

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

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

4. Approval of Meeting Agenda

a. Meeting agenda for June 25, 2015

1. Motion to approve Planning Commission meeting agenda for June 25, 2015

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman
AYES:	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jun 11, 2015 7:00 PM

Secretary Voight noted a few minor typos to be corrected in the final minutes.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Joe Colaianne, Trustee
SECONDER:	Thomas Murphy, Commissioner
AYES:	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

6. Call to Public

No public came forward. (Those in attendance who wished to speak waited until the public hearing for the agenda item they were interested in.)

7. Public Hearing

- a. SP # 531 - Speedway Rebuild; Site Plan with Special Land Use

a. Site Plan #531 - Speedway Rebuild; Site Plan with Special Land Use

Chair Fox first explained the public hearing process, then opened the hearing by asking for an overview of the project from staff planner. The planner described the proposal as a rebuild of an existing Speedway located on the south side of M-59 east of Old US-23. The new facility will have 18 pumps and a 6,100 sq. ft. building, which will include a café along with convenience items. The proposal also includes relocation of the M-59 access drive shared with Fountain Square, improvements to the parking lot, and expansion of the shared detention pond. The most significant issue associated with the project is traffic generation and access. The subject parcel will ultimately be 3.635 acres. Since an automobile fueling and convenience station is a special land use in the GC - General Commercial district, a public hearing is required.

Following the planner's overview, the Chair asked the applicant for comments. The applicant provided an extensive presentation on the proposal addressing site design, landscaping, traffic, access, architecture, and lighting. The applicant highlighted the high level of interaction with staff and MDOT on the various traffic/circulation issues.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Chair Fox asked for public comments.

Mr. Yurick asked about traffic flow and the traffic study, specifically left turns, expressing concern about the proposed relocation of the access drive.

Mr. Krieger on Deer Path Lane stated that he had experience with such projects, particularly the safety aspect. He asked about specific aspects of the fuel pumps and whether all fuel emissions would be captured (even if not required in Michigan). He also said that moving the access to the east would have a dramatic impact on safety, describing the conflicts. He also felt that MDOT was not an expert in this area, and further thought that a restudy was needed.

The Chair then proceeded to a point by point discussion of the staff review; he closed the public hearing at 7:50. Newsom asked if the left in right out and only having the shared access. The applicant's stated that this would result in back-up problems; other options were studied but this was the only one that MDOT would support. Chair Fox asked if documentation from MDOT was provided, the planner stated that MDOT supported the proposal.

Chair Fox explained the road jurisdictions but expressed concern about the traffic generation study. Mitchell also expressed concern about the relocated access on M-59 and left turns, especially at peak times.

Voight said that he was also concerned with the left turn lane, but said some of the access problems are related to the existing internal circulation, which will be improved. He stated that we will not be any worse off than we are now. Murphy agreed with the comments made, comparing the circulation to another Speedway site in the region, indicating that it will be somewhat of an improvement. Chair Fox said that he is familiar with 3 previous proposals for this site with many scenarios and models offered, and living it is different than the computer is reflecting, though this proposal will likely be better. He said he doesn't understand how moving the drive east will reduce backups; but said it is important to recognize that this is already an existing business.

The outdoor display/storage was discussed with Chair Fox stating that outdoor sales were not typical in Hartland. The applicant's representative described the wall that will screen such items as ice, propane and seasonal products. Murphy asked where the fuel truck will unload (at the southwest corner), and where store deliveries will be made.

Chair Fox expressed concern about the canopy lighting stating that much research was done to develop the Ordinance standards. He cited the White Lake Meijers as an example. The applicant's representative listed the light levels of other fuel stations in the area, stating that at grade the Speedway canopy will be at 18 fc and at 5' will be around 22 fc. The planner shared recent staff research undertaken on this topic highlighting peer communities with canopy light levels of 20 fc. Chair Fox could not recall what generated the specific numbers now in the Ordinance; the planner suggested they were likely recommendations from International Dark Sky Association. Chair Fox said one of the reasons for the lighting regulations was because they were unhappy with the canopy lighting in the Township at that time. Much of his concern is the impact relative to the light level surrounding the site. He does not want to agree to something he is uncertain of. The applicant's representative said the new lighting will be LED and is proposed to be one-third of what is currently existing at the Speedway; consistency is important. Murphy suggested a focused or spotlight approach should be considered. Staff was directed to survey the lighting levels in the vicinity of the Speedway. Chair Fox said it was more important that it fit the context.

Newsom asked for an overview of the environmental issues, particularly on the Mobil site. He asked that a report on the status be prepared.

The dumpster relocation, sidewalk locations, and directional signage were briefly discussed. Chair Fox asked about the outdoor seating and whether additional parking was needed - no additional was required. The planner also confirmed that the cross-parking easement agreements would be reviewed by the Township attorney.

The Planning Commission was asked for determinations on the proposed landscaping; Grissim commented that 1) larger scale trees should be provided, 2) more info on the knee wall should be provided, 3) foundation landscaping is ample, 4) parking lot shows new islands, and she needs to understand what is happening with

those, 5) regarding perimeter landscaping- the Norway spruce will likely outgrow the site - they are too large of where they are proposed, 6) a few more plantings should be shown around the detention, 7) in terms of material selections, they are largely appropriate, with the exception of creeping lilyturf and London plane tree; substitutions should be found for these two.

Chair Fox asked about the light bollards, then moved on to the building materials. He expressed concern about the size of the structural brick product proposed; he also asked for a rationale as to why a non-clay brick should be approved. The applicant indicated that it was a structurally more efficient. Chair Fox asked that the window surround be called out on the plan. Colaianne asked about the potential for music being allowed on the site; Chair Fox stated that this would not be permitted. The issue of signage was raised and it was stated that signs are approved administratively; electronic signs are not permitted. Color of the outdoor furniture should be shown on the plan. Newsom asked about the possibility of swapping the location of the outdoor seating to with the outdoor storage. He is concerned with maintenance, stating that he knows of no gas stations with outdoor seating. Chair Fox asked that a sheet be provided showing the actual building footprint as opposed to the prototype.

Chair Fox recommended that the proposal come back before them once the issues referenced were addressed, especially the lighting. The applicant expressed concern in that they had to (tomorrow) make a final decision about the site. Chair Fox responded that in his opinion this is the best redevelopment proposal that has come forward on this site. Mitchell agreed, though traffic flow is a real concern. He reiterated a question raised by a member of the public on whether the pumps would be “state of the art” - the applicant’s representative said that State of Michigan regulations would be followed. Voight said that it was a nice development and didn’t see why they wouldn’t want to go forward. Grissim agreed that it was an improvement and she could help (through staff) with the landscaping questions. Chair Fox thanked the applicants.

RESULT:	DEFERRED
----------------	-----------------

b. SP# 530-P - Walnut Ridge Estates Preliminary Site Plan for an Amendment to a Planned Development

a. **Site Plan #530-P - Walnut Ridge Estates Preliminary Site Plan for an Amendment to the Venture Church Planned Development**

Chair Fox again described the process and opened the public hearing at 9:05. The planner was asked to provide an overview explaining that the application proposes 64 single family site condominiums on the undeveloped land north of the Venture Church site located north of M-59 between Cullen and Hacker Roads. The entire site is 76 acres and includes the Church’s developed portion which comprises approximately 34 of those 76 acres. The units are generally 1/3 to 1/2 acre in size and the proposed layout and lot sizes are very similar to the Crestwood PD previously approved but not built. That proposal showed 80 units on 76 acres. The land is now proposed for development by Capital Construction, an entity separate and distinct from Venture Church. Both the Planning Commission and the Township Board looked favorably on the proposal during the concept stage.

Key issues outstanding include: 1) the building envelopes relative to accessory structures, 2) the status of a possible traffic signal at M-59, 3) the potential for a sidewalk connection to Hartland Estates, 4) status of the water main extension required, 5) status of the landscape waiver requests, 6) status of the water, sewer, and road connections to adjacent properties, and 7) an explanation of the recognizable benefits required. No staff recommendation was offered due to the significance of the outstanding issues.

The applicant was then asked for an overview as well. The applicant’s representative briefly discussed the project history, layout and design, emphasizing that it was the intent to develop in 2 phases in a manner that could allow some level of construction to occur while the outstanding issues were being addressed. He indicated that they see the issues outlined as important, and said that the water extension will certainly be addressed. They performed the water study and will extend sewer but have questions about whether the adjacent property will be located in the district. He said that this development is ready to proceed, but there are a number of questions related to the adjacent property development that seem to be holding up this project. They are requesting that Phase 1 of the project be approved this evening, with the outstanding issues to be addressed at a later date.

Chair Fox opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cole on Giovanni Court asked about how far the lots go back and whether the planting of pine trees is incorporated into the plan. She also asked if the neighbors have access to the plans - the response was that all information is available on-line.

Mr. Spencer on Giovanni Court asked if the natural buffer was to be eliminated, and if the mature vegetation could be preserved.

A resident on Giovanni Court stated that the buffer is not year round and wishes to see something better than the vegetation there as a screen.

Mr. Spencer asked about the retention pond location, stating that he was concerned about the direction of water flow.

The public hearing was closed at 9:27 and the Chair asked the applicant's to again come forward. He began discussion on the review. The first topic was setbacks for accessory structures. Colaianne emphasized that this must be addressed one way or another so the Township would not have to be involved. Chair Fox said that provisions stating that outbuildings must match the principal building be included; the applicant agreed.

The sidewalk issue was raised next and Chair Fox asked about its location. Colaianne emphasized the importance of connectivity overall. Discussion moved to the property to the west; Colaianne said he spoke with the owner and asked if efforts had been made to meet on the issues. Chair Fox said that he has seen the plan for the adjacent property and it would work. He suggested that a lot on the west perhaps tentatively serve as a possible location for a connection. Another lot could be incorporated so the overall number of lots remained the same. The paving of Hacker Road was included in this discussion. Chair Fox said the Director recommended phasing the project, thereby allowing further consideration of connections to occur when Phase 2 is proposed. The Chair said that an eventual connection to Hacker will be a major selling point for this development, reiterating that connectivity is a major element of the Comprehensive Plan. Mitchell asked about the phasing plan, which was reviewed by the applicant. Chair Fox suggested that the applicant confer with the Fire Marshal about the requirements for temporary access. It was agreed that the warrants were probably not there to require a traffic signal on M-59 at this point.

Discussion moved to the location of utility easements, and the applicant said that not enough is known about adjacent development. The elevations provided by the applicant were viewed and the comments were positive. Mitchell asked if they have 3 car garages, stating that accessory buildings may not be needed. Chair Fox said the units were not as "vertical" as they appeared; they were proportional. The materials were described at Murphy's request. Chair Fox said the applicant is building similar homes in other areas. He asked that the useable open space calculation be added to the plan. It was agreed that the conservation easement was a positive.

Chair Fox restated that the utility issues should be resolved before the project goes before the Township Board; the applicant's representative said that the extensions will be made, but the timing is the question. He said that at this point, they don't know the best location, and that the future water and sewer locations should be addressed in conjunction with Phase 2. Voight said that one of the outstanding issues was when these connections would be made and this answered the question.

Chair Fox raised recognizable benefits and options were discussed. The planner emphasized that the Director was concerned about the outstanding issues as indicated by the "no recommendation" contained in the staff review. Mitchell asked about the timetable for Phase 2, expressing concern about the potential removal of the secondary access if the stub road to the west is not built-out. The applicant's representative said this is one of the three issues that should be addressed in the future. He also said that the Township will need to do a study to determine if the adjacent site can even be included in the district, and said they should not be held up due to possible development of a project that is not even included in the district. Chair Fox responded that the Planning Commission has not yet been provided with a phasing plan, therefore they don't have anything to approve. The applicant's representative pointed to a note on the plan, but acknowledge there was no phasing

line or road information provided. The applicant asked if the road issue is resolved, how would the utility issues be addressed? Chair Fox said this would be a discussion with the Planning Director. He said again that the phasing proposal would likely work. The applicant expressed some frustration that they don't know what is happening with the property to the west; Colaianne responded that the Board requested that the applicant sit down with the property owner to the west to discuss issues and this did not happen. The applicant said that he did not want to do studies for another developer, and listed those elements. The applicant's representative asked if there was a concept plan that was of public record.

A question posed by the public about drainage was answered; all drainage would be away from Hartland Estates.

Chair Fox thanked the applicant.

RESULT: DEFERRED

8. Old and New Business

No items scheduled.

9. Call to Public

No one came forward

10. Planner's Report

No additional information provided.

11. Committee Reports

None.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned around 10:10pm.

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary