

1. Call to Order - THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN LARRY FOX AT 7:15 PM

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

PRESENT: Joe Colaianne, Larry Fox, Sue Grissim, Keith Voight

ABSENT: Thomas Murphy (Excused), Jeff Newsom, Michael Mitchell (Excused)

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 upon the arrival of Trustee Colaianne to establish a quorum.

4. Approval of Meeting Agenda

- a. Motion to approve the July 30 2015 Planning Commission agenda

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

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jul 16, 2015 7:00 PM

A motion to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 16, 2015 was offered by Grissim with a requested change on page 2 to the comment from Mr. Crouse regarding Bishop Airport as it was referred to in the draft 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Chair Fox said that the public hearing for the same item was closed at 7:20 as opposed to 7:30, and asked that this be corrected. The Director noted the changes. The motion to approve with corrections was seconded by Voight; motion carried.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Sue Grissim, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Keith Voight, Secretary
AYES:	Colaianne, Fox, Grissim, Voight
ABSENT:	Newsom
EXCUSED:	Murphy, Mitchell

6. Call to Public

Ms. Langenbruch and Mr. Hemple on Matthew Lane came forward to provide comments on the Mugg & Bopps proposal for M-59 and Clark Road. They said that their home is directly behind the proposed site. She said that she is disappointed with the proposal and wants to ensure that it is meeting all the requirements. If it must be approved, it should be with strict and absolute compliance with all the ordinances and regulations to protect the residents. She said that she received conflicting information - the staff said that a wall was proposed at the back of the property for buffering purposes, but at the meeting, a berm and landscaping was discussed instead of the wall. She questioned the applicant's request regarding concrete, stating that she doesn't want to see a gravel surface. She said she is praying that it isn't approved, but asks for the following 1) a noise study, 2) a light study, and 3) trash removal time limits.

Ms. Meisterfeld of Matthew Court came forward and asked what the blank area behind the wall would be, and what would the ground be covered with. Will it be grass or gravel, and could it be split again. She asked if this could become a building site in the future. She also questioned how semis would be circulating through the site in light of

the fact that they are not allowed north of Rovey Road. She concluded by saying that the Planning Commission and Board should protect the residents. She said that if the gas station closed at 11:00 and if there would be a traffic light, most would not be here.

Ms. Gruberson and Ms. Taylor of Blaine Road came forward to voice concerns about the proposed Mugg & Bopps development at M-59 and Clark Road. They said they were not adjacent but were concerned about the development since there are already donut shops and gas stations in the area. They expressed the general desire for other types of commercial uses, stating that this was a "drive - through" town and didn't have quality development. It was felt that different types of retail were needed other than gas stations and fast food restaurants. Concerns about traffic were also expressed.

7. Public Hearing

a. SP# 534 Turnin 2 Softball Complex - Site Plan w/ Special Land Use

Chair Fox first explained the public hearing process, then opened the hearing at 7:33pm by asking for an overview of the project from the Director. The Director said that the proposed project is a site plan with special land use for a private recreation area on a combined 95 acres on the southwest corner of US-23 and Clyde Road. It will have 4 outdoor, lighted softball fields and a 64,000 square foot indoor training facility with 2 fields, batting cages and support facilities. A parking lot is shown along with a future outdoor baseball diamond. Lighting, noise, and screening are the key issues associated with this proposal. No recommendation is suggested by staff at this point since this public hearing is intended to take public input, allowing the applicant to make changes in response to the concerns raised.

The applicant's representative then came forward and introduced the project, describing the need for such a facility, especially considering that weather limits softball play during much of the year. He said it was their intent to be good neighbors while also providing an important recreational facility. The project architect reviewed the design, layout, and details of the training facility, the architecture, the use elements, the outdoor fields, the dugouts, concessions stand, and infrastructure.

Chair Fox reminded the public of the hearing process and invited public comment at 7:48pm.

Mr. Walk and Ms. Urban, came forward and said that their property bordered the project. He said they wanted reassurance that all Ordinance requirements were adhered to and screening and lighting seem to be at question. He was concerned about the sound and lighting considering the fields face his property; he is not opposed to the project, but is curious to see what restrictions are in place and how can compliance be assured. He also asked about proposals for other parts of the property and possible impacts to wildlife.

Mr. Fairbanks on Fleck Drive echoed similar concerns stating that he does not oppose the project but is especially concerned about lighting, including parking lot lights. He is also concerned about the removal of vegetation and resulting noise levels, particularly noise from US-23. Wildlife corridors should be protected to the extent possible. He asked about the function of a detention pond. He said that if all are good neighbors the project could be done very nicely.

Ms. Robinson on Clyde Road said it may be a nice addition to the community, but she is concerned about noise and lighting.

Mr. Kerr of Clyde Road echoed the same concerns but specifically emphasized the lighting. He questioned the need for lights at all considering that this was a facility for youth. He also believed that during tournaments, traffic will increase on Old US-23.

Mr. and Mrs. Whiteman on Clyde Road said he sent a lengthy letter commenting on the project and wanted to ensure that these concerns were a part of the process. He said the sound and lights were critical, but traffic was the biggest issue. He doesn't believe the courtesy stop sign is sufficient. He also said that considering the ages of the users, security is a concern.

Chair Fox at this time noted receipt of the Whiteman's letter, along with one from Mr. Russell on Brookside, the Kantlz's on Townley, and another from Mr. Barr on Clyde Road. All of these letters are considered part of the public record.

Mr. Julian on Brookside noted traffic, light, sound, and displaced wildlife as concerns. He said that the removal of the vegetation will eliminate sound attenuation. More clarity on who would be using the fields was requested. Light glow in the evening seems unavoidable, and he doesn't understand why lights are needed. He also asked about future land use, citing that it is designated industrial as a future use. He questioned whether the lot will remain agriculture in the future if this project is approved. He thought this would be helpful to the neighbors. He said it looked like a nice facility and he hopes that the applicant is following the regulations.

Mr. Shaw on Fleck Drive said his property abuts the back end of the project. He said he recognizes that this is progress and knows that a lot worse project could go in at this location. He also is concerned about future use. He wants this to be successful and is concerned about a different use, such as a bank, proposed if something goes wrong. Traffic is an issue since it can get backed up any time during the day. In the Fall, this use could conflict with Spicer's across the road in terms of traffic generation. He wants visitors to Hartland to have a positive experience. He asked if the traffic will be able to go both north and south on Old US-23. He also asked about the potential for kids wandering off the property, and what could be done to prevent that if it becomes a problem. His main concern is the traffic considering the proximity to Spicer's. Lighting is also an issue, as is the retention pond. He commented that there appears to be a potential for people to hit home runs onto US-23.

Chair Fox closed the public hearing at 8:13 and asked the applicant to come forward and proceeded with a review of the special land use and site plan. He asked for an explanation of the PA system and the applicant's representative said there would be no system. The Director asked for clarification on the hours of operation, distinguishing between the indoor and outdoor uses. The outdoor fields will operate largely May through September and the training facility will not be used in the summer.

Colaianne asked about buffering; the applicant's representative said that after hearing all the concerns, that they will be moving everything closer to Old US-23 to expand the buffer and preserve the existing trees. They will give up the future baseball field. Colaianne also asked for a comparison on the illumination. The applicant's representative said that if there are lights, they will be state-of-the-art. He told the audience that the applicant may consider giving up the lights even though they are state-of-the-art and used by the University of Michigan; the indoor and outdoor facilities are intended to be complimentary. He further stated that this is one of the nicest softball complexes ever designed and there is nothing like it in the State of Michigan. Voight asked about the hours for the lights. Chair Fox explained the Township's lighting regulations, stating that the regulations will not allow the lights to creep to the property lines. Voight asked about timing of the tournaments relative to traffic; the applicant's representative said that the peak would likely be 100 people or 30-50 cars, and unlike church, not all exiting at once.

Chair Fox asked how tall the field lights would be; the lights would be 70 ft. tall. The applicant's representative explained that if they are short like a soccer field, they would be more likely to shine sideways and the taller they are, the more the light will be downcast. Voight asked about the retail sales. It was relayed that there will be no cooking, just chips, hot dogs and pop and such, with team items for sale inside. He further said that the Turnin 2 team was nationally ranked and the facility will help in meeting training needs. University of Michigan players will likely help train, and to involve U of M, a first class facility is needed. The teams will come from around Michigan.

Chair Fox began discussion of the site plan with traffic. It was stated that all the traffic approvals have been received. The Director said the applicant has laid out the project well away from the regulated wetlands. The wetlands study was briefly discussed. Voight said that there doesn't appear to be developable land available for future use; it was agreed. Chair Fox said it appeared that only the number of acres needed would be cleared and future expansion would probably not happen. The applicant's representative indicated the only 2 fields may be built initially.

Chair Fox said that the dumpster materials must match the building. He asked the Director about the parking analysis; the concern is for possible overlap in uses. Additional parking has been shown and set aside. The detention has been sized to address any future parking as well.

The Fire Marshall has asked about the potential for a secondary emergency access off Clyde Road, though the LCRC is not requiring a second access. The applicant agreed to an emergency secondary access on Clyde Road.

Regarding the landscaping and screening concerns, the applicant intends to move the entire facility to the east to increase buffer. Chair Fox also asked for confirmation that the applicant would consider eliminating the lights; and the response was affirmative.

Grissim reviewed the green belt requirements; trees will be preserved at the property corner. More information is needed on the boulevard treatments. She asked about landscaping of the detention pond, and Chair Fox asked for an explanation of retention vs. detention. The applicant's representative said that this would be a detention pond, and natural landscaping will be added. Voight clarified that the purpose of the pond is to filter runoff first before being released. Grissim asked the applicant to look at the sizes of plant material to ensure they conformed to the Ordinance and asked that the 1200' of concrete adjacent to the training facility be broken up. No sidewalks on Clyde Road will be required.

Chair Fox advised the applicant to keep in mind (for the future submittal) the permitted light levels as defined in the Ordinance. The lights on the perimeter will be on timers.

Regarding the architecture, Chair Fox said that only minor deviations on the building are necessary, stating that the building was beautiful and the deviations are totally acceptable.

The Director said that per the request of the Fire Marshal, minor changes are needed to accommodate the fire truck turning radius. The applicant's representative explained at this time that the project will likely be phased, with only 2 fields and half the parking installed first. A concept plan showing the relocated facilities was presented, emphasizing that they want to be good neighbors.

Discussion occurred on the proposed overhead doors. The Director explained the current zoning and future land use designation in response to questions raised by the public. He reiterated that the existing use is allowed (by special use) in the CA zoning district. If rezoned in accordance with the future land use designation, which is Planned Industrial Research and Development, a much more intense use would be likely. The site is constrained due to wetlands.

The question of "people wandering" was discussed, and the applicant's representative said the vegetation serves to prevent casual wandering.

Chair Fox suggested the applicant take the information and make changes, then return for further consideration. He thanked the applicant and said he looked forward to seeing the updates. He advised the public to watch the website for future submittals.

8. Old and New Business

a. Resolution Recommending Approval of the 2015 Amendment to the Hartland Township Comprehensive Plan

Chair Fox asked the Planning Director to provide background on this agenda item. The Director described the comprehensive plan update process and the steps that have occurred to date, stating that work has been going on for nearly a year. The public hearing was held 2 weeks ago and comments were heard. The Planning Department has recommended one change and if this is acceptable, a Resolution recommending adoption of the document to the Township Board has been provided. He further explained the amendment is essentially an update to the future land use plan and the future land use map. The Director went on to briefly describe key areas of proposed change, as well as the relationship between zoning and comprehensive planning. Motion by Colaianne and seconded by Voight to recommend adoption. A roll call vote was held and passed unanimously.

(Fox, Colaianne, Grissim, Voight). The Director said that a paper version will be presented for signature at the next meeting.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Joe Colaianne, Trustee
SECONDER:	Keith Voight, Secretary
AYES:	Colaianne, Fox, Grissim, Voight
ABSENT:	Newsom
EXCUSED:	Murphy, Mitchell

b. SP# 530-P Walnut Ridge Estates Discussion

Chair Fox asked the Director for an overview. He said that the process the applicant is in requires 3 meetings before the Planning Commission and 3 meetings before the Board to review the concept, preliminary, and final condominium plan. At the meeting before the Planning Commission to consider the preliminary plan, discussion was held on integrating the proposal into the surrounding area. The two issues of concern were vehicular connectivity to adjacent properties and extension of water and sewer. As a result, meetings were held focusing on this element. The purpose of this agenda item is to relay the results of the previous discussions and to obtain buy-in from the Planning Commission thereby allowing the preliminary engineering to proceed and an amendment to the PD drafted.

The Director said that the proposal is for a 65 unit site condominium on the property north of the Venture Church. The property is presently proposed to be accessed by the road east of the church, and an emergency access to the west.

The applicant's representative described the proposal showing the location of a new 90' easement to accommodate both the water and sewer extension, and a future road extension. He also described alternative scenarios, and the proposed phasing plan. He concluded by saying that he believes this meets the expectations of the Planning Commission. The Director said that if this is acceptable, one additional lot could result. Although the applicant will be providing the easement, he will not actually be constructing a road stub. Chair Fox said he thought this was a fair and equitable arrangement. Voight agreed saying that it was a good compromise since he did not want the applicant in limbo. The Director suggested that the Planning Commission consider not requiring the applicant to meet corner frontage requirements on the lots adjacent to the easement, especially. The Planning Commission agreed with this suggestion and indicated unanimous support for the overall changes. The Director asked if the easement would be graded to minimize impacts to adjacent lot owners; yes it would be graded in that manner, but such grading would not extend past the likely rear lot line in order to preserve vegetation. The applicant also said, in terms of lot sales, all will be made aware of the possible road connection.

Chair Fox thanked the applicant for all the work done on the proposal and said he hoped to see the project back soon.

9. Call to Public

No additional public comment

10. Planner's Report

The Director reported on the following:

Regarding the tablets, the Planning Commissioners should be receiving an email from Microsoft about downloading Microsoft Office.

The revised Speedway plan will be on the August 13th agenda. It appears that the applicant has worked hard to address all the issues raised.

11. Committee Reports

None

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned (Colaianne / Grissim) at 9:45. Unanimous vote.

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 crossing through the middle of the name.

Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary