

**Springfield Township  
Planning Commission – Business Meeting  
Minutes of October 16, 2006**

**Call to Order:** Chairperson Roger Lamont called the October 16, 2006 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

**Attendance:**

**Commissioners Present**

Roger Lamont  
John Steckling  
Bill Leddy  
Dean Baker  
Bill Champion  
Ruth Ann Hines  
Paul Rabaut

**Commissioner(s) Absent**

**Staff Present**  
Leon Genre  
Collin Walls

**Consultants Present**

Randy Ford  
Sally Elmiger

**Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2006**

- \* Commissioner Rabaut moved to approve the minutes of September 18, 2006 as presented. Commission Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines, Leddy and Champion; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

**Approval of Agenda:**

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as published.

**Public Comment:**      **None**

**Public Hearing:**      **None**

**New Business:**

1. Springfield City Gate – Concept Review 07-33-100-015 & 07-33-100-005

Ms. Sally Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman summarized Carlisle/Wortman's review dated September 29, 2006. Ms. Elmiger stated that the applicant must demonstrate why this particular property must be used as a City Gate site and compatibility with adjacent residential uses raises

significant concerns of operating a city gate in this location. [A copy of the full review by Carlisle/Wortman is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township].

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC summarized their review dated October 2, 2006. He stated that the applicant has referenced gas load studies in their narrative that demonstrate the necessity for the proposed facility. However, the applicant has not provided mapping or other data indicating how anticipated growth patterns in the Township will be accommodated by this facility. [A copy of the full review by HRC is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township].

Ms. Stella Carroll explained that Consumers Energy is requesting review and recommendation to the Township Board for a Special Land Use and Final Site Plan to construct a 1,100 square foot new City Gate and associated facilities. The purpose of the City Gate is to regulate pressure and add odorant. Ms. Carroll provided safety data sheets and two maps in detail, one is a map of the current gas system and the other is a load map.

Mr. Gerald Marshall, Senior Technical Analyst of Consumers Energy out of Jackson, Michigan explained to the Planning Commission how City Gate will be integrated into Springfield Township. He explained that pressures are low in this area and they need a high pressure line to provide adequate services to customers. Mr. Ford asked Mr. Marshall if 22 lbs is what they currently have, where does it become critical in terms of future growth? Mr. Marshall said, typically on mile roads it is 20 lbs. and as you go into subdivisions it drops down to 7 lbs., which is the break-off point.

Commissioner Champion asked if this will increase the availability of natural gas to areas not presently served? Mr. Marshall said, no, it would not change service.

Chairperson Lamont asked if this would provide higher pressures to the northern part of the Township that lies to our south? Mr. Marshall said, yes it will.

Commissioner Steckling asked if the future pipeline will replace the existing? Mr. Marshall said they will both be operable; they will be parallel pipelines. Commissioner Steckling said, as close as this is to the residents, if there is a leak or problem it will not be very nice to be living there. The odor is put in for obvious reasons but he knows there is an odor problem with the plant in Independence Township. Commissioner Steckling asked what assurance we have that it won't be a problem in Springfield Township because once this is approved and constructed, the Township is no longer in the equation? Mr. Marshall explained that the odor is a liquid and has the same components and flammability of gasoline. He is present for all odor deliveries to all sites and this site would have odor delivery probably every 3 to 5 years.

Commissioner Leddy asked about the monitoring of gauges for leakage? Mr. Marshall said they monitor it from their facility in Jackson.

Commissioner Champion asked why we wouldn't expect to have the same odor issues as Independence Township? Mr. Marshall said he is not aware of any odor leakage problems in Independence Township therefore, could not comment.

Chairperson Lamont asked if Consumers monitors and logs complaints? Mr. Marshall said there is no data available. Chairperson Lamont asked if the applicant has determined a percentage of distribution that this City Gate would provide within Springfield Township and outside the Township? Mr. Marshall said he would have to look into that and get back to the Planning Commission. Chairperson Lamont asked if this is approved, what would the procedure be for future growth as far as trenching and installation of pipes? Mr. Marshall said currently proposed he didn't think that would be necessary but he is not the person that could answer that.

Chairperson Lamont agreed with Ms. Elmiger that there is 1200 acres available in the vicinity that could possibly be utilized for this facility. Mr. Marshall said Consumers probably didn't know that but he could not respond to that.

In regard to the landscape plan, Chairperson Lamont noted that these site plans and landscape plans have not been reviewed by Ms. Elmiger or Mr. Ford. Mr. Patrick ??? of Pollack Design Associates noted that the fence was specifically for security and safety considerations for the City Gate itself and 20% of the total fence line is within the setback. The other plan addresses coming out of the buffer begins to squeeze the accessibility around the piping on the north side as well as on the west side. The fence would have to be removed to get any equipment in to do repairs.

Commissioner Baker noted that he is employed by Consumers Energy and would refrain from comment and vote on this matter.

Chairperson Lamont said he is not prepared to make any type of recommendation or even a conditional recommendation for approval on this site plan because the newest plans submitted tonight have not been reviewed by our planner or our engineer. The Planning Commissioners all concurred that there are too many unanswered questions to move forward with this plan.

- \* Commissioner Steckling moved to table this request until we can gain further information based on questions made to the petitioners and also until we can have a review from our consultants as to the latest information provided. Chairperson Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Hines, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Abstain: Baker. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**
  
- \* Commissioner Steckling moved to table the consideration of whether this qualifies as a Special Land Use to be considered in conjunction with the additional information to be submitted with the tabled site plan. Chairperson Lamont supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Hines, Leddy and Champion; No: none; Abstain: Baker. The motion carried by a 6 to 0 vote.**

### **Unfinished Business:**

## Planning Commission Business Meeting - Minutes of October 16, 2006

### 1. Zoning Map Changes

Supervisor Walls noted that the input from the Board is simple and not lengthy. One Board member is very much opposed to any split zoning and concerned about zoning for resource protection. The general consensus of the Board was that they felt open space areas in projects which are not subject to third party conservation easements should also be shown as Resource Conservation if the Master Deed and By Law provisions were consistent with Resource Conservation. There are two that allow active recreational uses within the open space and those would not be consistent with Resource Conservation.

Chairperson Lamont said he is ready to move forward and asked if any Planning Commissioners are opposed to holding a public hearing knowing that they can delete items from the hearing but not add? The Planning Commissioners agreed to hold a public hearing.

- ★ **Commissioner Steckling moved to clean up the zoning map changes and go through the procedure to publish for a public hearing and effectuate the changes on the map. Commissioner Hines supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Rabaut, Baker, Hines, Leddy and Champion; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

### Other Business:

#### 1. Priority List

Map changes - set for public hearing after another review by the Planning Commission. Date to be determined. Ordinance No. 27 Amendment is tentatively set for the November meeting. Sections 12.01.18.b(4) and 10.02.8.b(4) already set for public hearing. Dixie Highway Corridor Study is tentatively set to be discussed at the November meeting.

### Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

---

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary