

Springfield Township
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes July 21, 2015

Call to Order: Chairperson Baker called the July 21, 2015 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
Dave Hopper
Bill Leddy
Linda Whiting

Commissioners Absent

Ruth Ann Hines
Kevin Sclesky
Neil Willson

Consultants Present

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

Staff Present

Collin W. Walls, Supervisor
Laura Moreau, Clerk

Approval of Agenda:

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

Public Comment:

None

Consent Agenda:

1. Minutes of the June 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting

Commissioner Leddy moved to approve the minutes of the June 16, 2015 meeting as presented. Supported by Commissioner Hopper. Voted yes: Baker, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Hines, Sclesky, Willson. Motion Carried.

Public Hearing:

1. Chapter 40 – Zoning by amending Article III. – District Regulations, Section 40-455 of Division 11. – M-1 Light Industrial District and Section 40-485 of Division 12. – M-2 Heavy Industrial District

Chairperson Baker opened the Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m.

There was no Public Comment heard.

Chairperson Baker closed the Public Hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Old Business:

**1. Szott Ford – Final Site Plan
Parcel ID #07-05-426-001, 8800 East Holly Road**

Mr. Gary Laundroche, Bloom Contracting, introduced himself and Mr. Mike Powell to the Commission.

Mr. Doug Lewan summarized his memo to the Planning Commission dated July 7, 2015. The applicant provided information regarding the septic permit and upgrade from Oakland County Health Department. The previous septic system was designed for a maximum number of 35 employees and the current permit is approved for expanding the system up to 70 employees. He would like clarification on the total number of employees expected by the applicant. The applicant also submitted a revised plan and MDEQ review of the car wash system. The letter from MDEQ and a copy of the discharge permit was included in the submission and it was determined that after the car wash was in operation for a while, they would sample the effluent to determine if the chemical composition is in compliance. He stated that as proposed there is too much signage and the applicant has agreed to seek a variance for the proposed signage separate from this planning process. If they do not get the variance, they will put in signage that conforms to current ordinance standards. The applicant also submitted a revised floor plan to provide clarification. Mr. Lewan stated that he is recommending final site plan approval with one condition and that is a confirmation on the total number of employees on site.

Mr. Randy Ford summarized his memo to the Planning Commission dated July 9, 2015. The issues that were brought up in earlier discussion have been addressed. The car wash system and the septic permit issues have been addressed. He reiterated that the MDEQ would come out and inspect the car wash effluent for metals, non-metals and organic compounds to make sure they are in compliance after the car wash is in operation. The Township should be kept apprised of any test results. He stated that the applicant is proposing pre-treatment for the septic and utilizing the same septic field. The system has been reviewed by the Health Department and this is confirmed by the letter dated July 10, 2015 that was included in the packet. Mr. Ford stated that he is recommending final site plan approval.

Mr. Laundroche confirmed that the applicant is currently operating with 28 to 30 employees and their intent is to immediately hire an additional three to five employees upon completion of the project. The Health Department's calculation was based on actual water usage and since the owner was going to maximize the system, he decided to expand the system so he would have the ability to grow as a business. The Township would be

copied on any correspondence with MDEQ regarding the testing of the car wash water discharge. He stated that Mr. Powell could address any specific questions regarding the septic or car wash.

Chairperson Baker summarized that MDEQ was not requiring any additional permitting but would need to go out and test the system to make sure it was in conformance at a later date. The Township would be aware of that testing and the result. He confirmed that the septic permit that was issued allowed up to 70 employees. He indicated that Mr. Ford defined details that were part of the design detail that would be addressed in construction plans.

Commissioner Hopper stated that LED lighting is being proposed for building and he suggested LED lighting also be installed in the parking lots.

Applicant replied that a lighting consultant is looking at the plan now but they were concerned about conforming to the photometric requirements of the Township.

Commissioner Hopper stated that he did not receive updated sheets for lighting and signage in the site plan packet.

Applicant replied that only the floor plan sheet was updated to clarify the number of bays and this is what was included in the recent submission.

Commissioner Hopper reiterated that there was no signage included.

Applicant concurred.

Supervisor Walls added that the signage that is on the building now is compliant because it was approved by the Board of Appeals; they cannot expand the signage without Board of Appeals approval. The Township received a sign application in May and this application was denied because it was over in square footage.

Applicant stated that Ford Motor Company has their own sign company and they are planning to change the current sign images.

Commissioner Hopper asked about the deed restriction requested by the Health Department.

Applicant stated that the deed restriction is already drafted and it will be recorded when it is approved.

Commissioner Hopper moved to grant Final Site Plan approval to Szott Ford, Parcel ID #07-05-426-001, 8800 East Holly Road, subject to:

- 1. Providing Springfield Township with a copy of the recorded deed restriction and approval of deed restriction from Oakland County Health Department**

- in regards to the site being serviced by an alternative technology type waste water disposal system**
- 2. Correct note on page 4 regarding correct class of sewer pipe**
 - 3. No signage changes are approved as what was previously submitted for review was in excess of Springfield Township ordinance requirements and any additions to the existing signage would require a variance to be implemented**
 - 4. The Township must be notified of MDEQ's findings in regards to car wash drainage system after system is fully up and operational**

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

2. Ordinance Amendment – Dealership Parking

Mr. Lewan summarized his memo regarding dealership parking. He addressed several things including bumping up the showroom parking space requirements, the current ordinance amount is 1 space/200 square foot of showroom and he increased it to 250. He missed changing the service stall requirement and indicated that it should be two instead of three and this change should have been in this memo. He read the language which indicated that areas devoted to customer service shall be clearly delineated on the site plan and reserved for that purpose. Required parking is exclusive of vehicle storage. This will clearly show on the site plan what should be customer and service parking as opposed to car storage parking. The next section of language is a new section and has to do with screening. He provided this for Commission discussion because he would like more input. Mr. Lewan read the new section. He stated that this concerns vehicles that are for sale and that are located in the side yard and the non-required front yard and the fact that they have to be screened. He stated that this “prospective buyer” car storage is a spot where a customer might visit and “kick the tires” and this is differentiated from a storage area that is four to five cars deep. They are trying to provide limitations to this type of storage to the rear of the facility. This type of storage will also have to be screened. He asked the Commission if they would like a different type of screening for storage vehicles versus display vehicles and do they even want to differentiate between storage and display vehicles.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she doesn't know if they need to differentiate between the storage vehicles and display vehicles. She thinks that this should be left with the dealership. This also could not even be enforced.

Commissioner Leddy stated that if they follow the existing screening requirements, that should be sufficient. He does like the delineation between the types of parking and also using the restrictions on the number of spaces.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the proposed reduction in parking spaces makes sense. He did notice that service vehicles are screened, usually behind the building. He does like the idea of reducing the number of cars that are seen from the road. He thinks this is a good first attempt.

Mr. Lewan stated that there could be a delineation between display vehicles and storage vehicles and this is the way that it is written in the proposed language.

Commissioner Whiting asked if the storage vehicles are vehicles waiting to be display vehicles because she doesn't think they can be easily differentiated that way. She also doesn't know how that could be enforced.

Chairperson Baker summarized required parking is said to be in the side and the front so by omission, they are not to be in the back but storage is in the back only. He sees it as a challenge to the dealer to keep customers out of the back because they are not on display.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she feels like they are setting something up where they are going to give a nod and then do what they want to do anyway so why do they put it into the ordinance. She stated that they have the space requirement which should cover it.

Chairperson Baker stated that he likes the new space calculations. He questioned the second section regarding the required parking. They do not set any limits on them regarding parking based on employee count, it is about stalls and square footage.

Mr. Lewan answered yes; it is based on stalls and square footage the same as it is in the current ordinance. He confirmed that the setbacks would still have to be adhered to in the front and side yards. This would have to be clarified.

Chairperson Baker asked about the non-required front yard.

Mr. Lewan confirmed that it was the front yard, outside of the green belt. He stated that the front yard is defined as the front of the building to the front property line. The non-required front yard is the difference between the required front setback and the front of the building.

Supervisor Walls recommended simplifying it to you can't park in the greenbelt area.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the only place that employee parking is discussed in the ordinance is equestrian training facilities, child care homes, child care centers, schools and libraries.

Mr. Lewan stated that the current ordinance does take this into consideration when they consider showroom space.

Commissioner Hopper confirmed that they based the service space requirement on two.

Mr. Ford stated that in his experience, it is very hard to find visitor parking at any dealership and he wonders how this can be addressed because it is apparent at any dealership that you go to.

Mr. Lewan answered that they tried to address that in requiring dealers to have clearly marked customer parking. If they don't do that, it becomes an enforcement problem.

Commissioner Hopper confirmed that he also doesn't have any issue with the math in the proposed language or the addition of areas devoted to customer service. It does create a slight enforcement problem.

Chairperson Baker asked if they could create some graphics as further explanation. This would be helpful for him.

Mr. Lewan answered yes. He further clarified that the display parking may be located in the front and side, it does not have to be located there. He asked Commissioner Whiting if she agreed with Section 9.

Commissioner Whiting confirmed no, she doesn't.

Mr. Lewan asked if he should get rid of Section 9; he asked the Commissioners for their opinion.

Chairperson Baker stated that he thought Commissioner Whiting was opposed to the second Section of 9. He is interested in exploring both of them and he would like graphics to explain the first part of Section 9.

Commissioner Whiting asked if they were also going to regulate vehicles that are waiting to be serviced.

Mr. Lewan answered no.

Commissioner Hopper suggested that the cars that are waiting to be serviced are parked in back.

Commissioner Whiting suggested that the dealerships should do everything they can to have adequate visitor parking for increased business potential.

Commissioner Leddy stated that they have to understand that there are going to be many lot configurations; it can't always say in the back because maybe the lot is not situated that way and they might have more storage on the side. It is more important that the cars are screened properly.

Clerk Moreau wondered if the direction might be to indicate a maximum number of vehicles that would be allowed on the front and side and beyond that would have to be stored in the rear or with greater screening. You can have a maximum number of vehicles that are considered display.

Chairperson Baker asked if she would base the number on the square footage of lot size.

Supervisor Walls suggested it be based on the frontage.

Chairperson Baker concurred.

Clerk Moreau suggested that it be based on the square footage of floor space although that doesn't necessarily indicate the volume. The Township limits a retail store parking based on their square footage. The goal is to avoid a sea of parking for every other establishment. Although we understand that a car dealership has a specific need for vehicle storage, but a certain amount of that can be in the front for display and customers and the rear storage would accommodate the high level of volume of vehicles needed for inventory.

Chairperson Baker asked if there was any value in looking at the same communities to see how they address these items.

Mr. Lewan answered there is not a whole lot he can get from other communities.

Commissioner Leddy asked if they also have to have guidelines for off-site storage or if they are renting from someone, if they have any say over the screening.

Mr. Lewan stated that this is a use of land and they would have to go through the site plan approval process.

Commissioner Whiting stated that she is okay with paragraph #1 of Section 9 because it tells them where they can put them and mentions the screen.

Clerk Moreau stated that the old Saturn dealership might be a good site to look at as an example of front and side display parking and then the additional storage parking located back further away from the roadway. The configuration could change or the screening could increase if a different site couldn't accommodate the storage lot in the rear.

Mr. Lewan suggested that they get rid of required and non-required front yard, just call it the front yard and they could limit the amount of parking in the front yard. Some of these ideas were brought out in the Dixie Design Guidelines. For example, they just allow two rows of parking in the front and all other needs to be on the side of back and properly screened.

Supervisor Walls stated that all that they have in their ordinance is parking and he has never looked at a sales area as a parking area that is a sales area. The storage area can be beneficial; we just approved Szott which had exceptions from the parking standards because it was a storage area. It can be a storage area with a restricted customer access and customers do not go back there.

Mr. Lewan stated that they might want to come up with a different idea of what car storage is and is supposed to look like. These spaces might not need to be nine by eighteen feet and they don't have to have a twenty-two foot drive aisle between. Based on

this, they could expand on the subsection nine to include car storage language and differentiate the different types of parking.
Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Ford stated that they should still maintain a behind the dealership adequate fire lane access for emergency equipment.

Mr. Lewan stated that he would have to make sure that truck circulation and emergency vehicle circulation is taken care of.

Commissioner Hopper outlined the current ordinance parking standards.

Supervisor Walls confirmed that this was not storage.

Mr. Lewan replied that this could also apply to off-site locations.

Chairperson Baker stated that he would like to hear more options about the area that houses storage vehicles to insure plan review.

Supervisor Walls stated that the vehicle storage lot on Enterprise went through site plan.

Mr. Lewan reiterated that the parking of cars on property is a use of land that has to go through site plan process.

Mr. Lewan summarized that he was going to change three bays to two bays. He was going to leave the first part under Sub-section nine but tweak it a little bit. In the second part he was going to add language as to how display storage areas are different and some different standards.

Commissioners concurred.

New Business:

- 1. Chapter 40 – Zoning by amending Article III. – District Regulations
Section 40-455 of Division 11. – M-1 Light Industrial District and
Section 40-485 of Division 12. – M-2 Heavy Industrial District**

Commissioner Hopper moved to recommend to the Township Board to amend the Springfield Township Code of Ordinances, Chapter 40 Zoning by amending Article III. – District Regulations Section 40-455 of Division 11 – M-1 Light Industrial District by deleting Section 8 in its entirety and Section 40-485 of Division 12 – M-2 Heavy Industrial District by deleting Subsection 6 in its entirety. Supported by Commissioner Whiting. Voted yes: Baker, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Hines, Sclesky, Willson. Motion Carried.

2. Dixie Design Guidelines

Mr. Lewan provided a summary and overview of the Dixie Design Guidelines document dated July 2015 including a history of the efforts to develop it and the steps involved.

Chairperson Baker stated that they are looking for feedback from other Commissioners that have not been involved with the process.

Mr. Lewan concurred; he would like to also hear from Clerk Moreau and Supervisor Walls.

Clerk Moreau indicated that she and Commissioner Whiting already sent comments to Mr. Lewan.

Mr. Lewan stated that he does not remember receiving those.

Supervisor Walls concurred that the comments were sent.

Mr. Lewan stated that he now remembers getting Clerk Moreau's comments.

Clerk Moreau stated that she sees a lot that still needs some tweaking especially with the images and depicting their vision. She stated that some pictures are excellent but some other illustrations really don't work at all. She would encourage the Planning Commission to think about this because the images really should convey what they are looking for. The illustrations need to really capture the vision and in this regard, there is work to be done. She also had questions about the sign provisions that they need to discuss. It is unfortunate that they are missing three Commissioners because this was their chance to give feedback. She stated that it would be nice to move it along but it would not be appropriate at this point.

Commissioner Leddy indicated that the pictures on pages six, eight and ten depict such a formal setting. He suggested curving the sidewalk and making it more organic; it doesn't look natural. He would like to see variation on the architecture. When they limit themselves to two styles, it looks like a campus and is too formal.

Commissioner Hopper stated that the graphics needed work. He didn't pay as much attention to the graphics as the wording. He had the most questions on was in the first sections, the streetscape. It would be advantageous to develop acceptable color schemes that could be encouraged when repainting a building, for example. It would unify the corridor. The lighting on page seven are lights that are not allowed. We do not allow Edison lighting and this will have to be addressed in the ordinance. He prefers these lights but suggested that we look at the ordinance to allow these lights and allow the sight of the light source. He likes the fence detail and the natural stone; it does represent this area. He questioned the signs because he would like the signs to be easier to see but does

not like the height. He pointed out the building orientation on page seventeen and the statement about the pedestrian pathway connecting amenities. He stated that it is a good spot to emphasize the connectability of the pathway and if a business is putting in a pathway, they are going to have to connect to other buildings. He concurs with Commissioner Leddy on the structure of the pathway. He stated that Auburn Hills has a tree diversity requirement and he would encourage this because if one type dies, there are others to fill in. He suggests putting this diversity in their landscape ordinance. He stated that on page 27, they mention LED lights and this would be a good spot to push the LED lights. They can specify the color here to meet the intent and it should be unified. It should be looked at Township-wide. Commissioner Hopper stated that he likes how they incorporated the landscaping.

Mr. Lewan agreed in unifying the color of the lights.

Chairperson Baker stated that the sign graphic with the black background with light wording is very appealing. He suggested that these graphics are included and encouraged.

Commissioner Whiting agreed.

Clerk Moreau showed a sign graphic depicting the Kroger sign as it is now and another example with it as black background and light wording. She stated that it does offer examples of what the sign could look like. Currently, Subway is the only example of white lettering on dark background and it stands out.

Commissioner Leddy stated that the Kroger shopping plaza stands out more with the gas station relocated.

Supervisor Walls stated that the wording is very good. There are a couple of things that concern him including the fence requiring a variation from setback and they need to remember that under C-2 zoning, there is only a 35 foot setback and questioned if it was enough. He stated that they have to make sure that the renderings follow the words. He concurred with Commissioner Leddy's opinion about the linear arrangement of the sidewalk and they are looking for more form. He would encourage the reviewer to make sure that it depicts the ordinance standards or change the words. He stated that some of the pictures depict a sea of asphalt.

Clerk Moreau asked if the illustration program could depict topography.

Mr. Lewan answered he thinks so.

Supervisor Walls encouraged the use of more pictures to depict, for example, the variation in the craftsman and prairie style architecture. There isn't enough in the current copy.

Mr. Lewan considered having a whole new appendix.

Supervisor Walls suggested that the pictures need to be part of the document.

Clerk Moreau agreed.

Commissioner Whiting suggested taking one of the drawings and revise it according to what they think that they want and examine it before they go further. It would be a test to see if this is what they are looking for. She agreed with Supervisor Walls that the graphics have to do what they want them to do.

Mr. Lewan stated that they can do this.

Mr. Ford asked if the lighting intent was to illuminate the roadway or a low level pedestrian lighting.

Mr. Lewan stated that the bigger ones were street lighting.

Supervisor Walls stated that lights need to provide light, not daylight. At driveways and intersections, there are safety concerns and there is more lighting needed.

Clerk Moreau stated that on page 10 it shows a lot of light and all in a road and this light that is depicted is roadway light not pedestrian lighting. She asked Mr. Ford if roadway lighting would be more towards the shoulder.

Mr. Ford answered that it would be behind the walk to light to pedestrian path.

Clerk Moreau stated that the lights in this image are supposed to be the roadway lighting. They did not have a discussion about how much lighting they wanted. She suggested that the roadway light could be on both sides of the roadway at intersections and the pedestrian fixtures should be the acorn style and located where these are being depicted.

Commissioner Leddy suggested that this is part of the public lighting.

Supervisor Walls indicated that this would be part of the development.

Commissioners discussed additional lighting possibilities and setback requirements on Dixie Highway.

Chairperson Baker asked Township Board members if they want to present this document now for feedback or should it be finalized with the Commission first.

Supervisor Walls indicated that they can get it a lot closer before presentation.

Clerk Moreau stated that the graphics and pictures should depict the intent more clearly. She asked if it would be appropriate to refer the document to the Board without having an entire Commission.

Commissioners discussed whether or not the document should go before the Township Board first for consideration or to look at it again at the next Planning Commission meeting after it is refined based on comments offered tonight.

Commissioners concurred that Mr. Lewan will make necessary adjustments based on discussion this evening and it will be presented at the next Planning Commission meeting on August 18, 2015. They agreed the document should be forwarded after revisions to the other three Township Board members for their comments prior to it going to the entire Board for comment and consideration at a meeting.

Other Business:

1. Priority List

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

Public Comment:

None

Adjournment:

Commissioner Whiting moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:56 p.m. Supported by Commissioner Leddy. Voted yes: Baker, Hopper, Leddy, Whiting. Voted no: None. Absent: Hines, Sclesky, Willson. Motion Carried.

Erin A. Mattice, Recording Secretary