

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

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

Also present Planning Director Dave Campbell.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion to approve the January 29, 2015 meeting agenda.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: | Joe Colaianne, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Michael Mitchell, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Colaianne |
| ABSENT: | Voight |

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion to accept the December 18, 2014 meeting minutes.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: | Sue Grissim, Joe Colaianne |
| SECONDER: | Thomas Murphy, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Colaianne |
| ABSENT: | Voight |

5. Call to Public

Stan Siczka (1225 Maxfield): Voiced concerns on traffic for the proposed Woods Edge Development. This could affect his driveway, and he's concerned about the potential for headlights shining onto his property as well as any potential road widening.

Cheri Pollesch (1266 Maxfield): Voiced concerns over diverting the wetlands on the proposed Woods Edge Development and flooding concerns if the wetlands are disturbed. Also, concerns on the Indiana Bat Habitat in the Woods Edge Development, and the lights generated by new streetlights.

Chris Peterson (owns vacant property on south side of Lone Tree): Woods Edge Development concerns in regard to access to his property and those of neighboring property whose access is via Lone Tree Road.

Lee Stouse (656 Maxfield): Woods Edge Development concerns regarding access to his 5 acre parcel, along with his right of way via Lone Tree, and whether property owners will retain their Lone Tree access..

Bill Poland (1270 Maxfield): Voiced concerns on Maxfield Road maintenance with the extra traffic that the Woods Edge Development will create.

6. Public Hearing

Larry Fox called to order the Public Hearing for Special Land Use and Site Plan Application #527, Lucky Dining, Inc., at 7:15 PM.

Following the overviews of the Planning Director and the Applicant, Chair Fox invited public comment, and no public came forward. Chair Fox closed the public hearing at 7:34 PM.

a. Site Plan/Special Land Use Application #527 - KFC Restaurant w/ Drive-Through

During the public hearing, Planning Director Campbell summarized the review letters of the reviewing agencies, including the Planning Department's letter dated Jan. 21, 2015. Planning Department is recommending the Planning Commission forward the Special Land Use component to the Township Board with a recommendation of approval, subject to Planning Commission approval of a revised and resubmitted site plan. Site plan issues to be addressed included landscaping, screening of the drive-through use from the residents to the north, building design and materials, and the building's color scheme.

The Applicant (Glen Flewelling, Lucky Dining Inc.) and his project manager (Bill Beckett, WT Development) provided their overview of the project.

Chair Fox noted that the applicant has met most of the criteria for the SLU, and those that still need to be revised - like screening/buffering and drive-through stacking - can be addressed on a revised site plan

Applicant addressed questions on future cross-access and the proposed driveway stubs to the west property line. Planning Commission made it clear that a condition of final site plan approval would be a cross-access easement agreement, which the applicant agreed to since cross access would be mutually beneficial

Motion to recommend approval of the Special Land Use for a KFC fast-food drive through restaurant, Application #527, located east of Clark Road, to the Hartland Township Board, conditional upon Planning Commission approval of a revised and re-submitted Site Plan Application.

While the PC did not wish to delve too far into the issues on the site plan since the purpose of the meeting was to come to a decision on the recommendation for the Board on the SLU, they did provide feedback on some of the significant site plan issues that would need to be addressed on a revised submittal. This included discussion on building materials and colors, sign size and design, and whether proposed architectural features should be considered the background of a sign.

Newsom feels the red "flag" elements may be okay but that there is too much white EIFS. Fox agrees and adds that the Colonel's "mug shot" panel sign needs to be 10 sf or less and that sconce lights cannot shine up.

There was a consensus that the red flags were not necessarily dissonant in color so long as there was less white EIFS and more earthtone brick./stone. Newsom and Fox feel the flags are not to be considered the background of a sign so long that they are in scale & proportional to a compliant wall sign.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: | Sue Grissim, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Michael Mitchell, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Colaianne |
| ABSENT: | Voight |

7. Old and New Business

a. SP 524-C REVISED Planned Development Conceptual Plan - Chestnut Development

Planning Director, Dave Campbell, gave an overview of the Revised Planned Development Conceptual Plan from Chestnut Development, for a 25-unit detached condominium on 8.99 vacant acres on the south side of M-59 just east of Cullen, between the Autumn Woods and San Marino residential developments. Planning Director summarized Planning Department's review letter dated Dec. 16, 2014, much of which focused on the proposed density of the project as well as the required extension of the municipal water service.

Steve Gronow (Chestnut Development) and David LeClair (Livingston Engineering) were present to address the Planning Commission and answer any questions or concerns.

Per the procedures of the Zoning Ordinance, no formal action is required by the Planning Commission at the

Conceptual Plan stage of the Planned Development process.

Colaianne asked about the variations in the homes proposed, and applicant confirmed that there will be at least 4 elevations that buyers could choose from. He also confirms that with the detached condominium proposed, everything from the interior walls out would be considered common element under the control of a condominium association. Individual owners would not be responsible for exterior repairs, grass cutting, snow removal, etc.

Fox asked about the proposed open space, and applicant's engineer shows a map intended to demonstrate that open space is approximately 32% of the gross acreage.

Newsom asks about whether internal sidewalks and street-trees are proposed. Applicant states that they're still weighing options on sidewalks, and that they're more inclined to offer a woodchip walking trail around the perimeter. They will comply with Township's landscaping requirements, including street trees.

Newsom states he favors the proposed density, that the Township needs this type of home.

PC seeks clarification on municipal water main extension; 12" main will extend through the project and stub to an existing utility easement within San Marino, as opposed to a true to-and-through along the M-59 frontage. This method will also allow for a looped system with the existing Autumn woods water main.

Mitchell seeks clarification on existing versus planned M-59 right-of-way, relative to the setback of the homes from the existing highway. It is confirmed that the northerly homes of the development would be setback at least as far as the northern-most homes in the Autumn Woods development.

Mitchell has no objection to density; he feels it fits and would not be a detriment to adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Murphy seeks clarification on separation between homes and setbacks from the proposed private road. It is confirmed that the homes will be at least 20 feet apart, the same side separation as the homes in Autumn Woods. The homes will be closer to the road, which Murphy feels makes the proposal seem tight relative to neighboring developments. Fox states that this development will be very comparable to the Villas of Oceola (Latson between 59 and Hughes) in terms of setbacks, building spacing, and layout.

Fox says he recognizes that there is a market for this type of home but isn't convinced the proposed site is the right location for it. The more he learns about the consistency between the proposed development and neighboring Autumn Woods with respect to layout, setbacks, density, and building design, the more he could be convinced. The proposed development will need to be screened and buffered along its perimeter since it is adjacent to lower density developments.

Murphy states he likes the product and recognizes the demand for it.

Fox discusses the relatively short driveways and the possibility that the Fire Marshal may only allow parking on one side of the private road, and wants the applicant to be aware that could limit his buyers' ability to accommodate guest parking.

Colaianne asks about the entrance and whether improvements will be required, either a boulevard entrance and/or improvements to M-59. Applicant's engineer states they are still working with MDOT on traffic impacts, but doubts they will be required to do any improvements to M-59 beyond accel/decel tapers.

Fox states for the record that the applicant has completed their obligation to bring their Conceptual Planned Development Plan before the Planning Commission.

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

b. SP528 - Woods Edge Preliminary Site Condominium Plan

Planning Director, Dave Campbell, reviewed the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan for 21 single-family detached units on 20.8 vacant acres on the south side of Maxfield Road, south of Maxfield Lake. Planning Director summarized the review letters of all reviewing agencies, including the Planning Department's review letter dated Jan. 21, 2015.

The owners of the property, Tom Tecco and Steve Bellengar were present along with Dave LeClair of Livingston Engineering to provide an overview of their site plan and to answer questions from the Planning Commission.

Chair Fox asked about the Indiana Bat habitat on the site. Applicant's engineer said he wasn't yet aware of whether there was one, but if there is, the key is doing tree removal early in the year before the bats migrate back to Michigan. It is being investigated.

Fox stated his desire would be to have as much preservation of existing trees and natural features as possible. He also does not favor street trees in a development with an open-ditch road design. Use the natural features to your advantage, including in creating a stormwater detention area. Don't remove existing natural features to replace it with something not natural.

Murphy concurs. Keep it natural, and don't do street trees because they lend to an unnatural look. Let homeowners decide how they want to plant their frontage.

Colaianne discusses Lone Tree, and his understanding that because it is a section line it is by default public right-of-way, even if Lone Tree Road has long been de-certified. While he favors establishing an access easement for Lone Tree across the subject property, he acknowledges that it may be redundant.

Fox recommends recording a conservation easement around the site's perimeter, with as much conservation as possible to maintain the natural beauty of the property.

Newom seeks information on fire access. Applicant and Planning Director explain that the emergency access proposed is required with a development that has only one point of public access. Fire Marshal offered an alternative of waiving the emergency access in lieu of internal fire suppression for each home. Applicant not inclined to agree to that. Emergency access must maintain sight distance, be gated, be kept clear, and maintained. Newsom asked if Lots 20 and 21 could have access off Lone Tree rather than a shared driveway extending from the proposed private road. Answer is this would not be feasible because developer would then have to improve all of Lone Tree Road out to Maxfield.

Fox agrees with staff that there are some issues to be addressed on a revised submittal before the plan is forwarded to the HTB with a positive recommendation from the PC. If PC is being asked to waive landscaping requirements in lieu of preservation of existing vegetation, more information is needed on what that vegetation is so the PC can make an educated decision. PC does not typically forward plans to the HTB with a lot of open-ended questions.

Applicant seeks clarification on what more the PC what need to see on a revised submittal. Fox responds that, for example, PC needs an open space calculation.

Planning Director cites section of Zoning Ordinance that provides clear standards for the information an applicant needs to provide if they're seeking credit for existing vegetation in lieu of new landscaping.

Grissim concurs on needing more information on existing vegetation; she'd also like more detailed grading information.

Applicant requests a consensus from the PC that this is a plan the applicant can feel confident investing more engineering costs in. All six Commissioners concur that they believe this is a feasible development that they could give a favorable recommendation on once certain issues are addressed.

The Planning Department's recommendation was for the Applicant to revise and resubmit their plan to address the outstanding issues noted in the Department's review letter, particularly issues related to open space and natural features preservation in lieu of meeting all of the Township's landscaping standards. The Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation, and took no formal action. The applicant will come back to the Commission at a future date with revised plan which will take into consideration the concerns of the Commission.

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

8. Call to Public

Dan Siczka: Asked is there will be a traffic impact analysis for the Woods Edge development.

Cheri Pollesch: Asked is the Township will make sure the Woods Edge development follows all evaluation guidelines in their plan. She is concerns about the wetlands and flooding.

Lee Stouse: Concerned about easements across property. Also expressed concern about the creeks in the Woods Edge development area and flooding. Feels this needs addressed before development begins and concerned about public trespassing on properties near the Woods Edge development.

Chris Peterson: Lone Tree access easements.

9. Planner's Report

No report.

10. Committee Reports

No reports.

11. Adjournment

Adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:50 PM.

Move to adjourn the meeting at **9:50 PM.**

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: | Joe Colaianne, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Michael Mitchell, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Colaianne |
| ABSENT: | Voight |

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary