

1. Call to Order - THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY 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. Motion to approve the agenda

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

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Nov 17, 2016 7:00 PM

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

6. Call to the Public

None

7. Public Hearing

None

8. Old & New Business

a. Site Plan #544, request to construct 64,600 square foot theater, and Site Plan #439-A Emagine Theater, request to amend the PD Agreement and Pattern Book; Emagine Theater

Planning Director Troy Langer gave an overview of the request:

- Location of project is within the Hartland Towne Square Planned Development south of Meijer.
- Proposing to split the “island” area.
- Request to construct an approximate 64,600 square foot theater.
- Requesting a 6th Amendment to the PD that sets the standards for signs and also who can amend the PD in the future.
- The Township Attorney modified and accepted the language of the Amendment and it has been disseminated to the Planning Commission this evening.
- The PD Amendment requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the Township Board.

Mr. Edward Eickhoff of Ramco-Gershenson and developer for this project expressed his pleasure in being before the Planning Commission again and thanked the Planning staff for their assistance and for the cooperation of the Township. Mr. Eickhoff introduced the following attendees: Ross Gallentine and David

Darling of Ramco-Gershenson, Michael Southern of Signature Associates, Felino Pascual and Leslie Zawada of Felino Pascual & Associates.

Mr. Michael Southern stated the following:

- Has worked with Emagine for many years.
- This plan is the new build prototype for Emagine Theatres.
- Will be 64,000 square feet with 10 screens.
- Will have an upscale interior with approximately 1300 seats, all of which will be power recliners.
- Will have a bar/lounge area with a gas fireplace, traditional theater concession items as well as some upscale food items.
- Represents a quantum leap in the evolution of movie theaters.
- Emagine is an expanding business and is in the process of upgrading other existing theaters
- This theater is another first on the cutting edge of theater design and technology.
- Unique site with 1600 lineal feet of frontage and visibility of all four sides, presents some landscape and façade challenges.

Mr. Southern presented the elevations, site plan and landscape drawings for the proposed theater.

Chair Fox directed the Planning Commission to the site plan portion of the staff report. He addressed the various components of the report.

No Impact Assessment was required as this is an approved use.

A Traffic Study was not required as a movie theater was an anticipated possibility at this location. Extensive work was done when this site and the one to the south were developed regarding traffic. Many of the improvements enjoyed today at this location were paid for by the developers when the area was developed 10 years ago in exchange for this type of use being allowed in the future.

Emagine will obtain a Future Land Division and have ownership of the parcel on which the movie theater will be built but will be bound by the same PD regulations the other occupants must follow.

No minimum Lot Size is specified in the PD. Director Langer confirmed.

Meets Building Setbacks: Director Langer commented on the Right of Way confirming the proposed theater does meet the required setback from Hartland Road and Hartland Square Drive.

Parking Lot / Driveway / Internal Roads Setbacks comply.

Building Height requirement; Director Langer stated the Planning Commission will need to confirm if the 40-foot edge-lit architectural feature element on the north side of building is a structural appurtenance allowed to be up to 15 feet above the stated building height. Emagine is requesting a waiver for this component.

- Chair Fox asked the Planning Commission for their thoughts. The Planning Commission consensus was the architectural feature element is a structural appurtenance and will be allowed.

Lot Coverage requirements have been met.

Off-Street Parking: Chair Fox asked Director Langer to highlight the additional parking to the north.

- Director Langer indicated on the site plan 75 additional spaces planned to the northwest just outside of the theater property; however, Emagine meets the parking requirements without these additional planned spaces.
- Chair Fox explained this was added to accommodate a turnaround for each drive-aisle as discussed during the informal site plan review.
- Commissioner Voight inquired if this area would be utilized as shared parking in the future. Chair Fox stated it would. The Applicant confirmed.

Barrier-Free Parking requirements have been met.

Loading: Chair Fox asked Director Langer to address this issue.

- Director Langer stated there is no specific area designated for loading on the plan but there is an area that would comply; however, loading spaces, even when shown on a plan, are not always the location trucks choose to use for loading and unloading. Regardless, there is adequate space for that process.
- Chair Fox added loading activities would most likely not occur during peak movie times.

Dumpster Enclosure: Chair Fox stated the applicant mentioned it had been incorporated into the rear of the building. Director Langer explained it is the goal to have the dumpster enclosure materials match the building but in this case, it is part of the building, not very visible, and would comply.

Lighting: Chair Fox stated there were revisions to the Lighting Plan submitted along with another letter submitted today. Director Langer gave an overview of how to interpret the Lighting Plan and stated the following:

- Original Lighting Plan did not include wall mounted lights so a revised plan was submitted.
- The applicants have requested a waiver.
- The letter submitted today seems to comply with the requirements but there was not enough time to do a complete review before the meeting to verify.
- Staff has no concerns with either the original waiver requested or with the Planning Commission granting approval conditioned upon staff verifying compliance of the Lighting Plan submitted today.
- Chair Fox asked for comments from the Planning Commission.
 - Commissioner Newsom stated he would prefer they comply with the Lighting standards; if the revised plan does, that is the way he would lean.
 - Chair Fox indicated that information should be included in the motion at the end.

Landscaping: Chair Fox asked Director Langer to provide more detail.

- Director Langer gave an overview of the Landscaping Plan stating the following:
 - The PD Pattern Book requirement along with the Zoning Ordinance requires a certain amount of trees and shrubs to be installed on the site as well as specific areas where it must be located.
 - The perimeter area (between the parking lot and the road) has enough trees but they are short on shrubs. They are requesting a waiver for this area.
 - In the parking lot landscape, the northernmost landscape islands show 100% sod.
 - Some trees on the plant list are not specifically identified in the Pattern Book as part of the PD approved plantings.
 - Staff has reviewed the proposed trees and shrubs and found them to be fairly consistent with the Pattern Book and has no issue with the list provided.
 - Commissioner Voight stated it looks like they have more deciduous and ornamental trees than what is required, just not the amount of shrubs. Director Langer concurred.
- Commissioner Grissim stated the plan looks wonderful and the decisions where to put more trees and how to place the shrubs was well done, but there are a couple of places where they could be taken from one area and moved to another. She continued:
 - Hartland Road is the consistent thread of the whole development.
 - Big connector from the community to the town; it has a standard.
 - Berms remain with ample trees but are lacking on the shrubs.
 - Not all the shrubs required in the PD are needed.
 - Must be a continuous look along this road.
 - Without any shrubs, other than at the entrances, it is going to read differently than that main spine.

- Waiver request regarding shrubs within the parking lot islands is a great call; placing shrubs along the building frontage screens the expanse of parking lot pavement and allows for easy maintenance of the islands.
- Hartland Square Road has a nice almost three-foot berm around most of the site but landscape plants/features should be added where there is no berm to screen the parking lot.
 - Chair Fox inquired if they could increase the height in the areas they are short for compliance. Commissioner Grissim stated yes, if they could do it.
 - Commissioner Grissim also stated the language for the berm slope is 1:3 max; the Ordinance talks about a 1:4 max with a gentle four-foot rounded top. There is not a specific grading plan shown but she would like to note it will be steeper. It can be mowed at that grade, but there may be other ways adequate screening can be achieved, either with grading or some other feature along Hartland Square Road.
 - Mr. Pascual, Landscape Architect for the applicant, stated they would consult with the engineers about increasing the berms to a minimum of 3.5 feet, and wherever they fall deficient, they will, as suggested, revisit and add some additional components, shrubs or trees, whatever is needed to work with the Township and resolve the issue.
 - Chair Fox asked if Commissioner Grissim would be comfortable with staff reviewing those changes. Commissioner Grissim stated absolutely. She continued we want to go with the big stroke and the intent of the Ordinance realizing the applicant does have a hardship with 1800 lineal feet to deal with.
 - Chair Fox also commented on the amount of road frontage and stated he recognizes the applicant's hardship as well. Chair Fox indicated this information should be included in the motion at the end.

Architecture/Building Materials:

- Director Langer gave an overview of the PD Architecture/Building Materials requirement. The applicants are requesting a waiver to use C-Brick and deviate from the Materials Schedule in the Pattern Book.
- Chair Fox stated he totally supports the building materials being proposed for the following reasons:
 - Very few buildings in Hartland front on all four sides.
 - When the PD was created, no one, including Chair Fox who was on the Planning Commission at the time, envisioned a building with four frontages.
 - The applicant has done a phenomenal job taking a centrally located building and giving us four very attractive sides.
 - Does not view it as a compromise.
 - The brick is larger in scale matching the scale of the structure.
 - Waiver addresses some acoustic benefits to this type of construction.
 - Thinks the Planning Commission should grant the waiver based on the very attractive building they have put forward.
- Commissioner Newsom stated he supports the architecture but asked for an explanation of the difference between the two materials.
 - The applicant explained this material is structural and forms the exterior wall of the building eliminating the need to go back and add something else, plus it has a variety of colors and finishes.
 - Commissioner Newsom asked if it is cast in place. The applicant stated no, it is laid one at a time.
 - Chair Fox stated it is the same material that was used on the former Wal-Mart, now Rural King building; it is in the community already.

- Commissioner Newsom stated he would support it.
 - Chair Fox stated the average person would drive by it and not know the difference.
- Commissioner Grissim asked if it is concrete or clay. The applicant stated concrete.
- Commissioner Voigt asked about the dimensions of the product. The applicant replied they are 12 by 16 inches. Commissioner Voigt stated it is a better choice given the size of the building. Chair Fox agreed.
- Commissioner Murphy commented he agrees with the others that it is a very attractive looking building and the applicants have done a great job on breaking up such large expanses with architectural products and features. He stated he supports the materials waiver for the clay and complimented the applicant for their design.
- Chair Fox indicated the architectural waiver should also be included in the motion.

Pedestrian Access requirements have been met.

Chair Fox asked if there were any comments on the review letters. There were none.

Chair Fox directed the Planning Commission back to the PD Amendment portion of the request.

- Director Langer stated there is no waiver for the PD Sign Requirements. Generally the Planning Commission would defer signs to be an administrative process that staff would handle; in this case, the applicants are proposing to increase the signs on the building to include all four sides, given the unique nature of the site, which leads to more signs and more sign area than permitted in the PD agreement. Proposed signs include the following:
 - Emagine over the front entry.
 - “E”s around the structure that are part of the building design.
 - EMAX sign for the large screen experience on one façade.
- Director Langer referenced the comparison chart in the staff report stating this amendment to the PD would become the 6th Amendment, Section 6.6.3.3.
- Director Langer stated by amending the PD it would accomplish the following:
 - The goal is not too allow everyone to have additional signage, but to acknowledge the unique circumstances of this location.
 - Other tenants will not have these issues and should not necessarily be allowed additional signage.
 - Criteria have been established given the size of the building, making it a major tenant that should be allowed some additional signage.
 - This structure is almost in an island, surrounded by roadway on three sides with the front entry facing an interior parking lot, making it unusual.
 - The Planning Commission will need to discuss and forward a recommendation to the Township Board.

Chair Fox stated the Site Plan Review Committee had two informal meetings with the applicant and it is very apparent a project of this size at this location was never anticipated or provided for in the original PD requirements. He stated they encouraged the applicant to bring forward their sign proposal and language. Chair Fox continued many of the signs are backlit, not channel-type letters; the “E”s have a glow behind them and are not the typical type of lettering. He asked for comments.

- Commissioner Newsom asked if the elevations before them contain the proposed signage. The applicant stated they do. Commissioner Newsom stated he did not have a problem with them.
- Chair Fox stated the following:
 - Does not look overdone at all.
 - This is a unique case.

- There is not another parcel in the Township that has a four-front exposure.
- Each side taken on its own does not look garish or overdone.
- A front entry feature is always allowed.
- Commissioner Colaianne asked if there is a marquee. Chair Fox replied it has a timeless look to it: old fashioned but contemporary, but there are no letters or changing signs.

Director Langer stated there is another part to the PD Amendment request that was not outlined in the staff memorandum but is part of the language handed out prior to the meeting that the Township Attorney has accepted. The applicants have asked to limit who can come forward with PD Amendments in the future; they did not want every tenant to come in and amend the PD in the future.

Chair Fox stated he would agree with that and with the applicant. He would not expect any other applicant to come up with a similar justification as this circumstance is so unique. He also stated he could justify the sign package for this project to any future applicant as it is based upon data and fact, which is important.

Commissioner Murphy stated he feels the signs are in proportion given the size of the structure; there is an overage but it looks appropriate. If the signs were smaller they would not fit in with the big expanse of wall. He supports the size and coverage difference for the signage.

Commissioner Voight offered the following motion. Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell.

Move to approve Site Plan Application #544, a request to amend the previously approved plans for Hartland Towne Square Planned Development, to construct an approximate 64,600 square foot Emagine Theatre, including approval of the landscape and architectural waiver requests, with the following conditions:

1. **The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department’s memorandum dated January 5, 2017 on the Construction Plan set, subject to an administrative review by the Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.**
2. **Applicant complies with any requirements of the Department of Public Works Director, Township Engineering Consultant, and Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority Fire Marshal.**
3. **The recommendations from the Planning Commission for modification of the landscaping shrubs for screening.**

Motion carried unanimously.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Keith Voight, Secretary
SECONDER:	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
AYES:	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

b. Motion to recommend approval of Site Plan Application #439A to amend the PD

Commissioner Voight offered the following motion. Seconded by Commissioner Newsom.

Move to recommend approval of Site Plan Application #439A to amend the wall sign standards for the Hartland Towne Square Planned Development as a 6th Amendment to the Hartland RAMCO Planned Development Agreement and Hartland Towne Square Pattern Book, based on the following findings:

1. **The Planning Commission has determined the proposed amendments to the wall sign standards accommodates a major tenant in an area within the Hartland Towne Square Planned Development (PD), where a major tenant was not otherwise originally planned and may not have located.**
2. **The Planning Commission has determined that the amended sign standards offer flexibility for a major tenant building, when located on three (3) road frontages within the PD.**

- 3. **The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed major tenant would be a benefit to this PD as well as the Township.**
- 4. **Approval of the PD amendment language shall be subject to the approval of the Township Attorney.**

Motion carried unanimously.

At 8:01 PM the Planning Commission took a short break.

At 8:05 PM the Planning Commission reconvened.

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

9. 2017 Annual Planning Commission Organizational Meeting

a. 2017 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

A motion was offered by Commissioner Colaianne to approve the 2017 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar. Seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously.

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

b. 2017 Planning Commission Committee Appointment

[Chair Fox elected to address item 9.c. before item 9.b.]

Chair Fox re-appointed Commissioner Grissim, Commissioner Murphy and Commissioner Voight to the Ordinance Review Committee.

Chair Fox re-appointed Commissioner Mitchell as the Representative to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chair Fox re-appointed himself and Commissioner Voight to the Site Plan Review Committee.

RESULT: **INFORMATIONAL**

c. Election of Officers to Planning Commission 2017

A motion was offered by Commissioner Mitchell to carry over the existing officers that we currently have as well as the accepted positions. Seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

RESULT: **APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER: Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
SECONDER: Thomas Murphy, Commissioner
AYES: Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

d. Planning Commission By-Laws 2017

A motion was offered by Commissioner Colaianne to reaffirm the Planning Commission By-Laws. Seconded by Commissioner Newsom. Motion carried unanimously

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

10. Call to the Public

Kate Derosier, North Valley Court, Hartland expressed concerns about additional traffic, public safety, the number of driveways between Dunham Road and Hartland Towne Square Drive, and the lighting associated with this development; wants to keep a small town atmosphere. She also expressed concerns about the signage.

Chair Fox responded with the following:

- When the development was originally proposed, traffic was taken into consideration.
- Over 500,000 square feet of commercial space was planned for; Meijer is under 200,000 and this proposal is 64,000 square feet, about half with both buildings combined.
- There will be more to come but traffic was discussed at great detail at the beginning, the road improvements were well planned and paid for by the developers here and to the south.

Regarding the lighting, Chair Fox stated:

- Hartland has one of the strictest Lighting Standards in the area.
- Light pollution on the ground does not typically go beyond the property line.
- Light does bounce off of the pavement and we have to deal with public safety and security issues.
- While less than some communities, lighting is always something that we will have.

Chair Fox also stated the Township does care about the small town feeling but we are growing; hopefully we have put into place a good plan so we can grow in the best way possible.

Someone from the audience asked if there were any other proposed developments for this area.

Chair Fox responded with the following:

- There are no applications at this time but this property has 15 to 16 outlots; 12 are still available.
- There are restrictions as to what can go in, related to drive-throughs or banks, which were worked out by the developer with the Township.
- The original development plan shows a larger theater-size building west of Meijer and a potential hotel.
- The plan may change: they just asked to put a theater location on the site that was not on the original plan.

The same person in the audience asked if anything was planned for the intersection of Clyde Road and 23 and if there were plans for a school near that location. Chair Fox stated there are no applications at this time.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the location of the school owned property that is not located at that intersection.

11. Planner's Report

Director Langer reported the following:

- The Ordinance Review Committee met January 9, 2017.
 - Reviewed and briefly discussed a list of potential ordinance amendments.
 - Many of the items have already been brought before the Planning Commission.
 - The goal is to prioritize the list.
 - They will come back to the Planning Commission for their input.
 - Generally looking at meeting twice a month.

- The Planning Department has adopted a new numbering system for Land Use Permits, Sign Permits, Site Plans, etc., as was mentioned at the end of last year.
 - Land Use Permit numbers were coming to the point of rolling into five digits.
 - Since a change had to be made in the computer system, we opted to begin using a year-based number system for all permits; i.e. 17-000.
 - Easier to know when a case was brought before the Planning Commission.

- Newberry Mixed Use update.
 - Large mixed use project at M 59 and Pleasant Valley Road.
 - Is in the Preliminary Review phase and has been before the Planning Commission.
 - The applicant is currently amending their plans and working with Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) and Livingston County Road Commission.
 - Comments were recently received from MDOT; there are some changes but they appear fairly close with MDOT.
 - The Director anticipates they will make changes to their site plan and may want to meet with the Site Plan Review Committee.
 - Anticipated be coming back to the Planning Commission in the near future.

12. Committee Reports

None

13. Adjournment

- a. Motion to adjourn

A motion was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Newsom. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:20 PM.

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

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary