

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, Sue Grissim, Michael Mitchell, Keith Voight

ABSENT: Jeff Newsom (Excused)

4. Approval of Meeting Agenda

a. Motion to Approve Meeting Agenda

Motion amended to add Call to the Public:

Mr. Rowe on Deer Path Lane came forward and said he appreciated hearing all the different viewpoints on this project. He said that traffic is a issue, but he is most concerned about the cluster homes that will be 53 feet from his property line. He does not believe that the pine trees proposed will be effective in screening. He also believes that, without more of a barrier, kids will be crossing onto his property as well as others in the vicinity. He is urging the construction of a fence along with the pine trees along the boundary length.

Mr. Hill on Wilson Lane said he was not aware of the meetings. He did watch the videos to learn about the project. He said he is concerned about property values and his rural lifestyle - he believes this will bring his property value down. Traffic is a major issue. Noise from traffic brakes at a future light will impact the residents. He is very concerned that the community well will affect his well, and about the gas stations which can leak gas and oil. Crime is a concern, considering the number of people that will be in this area. Fire and police will need to be increased in light of the number of people this will bring. The houses will only be 10 feet apart which is too close. He said he understands that the developer has a right to build there, but the density is too high - it will be transformed to a circus. He is sure that a plan can be feasible that is less dense - this is too much. He does not believe that this project is in the spirit of Hartland - it is over the top. Just because this has been brought to you doesn't mean it has to be accepted. He sees major logistic problems. He understands that something will happen but this needs to be highly scrutinized.

Mr. Britton on Hearthstone Lane said he had recently moved here so his children could grow up in this wonderful community, and it is perfect as it is. But people are not paying attention to what is going on and decisions are being made based on a profit. You will make all of us suffer for what you think is now okay. What is being proposed is already available. Why do we need more housing. We don't have the law enforcement or fire fighters to be able to manage it. Colaianne responded to the question Mr. Britton asked of the consultant as to whether he lived here by saying that questions should be addressed to the Planning Commission. It was further explained that questions will not be answered during the Call to the Public, but at a later time. Mr. Britton said that outside consultants will give you what you pay them for. He said that the people they need to listen to are the ones paying taxes here and living here.

Ms. Ehgoltz on Peppermill Court said she has lived in the area since her birth and her grandparents lived in Hartland. She just found out about the proposal. She said that since she moved here in 1975 she has seen the community grown by leaps and bounds, and the amount of traffic amazes her. She said that there is a similar development in Howell and it went nowhere. She doesn't believe that this development will add anything beneficial to this community except more congestion and more people.

Ms. Vogel on Dunham Road said she recently found out about the plans and said it was ten pounds in a five pound bag. The previous development as mentioned has not been very successful and would like to see a study done on the number of vacant commercial properties and how many residential properties are available and take this into consideration.

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

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

None

6. Public Hearing

None

7. Old & New Business

a. Newberry Preliminary Planned Development #535-P, Mixed Use Development

Chair Fox asked the applicants to come forward and explained to the public that this was the third evening of review of the preliminary plan for Newberry Place. The Commission has been going through this in great detail with the Township's planning consultant. The next topic to be discussed is crosswalks - and they should be provided at the east and west ends of the east and west residential streets on the south parcel and at the west end of the mixed use streets. It was also suggested by the consultant that a system of pedestrian ways be provided in the park areas adjacent to the wetlands on the south side. Chair Fox suggested a wood chip path, signage may be needed as well. Colaianne said that wetlands permits may be necessary for such an endeavor. Grissim asked about the crossing of M-59 - the response was that such a crossing would need to be addressed by the traffic study.

The consultant provided an overview of the architecture and materials being proposed. He recommended that the Planning Commission discuss the appropriateness of vinyl considering that this is a PD proposal and higher standards are typical. Voight indicated that he had no problems with the vinyl since it is broken up by the architecture. Fiberglass was also discussed. The applicant said that hardy board would need to be painted every 5 years but vinyl siding will hold its color, and that vinyl siding products have become more sophisticated over the past 15 years. Chair Fox suggested that a six inch vinyl be considered as opposed to the double four proposed. Colaianne agreed but said that it was hard to look at a rendering and visualize the result. The applicant said that they are currently looking at the wider vinyl, especially for the lower levels. The applicant's representatives explained that the amount of vinyl proposed is substantially less on the commercial buildings. Chair Fox said that the overall look is appealing, but from a regulatory standpoint, we can't end up with vinyl boxes - the applicant said they will work with the Commission on this point. Murphy asked that the applicant explain how they are proposing to break up the architecture on the commercial. The applicant emphasized that their intent is to provide something that looks good from all directions. Grissim asked for clarification on the elevations of the gas station/convenience store as it shows vinyl - the applicant's representative said that this will be corrected. Mitchell asked for clarification on aluminum vs. wood screen doors - the applicant's representative said that this was probably a hold-over from the last submittal. The consultant suggested that the Planning Commission review each of the sheets illustrating the architecture.

Discussion moved to the corner features. Chair Fox said that not much color is used in the architecture in Hartland. The buildings are showing to be primarily brick with metal roofs. The applicant emphasized that the corner features are designed to look like landscape features. Grissim said she would like to see more detail when they come in for the next round. Murphy agreed, and asked for a cross section that better detailed the signage, particularly the size. Chair Fox asked to see the fourth side of the apartment buildings, but believed that the three sides shown met Ordinance requirements. Voight asked about air conditioning units - the applicant said that they will be screened. Chair Fox said that the architecture will be scrutinized when the buildings come in for site plan approval. Colaianne asked for clarification on the apartment floorplans - the applicant said that the building is flexible but the layout is for flats.

Discussion moved to the duplex architecture. The applicant said that it is a motor court design popular throughout the country now. This type of unit offers quite a bit of privacy since one driveway serves four units. The elevations for the duplexes will likely differ, and these will be for-sale units. The design will allow for fewer driveways and will eliminate front facing garages.

An overview of the cluster home architecture was provided. The applicant emphasized that the design was efficient and resulted in an interesting “sawtooth” look at the rear property line while providing for privacy and four parking spaces per unit (including the garages). Screening fences will also be built to further enhance privacy for decks. These will be a mix of one and two story units. Two thirds will likely be single story to serve the empty nest market.

Regarding the mixed use product, Chair Fox asked if living units were proposed on the upper floors. The applicant’s representatives said not necessarily, and these may provide for a mix of retail and office. Grissim expressed concern about the facades, indicating that these did not look like the other buildings. Colaianne agreed. More detail will be provided in the future.

The senior center will be submitted with the first phase, and Chair Fox said that the change in elevation is very positive and is more in line with the other buildings. The conflict in the materials to be used will be corrected. Mitchell asked about the HVAC units for the senior center and suggested landscaping around the proposed units.

The consultant reminded the Planning Commission that the condominium plans should be considered in coordination with the overall proposals.

Chair Fox said that the applicant should be aware that the issues identified in the three review letters must be resolved. Not enough information has yet been provided on traffic impacts, especially on whether or not warrants have been met. There appears to be some disagreement between the applicant’s traffic consultant and preliminary MDOT review. More discussion between these two is needed.

Chair Fox asked about signs, and the consultant said that what is being proposed is essentially the same as that contained in the Zoning Ordinance. He encouraged that the applicant consider simply referencing the Township’s current sign ordinance as an alternative.

Attention was then redirected to the first part of the consultant’s review which deals with eligibility. In terms of recognizable benefits, enhanced landscaping could be considered as such, along with higher quality architecture. Road improvements to be required are not yet known. The fire station site along with the community water system could be considered benefits, but more information is needed. The TND concept in and of itself could be considered a benefit. The applicant meets the overall size requirement. As far as impact on services, much of that impact is as yet unknown. Design principles were detailed. The unified control provision appears to have been satisfied.

Chair Fox concluded with a review of the process. Once revisions are made, the project will be submitted again to the Planning Commission for review of changes only. He said to the applicant that an issue that has yet to be addressed by the applicant is the impact of a community well on the water table. The applicant’s representative said that these impacts will be evaluated as part of MDEQ permit review. Mitchell asked the applicant to provide more information on the water issue, particularly the impact on wells, since this is a major concern. The applicant’s representative said that it is possible that the north side could be largely built out before a water storage facility is required. Colaianne said that Millpointe does not have storage and it serves 206 homes. He clarified that the storage facility would not be a tower, but a tank in a building.

Grissim asked when the evaluation of the sufficiency of fire and police protection occurred since many residents have expressed concern for this. Colaianne said that the Fire Authority has expressed a need for facilities at this end of the Township. He also said that discussions with the County, as well as the neighboring communities, is ongoing relative to police protection. He emphasized that this is an issue that the Township is carefully looking at. Voight said that any light trespass must be contained. In response to whether or not new residential units

are needed, Voight said that a residential market analysis has recently been done by the Township. The applicant said that they did a market study as well, and build is estimated to be 6-10 years.

The Director confirmed that public hearing notices were mailed as required, plus notices were placed in the newspaper as well as on the website. Grissim asked for an explanation of the retention pond design - the applicant's representative said the pond will be dry. A general discussion took place on retention, and the need for ponds to be designed to County standards - Colaianne offered assistance in coordinating with the County as needed. Murphy explained, in terms of school capacity, that the school district is aware of the residential market studies undertaken. Voight said that Hartland currently has open enrollment, and this could probably be eliminated if needed. Chair Fox asked for last comments and asked the applicants for revised plans. He said that the next review could probably occur in one meeting. The applicant thanked the Planning Commission for the additional meetings.

8. Call to the Public

Ms. Wilson on Parkway Place said that it will change the eastern half of the Township. She said that they already have many people coming in to use Dunham Lake and the parksts, and this will just compound the problem. She also said she does not understand why two new gas stations are needed. She questioned why another large senior center would be necessary. Most of the seniors have their own homes. She does not want to fight development but would like to see it scaled down.

Ms. Gardner on Fenton Road reiterated concern about density, asking if a revised plan would be brought forward. She asked about the timing of the tree buffer on the north.

Mr. Angott on Wilson Lane said this was his first meeting and he has many concerns, most of which have been brought up by his neighbors. He asked specifically the status of the traffic study. He is most concerned about density, since this appears to be twenty pounds in a five pound bag. He doesn't understand how the focus can be on the details when the dwellings have yet to be determined. This could be twelve to fourteen hundred residents on two small parcels. He said traffic will be a major problem. He has studied the Comprehensive plan and doesn't believe that this development will be harmonious with surrounding development. He thought that the density would be 3-4 units per acre but this will be much higher. The notices to those within 300 feet are not adequate since the properties here are larger. He feels people do not know about this project. The public notice side needs work. He questioned whether the commercial proposed would constitute sprawl along M-59 which is contrary to the Comprehensive Master Plan policies. It should not be located in the more rural areas. What protections will be put into place to protect Geiglers? He asked who will be paying for the fire station, and is concerned that the existing taxpayers will be paying for the new development. This development will not attract Hartland residents, but those from the outside. These homes will not be at the same price as the rest of the community. He commented that the hardy board siding has a longer warranty than discussed earlier. Will the trees installed be saplings or more mature at installation?

9. Planner's Report

The Director reported on the following:

The Township has hired a new planner and she will be starting on May 10th. You will have an opportunity to meet her at the joint meeting on April 26th.

Also, this is a general reminder that the joint meeting between the Planning Commission and Township Board is scheduled for 6:30 on April 26th.

The real estate brokers for the old Walmart building have indicated that two offers have been received. Neither of the offers will take up the entire building, so it will likely be partitioned in the future.

Nothing has been submitted for consideration at the scheduled April 28th Planning Commission meeting - that meeting may be cancelled. The Planning Commission agreed to cancel the meeting.

At the conclusion of the Planner’s Report, Chair Fox asked that the Future Land Use Map be shown, and he proceeded to explain the difference between the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map. He pointed out the provisions included in the Special Planning Area, highlighting that it specifically allows for a commercial component. Though some people are surprised by the proposal, the applicant is following the Comprehensive Master Plan. Colaianne then stated that it is not legal to zone out certain types of uses. It is important to understand that there is a need to provide a balance between those that own property and wish to develop it, and the wishes of the public. It is not possible to simply say no to a development that the public does not want. Hartland Township tries to be reasonable and often seeks to soften the impacts. Chair Fox said that they always strive try to get the best development for the Township that it can. General discussion continued.

10. Committee Reports

None

11. Adjournment

- a. Motion to Adjourn

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

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary