

1. Call to Order - THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN LARRY FOX AT 7:00 PM

Meeting was called to order by Chair Larry Fox at 7:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

PRESENT: Joe Colaianne, Larry Fox, Jeff Newsom, Michael Mitchell, Keith Voight
ABSENT: Thomas Murphy, Sue Grissim

4. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion to approve the Meeting Agenda was made by Colaianne and seconded by Mitchell; motion carried unanimously.

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Feb 25, 2016 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Keith Voight, Secretary
AYES:	Colaianne, Fox, Newsom, Mitchell, Voight
ABSENT:	Murphy, Grissim

6. Call to Public

No one came forward.

7. Old and New Business

a. Site Plan SP #538-C, Planned Development Mixed Use Concept Plan (M-59 and Old US 23)

a. Site Plan Application #538C - Planned Development Mixed Use Concept Plan (M-59 & Old US 23)

Chair Fox asked the Director for an overview of the proposal. The Director began by describing the planned development process stating that this is a 3 step process and each step must be heard by both the Planning Commission and Board of Trustees for a total of 6 meetings. This is the first of the three steps - the concept plan. This is the first time that the Planning Commission will have seen this application. Following this meeting, the application will be conveyed to the Board, and it will provide comments on the concept. The next step is the preliminary plan which will contain significantly more detail. The preliminary plan will be heard by both the Planning Commission and the Board as well. The last step is the final plan, which again must be considered by both bodies. The Director briefly described the project is the development of the property at M-59 and Old US 23. It is about 71 acres and it is zoned GC-General Commercial and has a future land use designation that is also commercial. The PD provisions allow a mix of uses, and what is being proposed is 12 acres of commercial on the north part of the property with the remainder to be multi-family consisting of 4 separate types of buildings. There are three story buildings, two story townhouse units, and another type of townhouse unit.

Chair Fox asked the applicant to come forward. The applicant proceeded to identify the project team and described the project in terms of its proximity to nearby uses, traffic impacts, landscaping, building design, and architecture. Also discussed was the estimated range of rents, the target market, and comparison between commercial and multi-family traffic generation.

The Chair then began discussing the staff review. The first item of the eligibility provisions is that of recognizable benefits - and none have been yet identified. The application meets the minimum size requirements, and use of public services will be addressed in the future. In terms of compatibility with the comprehensive plan, the Director stated again that the future designation is commercial and the Planning

Commission will need to make a determination regarding the multiple family proposal. Brief discussion on the design standards was held recognizing that more information would be needed. In terms of density, Newsom said that if more density was being requested, this was probably a good location for it. He then referenced the multiple family units proposed in association with the Newberry Place proposal, the concern being whether the Township could end up with 2 incomplete projects. Mitchell asked the applicant to confirm that all the units proposed were to be rental - and the answer was yes. The applicant described the market study done and a 5-7 year build-out is anticipated.

A density of nearly 10.30 units per acre is being requested which exceeds the Ordinance maximum of 8 units per acre. Chair Fox said that the Board would make a determination, but awarding a density bonus would likely require the applicant to do significantly more in terms of aesthetics. The applicant said that they are providing additional open space, pedestrian walkways and connections to the commercial. More landscaping and community amenities will be provided as well. Voight asked about public access to the community center. The applicant said that it would be made available. Voight also expressed concern about the density and whether the numbers would align. He said that the market study should be based on demographics and growth projections, not a single project type. Voight asked about interior design. Colaianne commented that there are no other 3-story buildings in Hartland. The applicant said that 3 story buildings allow more open space. Newsom said he did not have a problem with 3 stories but he is concerned about the potential for an unfinished project. Mitchell said he is uncertain about the 3-story buildings and stressed that the applicant will need to define the commercial aspect to illustrate how they will relate to one another. Colaianne agreed. Chair Fox said that he can see it both ways, and much is dependent on the location. He suggested a cut-away illustrating the potential views. He also said that most of the review entities are waiting for additional information before commenting, particularly relative to traffic impacts. Voight asked about the commercial element stating that it should not lag behind. The applicant said they are in discussions regarding the commercial. Mitchell asked about lighting, and site lighting will be necessary. Newsom asked about utilizing low-impact design standards and the applicant said that bioswales would likely be used and the building design may incorporate some green features.

Chair Fox asked for final comments and the applicant asked for commentary regarding the requirement that commercial must be the predominate use. He then described the rationale for the location of the commercial. Chair Fox then asked how the Commissioners felt about converting the commercial to multiple family. Newsome said he didn't have a problem with it in part due to the loss of the Walmart. Voight said he liked it in terms of transition and there is a lot of empty commercial. Colaianne said he liked the open space and the design but is concerned about density next to Millpointe. He is not necessarily opposed to it but more info is needed. Mitchell is uncertain about it emphasizing that a new Comprehensive Plan was just finished and many uses were changed, yet never was a change discussed for this property. He said a lot of time and effort was put into that plan and putting multiple family at this location wasn't discussed. Colaianne said that the corner could accommodate major commercial development comparable to that at the Latson interchange, and maybe the multiple family could provide a buffer and a transition to the existing residential. Chair Fox said that he was undecided as well and he would like to see the detail. He also said that the recommendations to the Board are for the long term and we can't necessarily say at this meeting whether there is too much commercial into the future. On the flip side, the commercial that exists now is hurting and rooftops are needed. He said he likes the project and it is very attractive; he may like it at that location, but would like it more at another location if one were available. He said traffic will be a major issue. The applicant asked for comments about the 36 unit building and none were offered.

RESULT:	INFORMATIONAL
----------------	----------------------

8. Call to Public

Ms. Kazan on Deanna Drive thanked the Commission for spending time on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment but said that they were ignoring the plan. She said she moved to Hartland for the peace and quiet and then quoted the plan stating that the population was projected to increase by 2.6% yet this complex is proposing a 7% increase. She said that she understood the plan includes commercial development to meet the needs of the future population so she doesn't understand the discussion on the sufficiency of commercial designations which is 1.7% of the total. She commented on the high median income and whether that would continue, as well as realistically how many people the complex would accommodate. She further referenced the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and its role

if its not followed. She asked that the Commission vote no and not waste time. She said that it is designated commercial which was chosen by the Commission with data from September. She does not want to see 3-story buildings; either we follow the codes or we don't. Traffic is a very big issue, especially with the new charter school opening. She said she appreciates the work done by the Commission and said they need to follow the codes - the project will look nice someplace else.

Mr. Meado on Andover said he was the president of the Millepointe association representing 206 homes, and the residents do not want the project. He said that Oakbrooke is located on the other side of their development and that development did not build the berm required. Single family residential would be a better option here. Schools must be considered and will become transitional and the grade points will go down. Single family homes are the key. There is a need for transitional units but not here. He said he appreciates what the Commission does.

Mr. Ryan on Peterson said he was a resident for 38 years and asked if there was a Plan "B". Traffic is a concern, especially when school buses are out. Adding to the traffic will make matters worse. He asked if the schools have the capacity to handle the new students. Although he recognizes that this land needs to be developed, but single family homes would be the way to go. This would likely mean 8-10 years of construction. No more gas stations are needed. He also asked if traffic would go through Millpointe. He said the Meijer property, the Target lot and an empty Walmart have excess commercial. He doesn't want more competition. There is already too much traffic at the intersection. There won't be any trees other than what will be planted. Although he uses the softball fields, he knows that they cannot stay forever. This area can't handle the traffic.

Mr. Grimm on Cullen Road asked about ball diamonds and said that that Tags is one of the leading softball programs and 93 teams resulting in 1400 players per week play. That means 2000 people that come here regularly and provide revenue for the area businesses. He is against the project.

Laura on Chelsea Circle thanked the Commission for the time they put in; but said she is against the project. She questioned the location of the property line relative to the pond in Millpointe. She said that residents are concerned about the proximity of the development relative to the pond. She also expressed concerned about preservation of pine trees. If balconies are facing Millpointe, residents could be seeing all types of items on the balconies from their living rooms. There should be as much concern for this view as there is from the roads. Property values could go down and they have only just recovered in the past few years. She stated that there is another apartment complex on the other side of her subdivision which brings all types of traffic, and foot traffic, from that complex. A barrier was supposed to be built there but nothing was constructed. There have been a lot of problems.

Mr. Wallace on Cullen commented that he was one of the founders of the tri-county senior softball league and said that 120 seniors would be disenfranchised. He said that 7 acres would allow for new softball fields for them. He said that softball is not just for young guys - there are a lot of old guys that still like to play ball.

Mr. Millen on Mystic Meadow Court said he moved here because of the community. He said he doesn't know much about the Planning Commission but said he hoped they are residents of the Township and then asked if the Commissioners resided in the Township. He then stated that Chair did not reside in the Township.

Mr. Fontaine on Norway Drive said that this doesn't look like a community to him- it's a community within a community, and that is not what Hartland's about. He questioned what would happen when the Mayberry project gets going and there is competition on price. He also questioned whether the 3-story buildings would blend with the 1-story commercial buildings stating that it would be an eyesore.

Mr. Horan on old US -23 said he was pleased that Edward Rose was proposing this and they have a proven track record for building and managing projects like this. The building materials show that they want to keep their maintenance down - they are a long term employer and will be part of this community. If this doesn't happen that property will probably sit another 30 years. You need more people to live here to stimulate the commercial. This will add amenities that this community could use. You won't find a commercial user.

Mr. Wilkenson on Dunham Road said he was asked to come by some of the residents of Millpointe. He doesn't agree with the projected number of residents. He posed procedural questions about the master plan process stating that considering all the time and thought that went into the master plan with comments, public hearings and

community participation and he hoped that it was not a document that now doesn't mean that much. Its often a question of winners and losers, especially considering the sewer system connections. We don't have to fill all our land as rapidly as possible. He asked if procedurally you have to amend the master land use plan or is it arbitrary and can anyone come in and say they want to do something different. Does it have to be amended in the same manner that it was adopted. He also asked if a rezoning would be required. Discussion then occurred on the relationship between a comprehensive plan and a zoning ordinance; it was relayed that a PD was a rezoning. It was suggested by the Commission that process questions be directed to the planner. He concluded by saying he was against the project.

Mr. Gannon on Parkway Place asked to discuss mathematics and questioned the bedroom count - he said it sounded like a lot of empty bedrooms. He said that the figure given on total number of residents made him distrust everything else that was said.

Mr. Jackson on Chelsea Circle said that the decisions made will impact the community 40-50 years into the future. He doesn't want to look at a 35 foot building. He also said that Hartland doesn't have a police force and asked who will provide patrol. He said that Edward Rose and Sons own Village and there are problems there that he doesn't want here.

Mr. Baylog on Newgate Drive said he loved Hartland and moved here from another community. His family has been here since the 40's. He said apartments can cause problems. His daughter has nearly a 4.0 and bringing in new kids can cause problems. Traffic is also a concern. Traffic around Meijers is an example; it is definitely scary.

Ms. Kelly on Thornridge Drive said she experiences major backups and traffic is horrendous in the morning and evening. She moved here from Brighton and to add more traffic will only result in more back-ups. She can't imagine what traffic will be like on her street.

Mr. Zherlag from the Thomas Duke Co. on Grand River said he represents the property owner and has for the past 20 years. They have put together dozens of site plans over the years. He has had many discussions on commercial and Hartland doesn't have the population. They have had a lot of interest from multi-family developers. They had the opportunity to hand pick the Edward Rose company because they were willing to do mixed use commercial. This will help promote demand for more commercial. This project will result in 100,000+ square foot of commercial. This will keep the commercial integrity of M-59 in place.

Mr. Luce on Dunham Road said although it is unpopular he does support what they want to do. He believes that large apartment buildings are in the Township's future and this would be a good place for it to go. He thinks it is good that they have preserved the commercial on the major roads. He moved here when it was just farms and trees; and the population and commercial has grown exponentially. It's the only open place of land at this location. He indicated that as a resident living there I could walk to businesses and schools. I support the project.

9. Planner's Report

The Director reported on the following:

I had a meeting the real estate agents for Walmart along with the Township Manager and Supervisor, and they are exploring opportunities for the reuse of the Walmart. It was relayed that there would be no deed restrictions on the property unlike what has occurred in other locations. The meeting was positive. The real estate agendas are working on bringing forth some options.

Another change I am making in the Department is to eliminate land use waivers such as required for the replacement of windows. There is no fee but it does take staff time. What we have elected to do is eliminate some of the waivers to streamline the process - there is no need for us to track such projects.

Also, we have made an offer to a new planning assistant and that person has verbally accepted. We are also in the process of interviewing for the new planner. Kim has indicated that she wants to retire.

There will be a special meeting on April 7th to consider the Mayberry Homes project - this will be the public hearing.

Also, the Township Board has requested a joint meeting with the Planning Commission. The previous dates were not doable. They have asked for dates other than Thursday nights. Tuesday April 12th and 26th were suggested.

10. Committee Reports

None

11. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Colaianne and seconded by Mitchell; motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Keith R. Voight". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line through the middle of the name.

Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary