motion.

Mr. Lewan stated that in regard to landscaping and following the site plan review standards, they require a landscape plan and this has not been submitted yet. He stated that existing vegetation may be used to meet the standards of the ordinance but this must be demonstrated by the applicant.

Mr. Lewan stated that in regard to lighting, he is aware that there is lighting at the site but this needs clarification. He asked the applicant to provide some clarification on the portable lighting towers for example when they are going to be used, how tall they are, etc. He asks the applicant to provide lighting cut sheets that show what the fixtures look like and details on the lighting towers. They did provide a photometric plan but they did not provide any description on what the lighting looked light. The ordinance requires full cut off fixtures in which the lighting source is not supposed to be visible from the light. This prevents glare going up in the sky and promotes downward directed lighting.

Mr. Lewan stated that according to our site plan review standards, building floor plans and elevations are required. The applicant addressed this in their revision. There are some

issues that have to be addressed by the Building Department prior to construction or obtaining building permit. Mr. Lewan stated that there were 10 items in his analysis that need to be addressed prior to the Planning Commission's satisfaction before approval. Mr. Lewan stated that some of these items have been addressed by the applicant through the items recently submitted. The applicant is asking for a waiver of the paved parking requirement but has indicated they will provide hard surface parking for barrier free spaces. Portable restrooms are shown and the applicant indicated that they are now located on hard surface. Applicant should describe what that hard surface is. The applicant will be requesting that the existing landscaping be used to meet the landscape standards. Mr. Lewan stated that typically, if someone said that, they would ask for particular type of plants as required by ordinance. This would not affect the layout of this project, but if the Commission is going to grant that type of waiver, they need more information including a landscape plan. The applicant should provide clarification on the use of portable lighting towers and the applicant did this. If the Planning Commission was looking at a brand new site plant in the Township all of the lighting would not be acceptable because none of the existing lighting is shielded. The applicant did provide the lighting cuts sheets are requested but the fixtures are not compliant because the lights are not shielded. The applicant needs to clarify the age of the fixtures and if they would be willing to shield any of these. The applicant provided elevation drawings and floor plans for table locations for various events like a wedding. The applicant has tried to address most of the comments, but still need to deal with paved parking waiver, using existing landscaping and the lighting issues. Mr. Lewan's recommendation is that the applicant needs to address these items to the Planning Commission satisfaction before approval.

Ms. Myers stated that they are requesting a waiver from the paved parking. They would like to request this for the entire site, but if not available for the barrier free sites, the applicant would provide hard surface as required by the Planning Commission. She stated that they do have a permanent location for the portable restrooms, however, it is grass and they will provide hard surface if that is the requirement. It is their intent to use the existing vegetation to meet the ordinance requirements and is shown to a certain extent on sheet C-2. She stated that this shows the buffering along the road to the west. She stated that all of the lighting is existing and the newer lights were put on the barn last June at the request of the Fire Chief wanting adequate lighting. She stated that she provided the lighting types on Sheet C-2 and it indicates how they are operated. The newest fixtures around the Ellis Barn are on a motion cell. The photometric plan shows that the applicant meets the lighting standards particularly showing the lighting falling away at the adjacent property line. The lighting fixtures are only used during Special Events not on a regularly scheduled basis.

Commissioner Hopper asked what type of hard surface was being proposed for the portable restroom area.

Ms. Meyers suggested a gravel surface, but they could put down a paved surface if preferred.

Commissioner Hopper concurred with Mr. Lewan regarding hard surface at portable restroom areas. He asked Mr. Lewan if he could meet the applicant on the site and look at the existing landscaping in reference to the requirements.

Mr. Lewan replied yes; they could meet and attempt to determine opacity. There are other standards like parking lot landscaping. He requested that the applicant provide a clearer idea of what they are requesting a waiver from. The landscape portion of the review is usually a very detailed part of the process.

Commissioner Hines asked if this would have been addressed when they put the barn there.

Mr. Lewan answered that he doesn't know if it was approved for landscaping when they put the barn there.

Supervisor Walls answered that he believes that it was. It would have been the same requirement at that time.

Mr. Lewan answered that he will try to verify that.

Commissioner Baker stated that if there was a landscape plan at that time and it was approved, does this still allow them to look at landscaping in reference to how it is going to be used and the time of day that it is going to be used.

Mr. Lewan answered that the Planning Commission can still look at it, however they should look at what they did in the past and what was approved in the past.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the status of the structural changes.

Ms. Meyers answered that they have approval from their Commission to go forward with the structural reinforcement and they have ordered the material but it is not here yet. They are trying to get the bulk of the construction done by the beginning of May but some of the construction is weather dependent and they need warmer weather. She stated that the lightning protection was installed last summer.

Commissioner Hopper asked about permanent restroom facilities.

Ms. Meyers answered that at this time they intend to use the existing permanent bathroom facilities and the portable facilities.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the lighting towers.

Mr. Lewan restated that the lighting cuts that were provided show that most of the light fixtures would not be allowed, that is why he asked the age of the existing fixtures. Any light fixtures that are installed new should meet the ordinance standards. The idea behind the lighting standards is to prevent glare from offsite and they need verification that this

glare will not occur. Some of the lighting that they show that does not meet ordinance standards is actually located between two buildings. They are willing to work with the applicant on this issue but what they provided is not permitted by the ordinance.

Ms. Meyer repeated her lighting comments. She agreed that most of the lighting is not full cut off meaning it shines in different directions other than down but the barn is well set back from its neighbors. Any light that might be shining up would only be happening during warm weather months and during special events. She indicated that during the warmer months, the sun is setting later in the day.

Mr. Lewan asked about the age of the lights. He visited the sites and he asked when some of the other lights were installed.

Mr. Donnellon replied that the lights were installed some time ago.

Mr. Lewan asked the applicant to verify approximate age of the lights.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the lift and the proposal for that lift.

Ms. Meyers answered that there are two issues with the lifts. The ramps are on the exterior so they are not providing access to the interior for barrier free and the second issue is that their "ramps" do not meet the code to actually consider them ramps. They are too steep and too wide between handrails.

Commissioner Whiting asked about wheelchair access to the 2nd floor.

Ms. Meyers indicated that they have alternate ways to provide accessibility; they would have assistance getting up. The process to obtain a lift starts with the judge sending a recommendation to the Barrier Free Design Board and they meet every two months. They take his recommendation and make a final decision.

Commissioner Whiting stated that the date of January 13th was incorrect; the date of approval for the Special Land Use was January 10, 2013.

Commissioner Leddy asked about the hours of use.

Ms. Meyers answered whenever it is rented. During the fair, it is during the hours of the fair. During a wedding, it would be during the wedding and reception.

Mr. Donnellon answered that they couldn't go beyond 11:00 p.m.

Commissioner Leddy asked what the person capacity is.

Ms. Meyers answered that they determined that the maximum would be approximately 300 people. They could post a maximum capacity if the Planning Commission wanted this posted. Sheet A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-5 showed possible room layouts for events. They

are planning on structurally reinforcing the barn so it meets current code requirements for assembly use; it is the same capacity for a new structure.

Mr. Lewan asked about the exhibition space layout.

Ms. Meyers answered that this was based on the actual layout that was utilized for the fair last year complete with individuals and display booths. They would have booths set up on both floors.

Mr. Lewan asked about the stable area.

Ms. Meyers answered that when the barn is not being used, these stables are empty. During the assembly time, sometimes there are booths set up and it is possible to set up a bar area here during a wedding.

Mr. Lewan asked if the applicant could clarify the floor plans with narrative. He asked about the height of the lighting fixtures and asked them to show it on the plan. The temporary lights were shown at 22 foot and this is allowed.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the portable lights are mentioned at 22 feet but can go up to 30 feet, but they indicated that they are only using two of the lights.

Mr. Lewan stated that he assumes that the county has a photometric plan for the whole site; this would be helpful to see.

Commissioner Baker asked if the photometric plan submitted accounts for the temporary lighting.

Ms. Meyers replied that sheet L-1, only shows site lighting without the temporary lights, but sheet SL-2 shows the temporary lights.

Commissioner Baker stated that he would be in support of waiving the paving requirements for the lot in general, but in providing a hard surface for the handicapped spaces. He stated that he supported a hard surface requirement for the portable restrooms area and would prefer either asphalt or concrete. He stated that with the introduction of lighting fixtures and evening activities that are outside of the fair week, they should provide some more details as to how this could impact the neighboring properties. He stated that he wanted to know what the people on Hall Road would see. He asked if there was a reason they would want to use lighting that is not more shielded.

Ms. Meyers answered that everything they submitted is existing; they are not proposing anything new for the lighting. They own 3 or 4 of the lighting towers and they would bring them out to the site depending on need.

Commissioner Hines asked if they were asking about landscaping for the entire site or just landscaping around the Ellis Barn.

Mr. Lewan answered that he would be looking for the area of influence around the barn. They are reopening this for site plan approval and they need to meet the requirements. They can get waivers from the requirements.

Commissioner Baker stated that there is a certain area around this barn that is going to have a use that it didn't previously have and he is interested to see if the applicant is going to change anything regarding landscaping.

Mr. Donnellon stated that he worked on the original landscaping for the Ellis Barn and it was deemed sufficient along Hall Road for opacity and the set back from the road is 160+ feet.

Commissioner Baker answered that they have nothing to look at so it is difficult to review. The barn that existed before had a certain use and at 9 p.m. during the summer, they knew that there was nothing going on there. Now, that has changed and it is important to evaluate the change from the residents' point of view and making sure that the plan is beneficial but takes into account the neighbors' status.

Ms. Meyers replied that they can put together a landscape plan.

Commissioner Leddy concurred with the hard surface requirements for the portable restroom area and if it is visible from Hall Road, it should have some type of screening maybe put them on the east side where they are not visible.

Commissioner Hopper stated that they need a landscape plan because every applicant is required to submit one and they are not an exception. He concurred with the hard surface requirement for portable restrooms and paving 7 handicapped spaces. He stated that the building code requirements have to be evaluated by the Township Building Official and this would be examined prior to any permits being issued. The biggest issue is the lighting plan and he would want to make sure that anything new meets the Township ordinance.

Mr. Lewan stated that it sounds as if the Commission is fine with the existing landscaping then it would be okay to recommend a waiver of those landscape requirements adding that they would want to insure that the landscape perimeter meets Township standards for a buffer and to require him to look at that. He would prefer that the condition does not leave it just up to him. He reviewed lighting options that the Commission could put in the motion.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she likes the idea of considering them nonconforming now and when anything is added new, it must conform to ordinance standards; this is a good compromise.

Commissioner Hines and Commissioner Leddy concurred.

Commissioner Hopper moved to APPROVE Final Site Plan to Oakland County Parks and Recreation for the Ellis Barn which would allow its use at Springfield Oaks Park as a Special Use Facility. The Ellis Barn is located on Parcel #07-20-201-016.

This final approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Being that the applicant is not proposing a wet fire suppression system, code compliance verification and subsequent building permit must be obtained and all work completed prior to any use as a Special Events Facility including any structural work as detailed in the structural engineer's report as provided to the Township.**
- 2. Waive hard surface requirements for parking for all but seven (7) handicapped parking spaces per Section 40.681(1)(h)(1) however require hard surface at the portable restroom location as outlined on the plans.**
- 3. Applicant is pursuing an exemption by the Michigan Barrier Free Design Board and applicant must provide exemption to the Township prior to use as a Special Events Facility. If no exemption is given, applicant must meet Building Code Requirements prior to its use as a Special Events Facility.**
- 4. Provide landscape plan by applicant and verification by Township Planner that the existing vegetation meets the screening between land uses requirements of Section 40.721 prior to its use as a Special Events Facility. Waive any additional landscaping required under ordinance.**
- 5. The applicant has provided elevation drawings and some potential use details on floor plan but applicant needs to provide Township with additional narration on potential floor plan use.**
- 6. Two photometric plans have been provided which appear to meet ordinance Section 40-888 requirements and lighting details have been provided. Applicant must provide Township with plans showing any new lights and how they meet Township ordinance requirements, attempt to provide age of existing lighting that applicant is proposing to utilize for this proposal and any new or future lights must meet ordinance requirements as existing lights might not conform to current ordinance requirements.**
- 7. Maximum occupant loads have been provided and these must be verified by the Township Building Official and all prior Special Land Use Requirements remain in effect.**

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

Old Business:

1. Strategic Plan – Update

Mr. Lewan stated that at this point they are in the midst of working on the Dixie Corridor Utility Plan. This is closely related to the Strategic Plan and as they got into the preliminary draft of the Utility plan, they discovered that they are covering the same issues. It is their preference at this point that they go forward with the Dixie Utility Plan and get it finished to help them determine how it will impact the Strategic Plan. Because of that and the information that they are getting from the Utility Plan, as he got into the Strategic Plan he was provided with information from Dick, Collin and Sally he realized that there was an ongoing effort on Dixie Highway that was never completed that goes back to 2007 or 2008. It went through fits and starts and the direction of that started as a planning document, it became clear that utilities were a key issue. This was before he was with the Township so he was not aware of all of the work that had gone into the Dixie Corridor Plan. He stated that they have to reconsider their focus for the Strategic Plan but what they have worked on to date is fine and they will use it going forward. We have a Dixie Utility plan that is part of a bigger plan that was never adopted. It is his preference to convene a committee made up of Planning Commissioners, Collin, himself with Dick Carlisle's input and use the launch of the Utility Plan to get the Dixie Corridor Plan finished. He stated that they should look back at what they wanted to accomplish but didn't and use this as a springboard going forward with Master Plan review. After the last meeting, he relayed some of the comments that were made and Dick Carlisle gave him the Dixie Corridor Plan file. He stated that he had launched into a major Master Plan renovation or update and they really need to take a step back. He stated that he would recommend developing a committee before the next meeting and prioritize where they are going.

Commissioner Baker stated that it makes sense and he asked about having a sub-committee moving this quicker to a level where the Planning Commission can look at it.

Mr. Lewan answered that it could be one meeting but he suggested starting with a sub-committee meeting so they could determine a clear direction.

Commissioner Baker verified that if there are 4 Planning Commission members, it has to be posted so they want to have a group smaller than that, so 3 members maximum. He asked if anyone felt that it would be an exclusion for the 4 that weren't involved.

Supervisor Walls stated that one of Mr. Lewan's comments, that the Strategic Plan was fine, is not unanimous. It is very clear that there are 3 or more definitions of the Strategic Plan and what they are trying to accomplish. If 3 of them could get together and begin with that goal, they can determine what they want to accomplish with the Strategic Plan. He is also concerned about moving forward assuming that they have consensus and they do not. They have isolated comments, one or two individuals that seem to agree, and we

are moving forward in thinking that there is a consensus. Before we move much further on a Strategic Plan, we need to make an attempt to define what we are trying to do.

Commissioner Baker stated that he understands this, just wants to be sensitive to the needs of the entire Commission.

Supervisor Walls stated that the sub-committee will probably do nothing more than bring back a report to the full Township Board and full Commission as to what the direction and what steps they need to take.

Commissioner Hopper concurred.

Commissioner Leddy suggested that they have someone from the Dixie Corridor.

Supervisor Walls answered that it has taken us five years to attempt to accomplish what the property owners requested in 2009. He stated that we are talking about the Strategic Plan. He has a draft of the Dixie Highway Utility Study on his desk. His assumption and goal is that the Planning Commission will have this document to review by the next meeting and they will have the Corridor Plan finished at least by November 2016.

Commissioner Willson asked if it would make more sense to have the three individuals who have a different definition of a Strategic Plan come to the Planning Commission and present their ideas.

Supervisor Walls answered that none of the 3 are on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Willson stated that his experience with Strategic Plans in the automotive industry for 30 years is that this is a common issue. The person that presents the idea of a Strategic Plan thinks all of the ears are hearing the same thing and they don't. Until they can get some agreement on this, a sub-committee meeting would be monumental waste of time. They have to first come to an elementary agreement of what a Strategic Plan is.

Supervisor Walls stated that he will put an end to the project before they continue to spend money without an obvious goal. He asked if all of the Commissioners are positive that each of them understands exactly the same idea as Mr. Lewan on the direction they are going and what they hope to accomplish.

Commissioners agreed that they did not.

Supervisor Walls stated that they need representatives of the Planning Commission along with himself and Laura Moreau to work together.

Commissioner Baker stated that they have to have something that is tangible that they can look at and offer comment on. Right now, there are a lot of different opinions but there is nothing concrete.

Supervisor Walls stated that there were a lot of different assumptions.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the sub-committee can work together to establish a common goal.

Commissioner Whiting stated that it sounds like they started getting the cart before the horse. She asked if they first needed to look at the Utility Plan, then the Dixie Corridor Plan and then they can branch out.

Mr. Lewan stated that he thinks so. He was looking at this as an overall launch to a Master Plan update and this is a very standard way to launch this type of update. He stated that the Dixie Corridor Plan and Dixie Utility Plan being out there, it makes sense to address those and make sure that no matter how they do the Strategic Plan, make sure that their process is agreed upon and that they are all rowing in the same direction. He stated that he assumed they were working on a Master Plan Update and how they get to the steps, or whoever took whatever Strategic Plan class, he is okay with getting together and figure out how they are going to do this.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she likes the idea of the sub-committee then there is something to bring to the Board for them to focus on.

Commissioner Hines confirmed that Mr. Lewan is asking them to put together a sub-committee to finalize the Dixie Corridor Plan.

Mr. Lewan agreed that this should be the initial focus.

Commissioner Hines stated that this would be a part of the Strategic Plan and Master Plan update.

Mr. Lewan replied he thinks so.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they will have a chance to voice their opinion when it is presented.

Commissioner Willson asked if the focus is to nail down or settle the sanitary system.

Mr. Lewan replied no; this is part of a completely separate report which will become a part of whatever they do.

Supervisor Walls stated that the Utility Plan Report has in it an analysis and costs for the various easily assumed connections to the various water and sanitary systems. They range from 3 to 4 million to 6 to 8 million. This report also contains options from biological treatment to mechanical treatment and water systems that are both potable and unpotable. It also gives information regarding fire suppression. It will help the Township to get rid of the assumption that you just go down the street and hook up to the sewer and it will give developers another option that they can work with. He stated that this essential

information also can apply to a residential development on Ormond Road or a potential multiple development that is not necessarily on the Dixie Corridor. It is an essential planning tool that can and should be used for anything other than a single family house in the Township.

Commissioner Hines reiterated that it would be a utility planning study report. It is not necessarily inserted into the Dixie Corridor Plan.

Supervisor Walls stated that this was still their intent but the standards can be applied at many other locations.

Commissioner Willson asked if the report was done.

Supervisor Walls stated that that is next on the agenda, but the preliminary plan is on his desk, Doug's desk and Dick Carlisle's desk.

Commissioner Baker stated that the recommendation is the formation of a sub-committee.

Supervisor Walls asked what was the topic of the sub-committee discussion.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that the topic that the sub-committee will work on is moving forward with the strategic plan.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she thought it was the Dixie Corridor Plan.

Mr. Lewan stated that right now they are working on a strategic plan and it is not going in the direction that some would like so to him this is the starting point. What are the agreed upon steps of what a strategic plan should be, etc?

Commissioner Baker confirmed that the sub-committee would be made up of Commissioner Whiting, Commissioner Baker, Commissioner Willson, Supervisor Walls, and Doug Lewan with input from Dick Carlisle.

2. Dixie Corridor Plan – Update

Mr. Lewan stated that this agenda item should have been the Dixie Highway Utility Plan and he now has a copy of the first draft. They have completed the draft and it is under review and it is his goal is that this will be a main topic on the April agenda.

3. Mining and Extraction Ordinance Amendments - Update

Mr. Lewan stated that a copy of the letter sent to the representatives of Edward Levy to ask them for comments on ordinance amendments being proposed particularly how it relates to operations. This letter was sent and he never received a response. He sent an email to the representative today and he did receive a response from the representative

saying that he did receive the letter and they would try to put together a response by the end of the month. This item is progressing, but probably will not be ready by the April meeting.

Old Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and made updates and revisions to the current Priority Task List. Mr. Lewan stated that he is planning for the sign ordinance amendments to be a May agenda item with the administrative ordinance amendments to be on the April agenda.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Whiting moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 PM. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting, Willson. Voted no: None. Absent: Sclesky. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary