

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes July 18, 2017

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the July 18, 2017 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:

Commissioners Absent

Dean Baker
Ruth Ann Hines
Dave Hopper
George Mansour
Jason Pliska
Kevin Sclesky
Linda Whiting

Consultants Present

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

Staff Present

Collin Walls, Supervisor
Erin Mattice, Planning Administrator

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the June 20, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Hines moved to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2017 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

None

New Business:

1. Conceptual Site Plan Review, Progressive Irrigation, 4584 Clawson Tank Drive, Parcel #07-36-401-010

Mr. Jim Simpkins, applicant, introduced himself to the Commissioners. He stated that they are trying to establish a site for his business. They want to house the employees and equipment on the site. They are an irrigation business primarily doing irrigation installation, service and property maintenance as well as cutting grass, mulching and snow plowing.

Mr. Doug Lewan reviewed his review letter dated June 22, 2017. The site has a fair amount of vegetation and at Final Site Plan review, the areas to be preserved and the areas to be cleared should be clearly shown. The applicant is proposing five land banked parking spots that are included in the total number of required parking spaces. Fourteen parking spaces are required and the applicant is proposing that five of those spaces will be land banked. The Planning Commission can waive parking space requirements and usually that is done if the applicant can show that they only need the amount of parking that they are proposing. If a need does arrive later, there should be an area designated for those spaces that can be added at that time. Safety path easements should be added along Clawson Tank Drive and Andersonville Road. Outside agencies permits should be submitted with Final Site Plan submittal including Oakland County Health Department for septic and Road Commission for the new driveway. There is a driveway shown on the plan that shows a temporary gravel entry to the site from Clawson Tank Drive and they will need a note on the Final Plan that this entry drive will be paved after construction and that there is a proper cross section showing that pavement. At Final Site Plan review they will require a complete landscape plan, detailed photometric plan, signage details and information regarding the building façade materials. In the review, he provided all of the requirements for Springfield Township's landscape ordinance for the applicant's use in preparing their landscape plan. He concluded that this plan is ready to move on to the Final Site Plan stage.

Mr. Randy Ford provided a summary of his report dated July 6, 2017. The proposal is to sheet flow drainage towards the rear of the site and a basin will be sized in accordance with the Township standards for two 100 year back to back storms. There are preliminary detention calculations on the plan demonstrating volume that satisfies the Township ordinance. He stated that the plan shows swales along the sides of the property diverting drainage from the front site which is going to be the developed area back to the basin. There are preliminary grades but he questioned the amount of grading that is being shown and if it is necessary. At Final Site Plan, there should be more definition as to what needs to transpire with regard to the grading. The applicant should come back and indicate what the purpose is of stripping the site of all vegetation. He stated that there are leeching basins being proposed at the bottom of the detention basin and there is some preliminary indication of the test holes that were dug and the soil types present. One of the ordinance requirements is to demonstrate percolation and when they come back for Final Site Plan, the applicant will need to provide calculations. There is a curb cut proposed off Clawson

Tank Drive which is under Road Commission and for Final Site Plan, the applicant will need to provide copy of approved permit application from RCOC. There is some cross-section information provided which does conform to Township ordinance requirements. They are showing a large area of gravel storage on the plan. The ordinance requires that if the applicant wants to deviate from the paving requirement, they must seek a variance from the Township Board to get the paving requirement waived. The site will be serviced with an onsite septic system and at Final Site Plan the applicant must provide correspondence from the OCHD regarding the septic. Clawson Tank Drive has a water main constructed with an intergovernmental agreement between Springfield and Independence Township. There is a water main on Clawson Tank Drive for fire protection. The applicant must approach Independence Township and pay all applicable fees to connect to this water supply. They must provide Springfield Township with documentation showing that the fees have been paid.

Mr. Simpkins stated that they are clearing the site to land balance the site for drainage and flow. Once they have their business established and they continue to grow, they will not have to bring in heavy equipment to haul the rubbish out which would cost them more in the long term. He stated that to start with a clear grade it is the best way to go because it gives them a clean canvass to work with and to bring in new vegetation and get everything to balance properly. He is the owner of the land and he wants to clear it properly and get rid of rubbish. There are two large trees on Clawson Tank Drive that he would like to preserve. He asked if the Planning Commissioners got a landscape plan in the packet.

Commissioners and Mr. Lewan confirmed that they did not receive a landscape plan.

Chairperson Baker confirmed that the landscape plan is not required for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Ford stated that it is an ordinance requirement to maintain the natural topography to the extent possible. The applicant is saying that mass grading is required for land balancing but Mr. Ford does not see that type of grade on the site. As the applicant moves forward, he can come back with some type of analysis to demonstrate that it is needed and why.

Mr. Simpkins stated that he has to clear the area to get to the Township's requirements, that is what they are looking to do.

Mr. Ford stated that the applicant must demonstrate that there is a need to clear the site. If balancing is what the applicant is suggesting, it still must be demonstrated.

Commissioner Whiting asked how would the applicant demonstrate that.

Mr. Ford answered a cut fill analysis and they are lacking this type of detail at this point.

Commissioner Mansour asked the applicant what type of debris is on the site.

Mr. Simpkins replied overgrown vegetation. There are no trees back there worth keeping; the only trees he is interested in keeping are the before mentioned trees on Clawson Tank Drive.

Commissioner Sclesky asked if the landscape plan showed these two trees.

Mr. Simpkins answered no. They are in the front part of the greenbelt area which is outside of the proposed landscape plan.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the landscaping planned along Andersonville Road.

Mr. Simpkins answered that it will be screened with a cedar 6-foot privacy fence. On the outside of that fence would be landscaping all of the way down Andersonville Road greenbelt including trees, shrubs and flowers.

Commissioner Sclesky commented that there were 23 trees planned along Andersonville Road.

Mr. Simpkins concurred. The planting that he is planning will dress up the area. He asked the Commissioners if they had the drawing of the building.

Commissioners indicated that they did not have the elevation for the building in their packet.

Commissioner Mansour noted that the privacy fence should screen the dumpster.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the business will have four office employees, one maintenance crew consisting of three people, four mowing crews with two people per crew and six irrigation technicians. He concluded that there are 21 total employees. He is assuming that the front parking lot is for the office staff. The other 17 employees would park in back. He stated that this is allowed but Mr. Simpkins would have to get a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to provide employee parking or he could pave some parking spaces in back for the employees.

Mr. Simpkins stated that this area will be screened with a gate.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the ordinance doesn't differentiate between visible or not; it just differentiates that you are parking employee cars on gravel.

Mr. Simpkins asked what is the concern with parking on gravel.

Commissioner Hopper and Mr. Ford answered that it is an ordinance requirement.

Chairperson Baker stated that there concerns with parking on gravel and having high volumes of traffic moving in and out creating dust, airborne items that leave your property. It also creates the potential for ruts and generally creates unsightly

circumstances. If you have consistent use of a parking area, there are issues with safety, dust management and the maintenance of the whole area.

Mr. Simpkins stated that Clawson Tank has gravel parking with trucks that come in daily and he asked how this compares with them parking a handful of employees in the back of the site. His plan is to comply with the ordinance within reason in the Township.

Chairperson Baker clarified that complying with the ordinance is required.

Commissioner Mansour confirmed that he could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals to ask for the variance for gravel employee parking. If they approve it, he can keep the gravel parking for employees.

Mr. Lewan added that he could also pave it; there is no guarantee that the variance is going to be granted.

Chairperson Baker stated that the applicant has proposed the banking of parking and the Planning Commission would need to decide if they are amenable to that which does allow them to have parking without paving it right now.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he assumes the office employees are going to park in the front by the office but he doesn't know how much foot traffic the business is going to have.

Mr. Simpkins clarified that they are not a retail company.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he would be amenable to land banked parking as long as there was room for it if something changed.

Commissioners agreed with allowing the applicant to have the five banked spaces.

Mr. Simpkins asked if the borings are shown on the site plan.

Mr. Ford replied that the soil types are on there but there are percolation calculations needed that show how long it will take to de-water the basin.

Chairperson Baker stated that there is an ordinance obligation for the applicant to designate an area where a safety path could be placed in the future. He confirmed that the applicant should show a place reserved for a safety path down Andersonville Road and Clawson Tank Drive on the Final Site Plan.

Mr. Simpkins asked if this would be on his property or on the easement with the County.

Mr. Lewan stated that typically the easement is on the subject property and should not be built on.

Chairperson Baker confirmed that this safety path easement is not a part of the road right of way.

Commissioner Hopper stated that it would have been helpful to see the elevations and landscape plans.

Mr. Lewan stated that Commissioner Hopper counted the anticipated employee count at 21 and wondered where they would be parking. Commissioner Hopper concluded that four employees would park in the front as they are office employees and 17 would be expected to park in back. He noted that the Commission was okay with the five land banked spots, but he stated that if these spaces are not banked, this would take care of some of the parking issue and they might meet requirements.

Mr. Simpkins stated that he is also looking at appearance and that is why the back is gated and sealed. He stated that he can go to the ZBA and address the concerns with the gravel parking area. It is not an option to increase parking in the front for him. He asked for confirmation that there is city water at the site.

Mr. Ford replied yes.

Chairperson Baker stated that the applicant may want to give the landscape plan to Doug Lewan so that he could provide feedback on it.

2. Final Site Plan Review, Maple Grange, Ormond Road north of Scott Road, Parcel #07-19-226-025, 07-19-226-016, 07-19-226-017

Jim Sharpe, Sharpe Engineering, introduced himself to the Commission. Dave Miller, Builder, introduced himself to the Commission.

Mr. Sharpe stated that they have made amendments to the previous plan based on review and comments from the Commission, Township Board, Engineer and Planner. They are proposing 23 units in this development with a significant amount of open space. Details involving the retention and detention ponds were reviewed during a meeting with the Township Engineer and they have worked through discrepancies. He stated that they have obtained the road permit from RCOC and have a soil erosion permit that has been approved but they have not picked up yet. Another significant item was about a potential connectivity between a couple of wetlands found in the northeast portion of the site. MDEQ determined that those were not connected and the email from them should be contained in the Commission packet. He received the consultants' review letters.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated July 6, 2017. He provided a history of the approvals that this project has received. The only outstanding issue is the consideration by the Planning Commission regarding screening from adjacent residential properties. Units 22 and 23 were added and now are part of the development and adjacent to other residential properties with homes on Ormond Road. Per the zoning ordinance, some landscape screening is supposed to be provided where a site condo abuts single

family homes. There is an existing stand of trees that will screen most of the development from the residences, however the rear of Units 22 and 23 are not screened. He stated that they are recommending approval but the Planning Commission should discuss if a landscape screening should be provided to the rear of Units 22 and 23. Also, the Township Attorney will need to weigh in on the condominium documents. He assumes that Units 22 and 23 will have the fronts facing Grange Meadow and the rears facing the two existing residential lots on Ormond Road.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated July 7, 2017. Most of the issues that he had have been worked through with the applicant and the engineer since the Concept stage and these involved grading and drainage issues. He confirmed that the wetlands on the northeast of the site are not connected and this was confirmed by MDEQ. This freed them up to use the wetland area for necessary detention needed in the rear half. They can provide the necessary detention and following the best management practices they are integrating some fore bays too. They have met the Township requirements as far as storage volumes. A part of the review involved the soils report provided by the applicant and in summary, Pond A has the least conducive soils in terms of percolation. However, there is a means for the water to get over land if it doesn't percolate fast enough and this was demonstrated. He stated that with this submitted plan, there will be an overflow for Ponds B and C that will run down the Grange Meadow Drive roadside ditch out to Ormond Road and then out to the north and these are shown on the construction plans. The approved permit has been received from the Road Commission. The internal roads are going to be private and they do meet AASHTO requirements for public road standards. The Township ordinance requires that the driveways do not exceed 10% and there is a notation on the plans. The grading plan shows much more than what is necessary to construct the roadways. He stated that he wants this viewed as a master grading plan for the whole site with the understanding that they will be building these units individually. This is demonstrated on the grading plan submitted and Mr. Ford is satisfied with the plan. It is understood that they will not mass grade the entire site. All lots are individual wells and septs. The OCHD performed perc tests on all lots and they were all acceptable.

Mr. Lewan clarified that the screening requirement from single-family to single-family may be designated by the Township.

Mr. Sharpe stated that the only outstanding comments is the screening behind Units 22 and 23. It is all residential and similar uses and it doesn't appear to them that landscaping should be required.

Mr. Miller commented that Units 22 and 23 were added to the development later in the plan after comments from the Township Board were received. The intent of the ordinance is to screen and protect residents from more dense application than what they are doing. They did not change the footprints of Units 22 and 23; they are still 1.5 acres each with retention areas. He is not changing the density and he does not believe these lots require additional screening. He would consider pulling the lots out of the plan if the Township requires additional screening.

Commissioner Sclesky asked about the Township Attorney's comments on the condominium documents because he did not see them in his packet.

Chairperson Baker stated that this evaluation will be given to the Township Board when this plan goes on to them for their review.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the screening requirements apply because the applicant decided to go with the cluster option. It is higher density than what is allowed. He stated that if Mr. Miller pulls Units 22 and 23 out of the plan, Mr. Miller would lose the Special Land Use approval from the Township Board. The inclusion of Lots 22 and 23 was one of the conditions of approval and he questions why Mr. Miller would do that.

Commissioner Hopper noted that having units 22 and 23 gives less curb cuts on Ormond Road and this is a benefit.

Commissioner Hines stated that she does not think the additional screening is necessary because they are not changing the density along Ormond Road. These houses are not encroaching any more than a standard development.

Mr. Lewan stated that the ordinance requires the consideration of additional screening if it abuts equal or lower density. He would say this case abuts equal density and it says the Planning Commission and/or Township Board may require screening.

Commissioner Hines stated she does not believe screening is required. .

Commissioners Pliska and Whiting and Chairperson Baker agreed that the two lots do not need any additional screening.

Commissioner Mansour complimented the applicant on the plan. He stated that the posts delineating open space were missing on Unit 6, Unit 10, Unit 11 and Unit 22 and Unit 23.

Mr. Miller concurred.

Commissioner Sclesky moved to recommend approval to the Township Board for the Final Site Plan of the Maple Grange Condominium Development located on the east side of Ormond Road north of Scott Road. The proposed cluster development enables the preservation of significant wetlands, woodlands and steep slopes on the site. Additionally, we find that the proposed development is in substantial compliance with Springfield Township Cluster Housing qualifications and site plan standards. We would ask that the soil erosion permit be demonstrated at the Township Board level as well as any concerns and Township Attorney's comments. It was determined by the Planning Commission that no additional screening would be necessary to the abutting Units 22 and 23. Supported by Commissioner Hines. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

3. Final Site Plan Review, Outdoor Expressions, 8190 Old White Lake Road, Parcel #07-36-451-031

Mr. Jim Scharl, Kieft Engineering, introduced himself to the Commission. The overall development includes an additional building but now they are looking for approval of Phase 1 which is construction that will house their business and office space and some bays for truck parking. There will be an area for outdoor storage of their equipment and materials used in day-to-day business. The plan should have showed a screening fence along the front because it will be located there. It is part of the ordinance and is shown on three sides but not along the front and it should have been. It will be an opaque fence as required by ordinance and will screen the outdoor storage. They have submitted storm drainage plans, grading plans and Mr. Ford has reviewed these. This is a complex site because it does not have any storm drain outlet. They have put in a large below ground storm sewer system to meet the Township ordinance. He understands that the applicant must go to the Township Board to get a waiver to utilize the underground storage but there is no alternative. This system is engineered design and backed by reports that it can handle all drainage of the entire site. He received the reviews from Doug and Randy and will address those comments.

Doug Lewan summarized his review dated July 6, 2017. The applicant is proposing a large outdoor storage area. The materials to be shown are generally shown on site and those consist of equipment parking and bulk material like stone, etc. On page 3, he provided the requirements for screening of the outdoor storage. There is greenbelt landscaping proposed between White Lake Road and the outdoor storage area. Mr. Scharl now indicates that a fence is proposed along White Lake Road. This would address the requirement to be screened on all sides. He stated that he would like to see that fencing detail. He stated that the applicant is proposing above ground fuel storage and the Township does have some requirements for secondary containment for the tanks and some additional detail is needed regarding the secondary containment, Section 40-890. He suggested that the applicant could address what types of trucks would be coming and going from this site and if it was a very large vehicle, it appears there might be a conflict with the entrance drive. A RCOC permit will be required for the new driveway location with some detail about the entry gate proposed. There was some discussion during Concept about the safety path construction at this site. It was determined that it is highly unlikely that a safety path will be located there but the Commission discussed some type of payment in lieu of safety path or an easement dedication. The Health Department must provide the permit for the site. This lot is industrial in nature and across the street is residential property. This is why the green belt landscaping is required when an industrial project is adjacent to a residential project there are certain screens that need to be met. Alternative number three would be required in this case and to meet this requirement, additional evergreen trees would have to be provided. This is different from the outdoor screening requirement. Open space calculations need to be added and there is additional information needed on the floor plan mezzanine area.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review dated July 6, 2017. The plans depict an extensive system of underground storage pipes. In addition, there is an open basin to the outlet of this system and the reason the applicant is going with underground storage is because the amount of building square footage makes them unable to achieve above ground storage. Because the ordinance requires a variance for below grade or underground storage, they must go to the Township Board to get this variance. The applicant provided a soils report from McDowell and Associates which showed favorable soils for the permeability. There are some percolation calculations provided by the applicant. The applicant has demonstrated the necessary storage and permeability of the soils in support of the Township ordinance requirements. He recommended that the applicant provide an oil/grease separator. The grading plan showed a difference in elevation in the corner of the site and the grades need to be corrected to make sure that they are not going to fill on the adjacent property. RCOC permit is required for the driveway approach. The OCHD permit needs to be provided for the well and septic. The water services need to be shown for the buildings. The fuel storage tanks being shown for Phase I need to include documentation showing they are following the appropriate rules including a double walled tank or secondary containment. The applicant's tanks are shown as double walls.

Chairperson Baker clarified that due to the size of the lot and the drainage obligations that are present, an above ground solution to drainage would take up an unreasonable amount of the lot to accommodate the necessary water management.

Mr. Randy Ford agreed. There is a lot of storage to be provided underground and they also show an above grade that gives them some additional storage capacity. This coupled with the permeability of the soils goes a long way to address the ordinance requirements.

Supervisor Walls stated that this is a use by right and does not go to the Township Board. It will only have to go to the Township Board for the underground storage aspect of the plan.

Mr. Scharl stated that they have the approved application from the Road Commission. They perked this site over a year ago and the soil conditions are excellent. They anticipate no problems with the Oakland County Health Department. He stated that Mr. Lewan had a comment regarding loading. The plan shows overhead doors and their vehicles will be driven straight in to be parked and worked on. As far as loading space is concerned, it is the entire gravel parking area where all the pallets are. They do not anticipate any vehicular problems.

Commissioner Hopper asked how the payment in lieu of safety path works.

Mr. Lewan stated that this was raised at the last meeting and the option would be an easement. At the last meeting, the discussion centered around the fact that an easement probably is not needed because there will never be a safety path here. In this case, the applicant puts funds in an account which would be used to construct a safety path somewhere else in the Township. They could determine an amount that would be equal to the cost of an equivalent path.

Mr. Scharl stated that this is in an area in which a safety path will never be constructed. He is familiar with the process but this is not a safety path priority area and will never be built.

Commissioners commented that it is in the ordinance.

Chairperson Baker agreed that a safety path will not be located here but there are options; either dedicate an easement for one, participate in the contribution plan or seek a variance.

Mr. Lewan clarified the ordinance stipulations regarding safety path easements.

Mr. Scharl stated that there is no room to put an easement so his suggestion would be to negotiate a fee for safety path located somewhere else.

Chairperson Baker asked what type of fence was being constructed.

Mr. Scharl responded that the front fence would be an obscuring fence and since they need to submit a detail of the gate, they can submit a detail of the fence too. With this obscuring 6 foot high fence, the landscaping plan stands on its own and will not need additional landscaping.

Mr. Lewan stated that the evergreens that he recommended would take the place of an obscuring buffer, however there are two different requirements. There is the outdoor storage screening requirement and a barrier between two conflicting land uses which they have here between industrial and residential. The Planning Commission can waive some of those standards under certain circumstances. If there is a full screening fence and the proposed landscaping, this possibly could serve the same purpose as the evergreen trees that he said were required in his report because this is adjacent to a residential property. If this plan is approved, he would be happy to work with the applicant prior to the start of construction.

Mr. Scharl confirmed that they are proposing a six foot high chain link fence on the other three sides but the front will be an opaque screening fence in addition to the landscaping that they show.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the trees that they are propose along the front are maple and he suggested that there should be additional landscaping especially during the winter because there are residences across the street. He suggested that instead of maples, they propose something that gives year around screening.

Mr. Lewan stated that they are supposed to provide 30 additional evergreen trees as per ordinance. He suggested some deciduous with some evergreens added.

Mr. Scharl stated that the residential area across the street is in another Township.

Commissioner Hopper reiterated that it is still residential use. It may not need more trees, he suggested changing the variety.

Mr. Scharl agreed with the combination of the fence, maple trees and some evergreens.

Mr. Lewan stated that he would work with a landscape architect to come up with a plan. The outdoor storage area shall be screened from all sides in a manner approved during the review process. If the Commission is okay with what is being proposed, then that is what is being approved. If there were less intense land uses around this property, the Commission would and could ask for greater screen around the other parts of the property too. There is a retaining wall in the back of the property which will screen to a certain degree in the rear. They are proposing just chain link fence on the sides.

Commissioners confirmed that they agree that chain link fence on the other three sides is acceptable.

Commissioner Hopper moved to grant Final Site Plan approval for Outdoor Expressions at 8190 Old White Lake Road subject to the applicant providing the Township with copies of Road Commission and Health Department permits, the applicant attaining and receiving a waiver to allow the underground storm detention as depicted in the site plan, the applicant establishing a payment in lieu of safety paths with the Township through Randy Ford of Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc., the applicant to address the screening alternate Number 3 with input from Carlisle Wortman, Associates prior to the start of construction because the Planning Commission feels that an alternative to the required alternative 3 can be obtained, applicant provide fence detail and further address the Engineer's and Planner's notes in their reviews. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

4. Final Site Plan Review, Springfield Industrial (Umbrella Holdings), 9732 Andersonville Road, Parcel #07-26-326-038

Mr. Scharl introduced himself to the Commission and provided an overview of the proposed plan. There are two existing buildings on the site and proposed with Phase 1 is one additional building which will be a contractor's building. The existing two buildings are not intended to be modified in Phase 1. He stated that Phase 1 of this plan is ready for Final Site Plan approval which will include the construction of one additional building and the construction of a gravel area around the fuel facility that will be used for truck storage, primarily Flo-Boys. These types of trucks ruin asphalt which is why the storage is proposed on a gravel lot. Most of the storm drainage is being constructed at this point for all phases. There is no storm drainage retention required with this plan because of the nature of Valentines Industrial Park which had regional storage provided for when it was recorded. This plan varies from the previous plans in that now they have provided for two areas of storm water which will help purify storm water management process prior to

discharge into an existing storm sewer. He stated that they have received approval from the Road Commission for the approach. The soil conditions in the proposed septic area are excellent so there will be no problems with Oakland County Health Department.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated July 6, 2017. He stated that the fuel tank should be shown on the existing conditions page. They should also provide information regarding a secondary containment system for this tank. Last time this project was in front of the Commission there was a lot of time spent considering if a hard surface waiver could or should be permitted for the southern part of the site which is labeled on the site plan as storage and driver parking. There are specific standards that allow the Planning Commission to waive hard surface requirements and generally need to show that the area will receive limited use. He read this Ordinance section. The applicant is requesting gravel however if this area receives regular use, a waiver is not something that the Planning Commission could grant. A safety path easement should be shown. One is shown on the plan but it is within a drainage easement on the western side of the property. He thinks the Commission already discussed this and found it to be acceptable, but should be discussed tonight. The applicant will need to provide Oakland County Health Department approvals of on-site septic system. Also, the applicant should provide open space calculation on the landscape plan. The applicant should provide information on what the storm water detention basin will be planted with. The site plan does indicate poles for lighting and he wants to make sure that only the Phase 1 light poles will be installed now. The western property line has an issue with the amount of lighting proposed and the number of foot-candles need to be reduced slightly. Floor plans and elevations were provided for the new building being proposed but not provided for the existing buildings and since the notes indicated that there would be some changes within the existing buildings, he would like to see floor plans as to how they were going to change. He stated that most of these issues are relatively simple except for the Commission weighing in on the requested waiver of the hard surface paving for the large area south of the site.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated July 6, 2017. On site detention is not required for this site. However, they are showing the two greenbelt areas in front where the storm water is discharging prior to getting into the storm sewer. The applicant added a grease/oil interceptor in the last drainage structure. Ordinance requires that the sumps of the structures be three foot deep and this should be done. Applicant provided approved permit from the Road Commission for entrance improvements. Applicant addressed the ability of an emergency vehicle being able to maneuver behind the building through a truck template on the plan showing that this truck could circulate. Applicant should provide permits for both well and septic from Oakland County Health Division. Applicant should provide documentation showing NFPA rules are followed for the fuel tank. If they are not providing secondary containment, the tanks will have to be double-walled in accordance with State rules.

Mr. Scharl stated that the tank has been installed and approved so that is not a problem. There will only be two lighting poles installed and all the rest of the lighting is building mounted. He will adjust the illumination as Mr. Lewan suggested.

Chairperson Baker reiterated that the gravel parking proposed for the large trucks would also be parking for the employees coming to that site to drive those trucks. It would be considered employee parking on gravel.

Mr. Scharl indicated that they will be applying for a Zoning Board of Appeals variance in this regard. The primary reason is that the large trucks would destroy the asphalt and it needs to be gravel parking.

Chairperson Baker asked for the time table for Phase 2.

Jim Brown, 2563 Bender Avenue, Waterford, applicant, stated that it will take them approximately two years to put up the first building and after that, they would start Phase 2.

Commissioner Hopper asked Mr. Lewan if the Commission could waive the hard surface parking requirement except for employee parking.

Mr. Lewan answered yes. If the parking lot is receiving limited use and not used for employee parking, customer parking or primary access, the Commission can waive the requirement. And they would also have to determine that the gravel surface will not cause problems with regard to dust and gravel impacting neighboring properties. Also, if the hard surfacing will significantly increase storm water run-off which is not an issue here.

Commissioner Sclesky reiterated that the large flo-boy trucks would park there at night but during the day they are out doing deliveries.

Mr. Brown stated that the gravel surface currently is sprayed with an eco-friendly brine solution that holds it in place. It is sprayed monthly and keeps the dust down.

Mr. Scharl indicated that the trucks will also be moving at slow speeds because they will be maneuvering to park on this lot so not much dust will be generated.

Commissioner Sclesky stated that he believes asphalt put in this area would be destroyed in a short amount of time.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the differentiating item regarding this waiver and another site plan parking waiver that the Commission had seen.

Chairperson Baker replied that this is where the employee parking is and if employee parking is being done there, the Commission cannot waive the hard surface requirement. The applicant has already said he will apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals which would be appropriate in this case.

Commissioner Mansour asked how the gravel parking area is maintained.

Mr. Scharl answered that they re-grade as necessary.

Chairperson Baker asked how many trucks would be parked there.

Mr. Scharl answered between six and ten trucks.

Commissioner Whiting asked the applicant if the fuel tank is double walled and already approved. She also asked about health department approval.

Mr. Scharl answered yes. The site has been perked but they still need to provide the Health Department with details regarding water usage. The soil conditions are excellent.

Commissioners agreed that the safety path easement could be co-located in the drainage easement.

Commissioner Whiting moved to approve the Final Site Plan for the Springfield Industrial (Umbrella Holdings), 9732 Andersonville Road, Lots 18 and 19 of Valentines Industrial Subdivision, M-2, Heavy Industrial with the following conditions which can be checked administratively:

- **Applicant will revise existing site plan to include existing fuel tank**
- **Applicant will provide documentation to the Township showing that the containment for the fuel tank has been met**
- **Applicant understands that they will apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals to request waiving hard surface requirement**
- **Commission agrees to share the proposed safety path and drainage easement**
- **Pending approval from the Oakland County Health Department for site septic and water systems**
- **Applicant adds the open space landscaping calculations to the landscape plan**
- **Applicant should provide detailed information on the storm water detention basin seed mix**
- **Applicant decrease lighting levels on the western property line to below 0.5 foot candles**
- **Applicant should provide floor plans and elevations for the existing buildings**

Supported by Commissioner Pliska. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

5. Conceptual Site Plan Review, Angona Construction – 9158 Dixie Highway, Parcel #07-14-476-027

Mike Angona introduced himself to the Commission. He stated that he was in front of the Commission a year ago and since that time, he went back and looked at the Dixie Design Guidelines and he is seeking Conceptual Approval of his submitted site plan. Last time, there was a concern with the look of the building and the use of the building. He stated that the look of the building was changed to look more like an office. This whole project

began with them trying to put an asphalt area for parking lot which they want to install for safety.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated June 30, 2017. One of the biggest concerns at the last meeting a year ago, was the use of the site. There was discussion as to if the new building would be considered a contractor's storage facility or something like that. Construction materials and contractor's storage facility is not permitted in the OS District. The applicant provided a little more information regarding the breakdown of uses in the proposed building. The Commission should make sure that the storage use is accessory to this office and not the primary use. If it is accessory and the building truly is office, then the use may be acceptable. The site plan floor area that was marked was not consistent with the percentages that the applicant provided. The building must be smaller or be moved because now there would be a front yard setback variance required and a setback variance on the north side. More information is needed on the paved parking area on the western side of the site. There is a note on the plan that says paved parking but it did not get striped. If it is parking area, that must be striped and sized for circulation. He calculated parking spaces to be 17 feet in width and they are supposed to be 18 feet. The driveway between the spaces is 30 feet and they only require 22 feet so this can be addressed. Applicant needs to address how vehicles are going to be loading and unloading on this site and this will help explain the use a little bit better. There appears to be a curb cut on the west side of the street entering Center Street and this curb cut is very close to Dixie Highway and should be moved to the north. There should be notes on how vehicles will get around the site, possibly some one-way signs could be located to help circulation on the site. The applicant shows sidewalk on the site and it should be extended to the eastern property line. Applicant should provide any permits from Road Commission. The on-site sidewalk should have a connection between the sidewalk and the building. Full landscape plan will be required at Final Site Plan and some comments were provided to guide the applicant in designing this plan. A landscape screen is required along the north and east property line because of the conflicting land uses. This property is within the Dixie Highway Overlay District and is subject to the Dixie Highway Design Guidelines. In addition to the building elevation that was provided, the applicant provided color photograph examples proposed. Applicant needs to provide more detail on exactly what he is proposing. He summarized additional items needed for Final Site Plan Review including: detailed existing conditions, grading, landscaping, detention planning, dumpster plan, lighting and photometric plan and dimensions for signage.

Mr. Angona asked why he is required to provide building design before they are even approved to build the building. That is why it took so long to come back because why should he spend the money for architectural drawings for a drawing that won't be built? At the time of construction the building, the plan must pass building criteria. He is being asked to have architectural drawings before approval.

Mr. Lewan replied that it is a requirement of the ordinance. They are not requiring architectural building plans; they are requiring floor plans and elevations.

Mr. Angona asked if Mr. Lewan was saying without that, they would not approve the site plan.

Mr. Lewan answered yes.

Mr. Angona stated that it says proposed because it's a proposed building if it meets the criteria of the Dixie Corridor.

Chairperson Baker replied that Mr. Angona must demonstrate to the Commission by showing this type of detail.

Mr. Angona replied that if it is not, then you would not get a building permit for that building.

Chairperson Baker commented that the Commission's role is to work with Mr. Angona to maximize the return on his time so that the idea of bringing something to the Commission that is as complete as it can be to give the Commission the chance to give feedback as to how his thoughts match up to the ordinance language, the specificity that surrounds this area of the Township and the way his proposal will mesh with the surrounding properties that are already there. This appearance will allow Mr. Angona to make the most effective choices on the size of the building, what he can do in the building, how it will be placed on the lot, etc.

Mr. Angona responded that he understands that to an extent but the Commission is asking for architectural drawings and floor plans.

Chairperson Baker commented that architectural plans are required, not building plans.

Mr. Angona commented that there are codes for that in the Building Department.

Chairperson Baker stated that they have an obligation to make sure that the design is in harmony with neighboring properties. They need to manage structures in an overall planned fashion within the Township. The Commission is asking for architectural plans. They have one elevation of a building that looks large and looks larger than this lot can accommodate and they are not sure yet how vehicles are going to move around it and how emergency vehicles are going to be able to move. It is a whole package that they are looking for.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated July 6, 2017. The purpose of his review is to determine if the site plan as submitted conforms with ordinance requirements and the site plan criteria. The ordinance requires an engineered site plan that is to scale, with title block, and a list of things that should be on the plan. The plan shows some general configuration of the parking lot and shows some storm sewers but the ordinance says that the detail should be provided, and they are not. Topographic information should be provided to see how the site will be graded. Storm water detention is a Township requirement that has not been addressed. The applicant did receive permits from Road

Commission. One for the drive approach on Dixie Highway and the other one speaks to a four inch restriction in the storm sewer. The applicant still needs to explain how they are achieving the on-site detention. There needs to be more definition regarding the geometrics of the approach on to Dixie Highway and the plan needs to qualify what the radius is and the same is true for Center Street. Details need to be provided and it needs to be engineered per the Township ordinance. The applicant indicated that they are going to utilize the existing septic and the Commission would have to see the documentation from Oakland County Health Department as well as documentation from them regarding water supply.

Mr. Angona indicated that he received copies of the reviews from Mr. Lewan and Mr. Ford. He stated that this will be the first on the Dixie Corridor that follows the Design Guidelines. He took the plan presented last time, looked at the guidelines and submitted a building design for the Commission's feedback. He is not going to come back in front of the Commission with detailed drawings if he does not have an idea if the building has potential to be built; it would be a waste of money.

Chairperson Baker suggested that Mr. Angona work with the Supervisor's Office and with the Planner and the Engineer to get their assistance. There are obligations that the Commission administers and these are obligations for all applicants.

Mr. Angona suggested that he turn in a plan without the building on it.

Chairperson Baker replied that this is an option. Mr. Angona will still have to deal with the items that Mr. Ford has outlined. The drawing provided is lacking a lot of elements that would allow the Commission to understand the plan. He summarized all the details that were missing. If Mr. Angona wants effective feedback, he has got to provide enough detail for the Commission to offer comment on.

Commissioner Mansour suggested that Mr. Angona go to the next step and get an engineer involved so Mr. Angona can comply with the ordinance. Right now, there are a lot of things that do not comply and that is because he is doing it himself.

Mr. Angona confirmed that the first plan was brought before the Board and was done by Kieft Engineering. He thought he was going to get feedback on this new plan.

Commissioner Whiting stated that the issue last time is to show that this new building was not being used primarily for storage. It is an Office Service zoning so the primary use of the building should be office. The Commission is still not clear on that.

Mr. Angona asked if every other site plan in front of them had elevations.

Commissioners confirmed yes.

Mr. Angona stated that he would love to improve this property and make it safe on Dixie Highway and at this point, they really don't care if they build the building. This process

has been a pain and was simply started by putting a paved parking lot on our office. They combined it with the lot next door because it was too small. It doesn't seem like there is any cooperation or help from the Township. He provided a history of his ownership of the property.

Chairperson Baker reiterated what should be included on a site plan.

Clerk Moreau commented that she understands the frustration of Mr. Angona and she recommended a conference meeting at the Township. She commented that she appreciates that his plan includes elements of the Design Guidelines such as the fence and through through the pictures Mr. Angona provided, it appears that he understands the architecture that the Township is looking for on Dixie Highway.

6. Final Site Plan Review, Fire Station 1-12800 Andersonville Rd Parcel #07-17-327-001

Supervisor Walls introduced Chief Dave Feichtner and Construction Manager, Mark Yovich. He summarized his cover memo to the Planning Commission. Lighting plans are almost identical for both stations and contain much less than the maximum lumens allowed due to the neighborhood that they are in. The floor plans for both stations are identical except for extra space added to Station 3 because of its dual use as a voting precinct instead of Andersonville Elementary School. The gathering space was added at Station 3 along with gravel overflow parking. Neither facility will be manned and response personnel for both stations will be paid call. Efforts were made to reduce impacts on the adjacent neighbors. One of the big concerns initially was drainage at Station 1. The Township wanted to make sure that we did not have impact on the pond to the north. He pointed out the ditch that the Andersonville Road drainage currently follows and then discharges directly toward the well and the house of the adjoining neighbor. It then flows easterly. He pointed out the flow pattern on the site plan. They are waiting for the septic permit from the Health Department. If the neighbor's well is too close to a storm drain they are going back to the open ditch concept. The other concern that they have with this site is landscaping. This results in a request for the Planning Commission to waive and approve a modification to the ordinance requirements for screening. If they follow the ordinance for a 20 foot screened area, the screening would come exactly to the center line of the detention basin. The other concern with the screening is the topographical differences between the Fire Station property and the adjoining elevation; there is a seven foot difference in elevation. He stated that they are also asking for a waiver on the ordinance screening requirements. Supervisor Walls summarized the proposed landscape plan. Section 40-721 allows the Planning Commission to waive the screen on property lines if more effective in another location. Section 40-721(b)(3) allows the Planning Commission to modify the screening location if it is necessary due to site conditions or if the effectiveness of the screen is improved. Section 40-721(c)(3) allows a total waiver or modification if the topography is such that the adjacent parcel to be screened is higher. These apply to the landscape plan that was presented. He suggested that the Planning Commission allow him to work with the adjoining neighbor on the north side to meet the ordinance intent. The landscaping for

both stations will not take place until the spring of 2018. He suggested that the request for Station 1 is that the modification to ordinance to address site conditions, approve effectiveness and work with neighbors and to allow Construction Manager, Landscape Contractor and Supervisor to develop an alternate landscape plan that fits the intent of the landscape screening and buffers and other landscape provisions of the Township ordinance. The revised plan will be reviewed by the Township Planner and approved by an administrative committee or can come back to the Planning Commission. There is a Site Plan Review Committee that could be utilized.

Commissioner Sclesky asked what was behind the Station 1 property.

Supervisor Walls outlined the house behind the property and confirmed the tree line and the area of residential property located there.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated July 7, 2017. Safety path easement needs to be added to the plan along Andersonville Road. He stated that he understands that the landscaping might be changing. His firm put together the landscaping plan so he is not providing a lot of judgement since they provided the plan. He pointed out the ordinance requirements in his review letter with the understand that the Planning Commission can grant waivers as Supervisor Walls explained. The proposed plan shows a combination of trees and shrubs which meet or exceed the numbers required. He stated that this site could not support a high number of large trees over time. Therefore there is a combination of trees and shrubs.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated June 22, 2017. The Road Commission has approved the application for the improvements including the right turn lane and the tapers. The drainage is an improvement as Supervisor Walls explained. He further explained the proposed drainage plan.

Commissioner Hines asked what would be a typical manpower response call.

Chief Feichtner stated that they average between three and five firefighters responding to every call.

Chairperson Baker asked if the precinct at Andersonville Elementary will be completely replaced by the new Fire Station 3.

Clerk Moreau answered yes.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the safety path easement.

Mr. Lewan stated that at this point they do not necessarily need an easement, it just needs to be shown on the plan.

Tom Weiler, 9171 Hillcrest, commented if they do not put the safety path easement, why does the Township require the citizens to do it. He commented that instead of putting the easement on the plan, they should put the money in escrow.

Chairperson Baker reiterated the Planning Commission's ability to grant a waiver regarding the landscaping.

Commissioners and Supervisor Walls agreed that the updated plan can be reviewed and approved by the Site Plan Committee made up of the Chairperson of the Planning Commission, the Township Board representative on the Planning Commission and the Supervisor working with the Township Planner.

Commissioner Hopper moved to approve Final Site Plan for Springfield Township Fire Station 1 to be located at 12800 Andersonville Road subject to:

- 1. The plans being revised to show potential future safety path location on the plan**
- 2. Strict conflicting land use screening requirements based on the proposed alternative deciduous evergreen and shrub mixture as proposed further because of the existing topographical conditions using a waiver is allowed under Section 40-721 (c)(3) and Section 40-721 (d)(3)(a)(2) which allows the Planning Commission to waive the buffer with requirements**
- 3. To allow Landscape Contractor, Construction Manager and Supervisor to develop an actual landscape plan that fits the intent of the ordinance while addressing issues of topography and site conditions to be reviewed by the Planning Review Committee and Doug Lewan at Carlisle Wortman Associates**
- 4. Meeting lighting levels on the north property line to be verified after complete installation**

Supported by Commissioner Mansour. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

**7. Final Site Plan Review, Fire Station 3 – 9482 Andersonville Rd
Parcel #07-35-203-012**

Supervisor Walls summarized the proposed site plan for Fire Station 3. He confirmed that the station is located in the back of the property which allows for only one curb cut and to minimize lights shining into the house on the other side of Farley Road. The plan improves the grade and improves the site distance at Farley and Andersonville Road. This site naturally drains to the rear so no basins or storm drains are required except for an extension to what is already at the road. He explained the proposed landscape plan showing modifications from the ordinance standard. He suggested that as soon as possible, the Township screening requirements should be addressed because it needs to be improved. They have received a septic permit from Oakland County Health Department and he is also asking for approval for modification to ordinance requirements

to improve the effectiveness of the screen and more closely meet the intent of the ordinance by improving the compatibility between the fire station and the neighbor. This approval is necessary to proceed with the proposed landscape plan.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his review letter dated July 7, 2017. He stated that the safety path needs to be added to the plan or the Planning Commission approving a waiver as Supervisor Walls suggested.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his review letter dated June 29, 2017. The approved permit has been received from Road Commission for the approach. They also have the septic permit from Oakland County Health.

Commissioner Pliska asked about the parking for voters during a busy time.

Supervisor Walls stated that they looked at the overall parking and there is additional space next to the gravel area that could be used.

Clerk Moreau commented that Precinct 3 is very busy. She spoke to the Chief and if the trucks were pulled out in the drive, additional voters would have access to the whole circle portion to park in.

Commissioner Whiting asked about the current well on site.

Supervisor Walls confirmed that it is already abandoned.

Commissioner Whiting moved to approve the Final Site Plan for Fire Station 3, Springfield Township, Parcel #07-35-203-012, northeast corner of Andersonville Road and Farley Road which is zoned Public Service with the following conditions:

- 1. The Planning Commission has agreed to waive the strict conflicting land use screening requirements of Section 40-721 and accept the proposed alternate of deciduous tree and evergreen mixture in a curvilinear design so as to minimize obstruction of the prairie views of the resident home to the south**
 - 2. The site plan designates a safety path easement along Farley and Andersonville Roads before issuance of the building permit**
 - 3. A shallow swale be installed along the outside perimeter of the rear parking driveway to accept run off and direct to the south**
- All the above can be checked administratively. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.**

Other Business:

1. Priority Task List

Commissioners reviewed and made changes to the Priority Task List.

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Hines moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:17 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hines, Hopper, Mansour, Pliska, Sclesky, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: None. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary