

# HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

October 20, 2022– 7:00 PM

---

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance:**

3. **Roll Call and Recognition of Visitors:**

Present – Commissioners Fox, Grissim, Mayer, McMullen, Mitchell, Eckman

Absent – Commissioner Murphy

4. **Approval of the Meeting Agenda:**

A Motion to approve the October 20, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Mitchell. Seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously

5. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

A Motion to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 8, 2022 was made by Commissioner Grissim. Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Call to the Public:**

None

7. **Old and New Business**

- a. Site Plan with Special Land Use Application #22-007 (Automobile wash within completely enclosed building at 10382 Highland Road)

Director Langer stated the following:

- Located at the intersection of Blaine Road and M-59.
- Public Hearing was held on September 8, 2022.
- Revised plan provided based on items discussed at the previous meeting plus additional information.
- Proposing to remove existing structure (former Burger King) and construct an approximate 6,500 square foot building for a fully automated automobile wash (Mister Car Wash).

Chair Fox referred to the staff memorandum dated October 13, 2022 and the revised site plan dated October 6, 2022.

Director Langer stated the following:

- The Planning Commission requested the drive aisle be reduced; it is now 26 feet wide.
- The Planning Commission expressed concern about the setback in the northwest corner; this plan meets the required setback at that location and reoriented some of the parking spaces.
- The Planning Commission requested fewer vacuum stations, but the Applicant is hoping for the opportunity to explain why they feel they need them. It was discussed by the Site Plan

Review Committee, and they thought it best to have the discussion before the full Planning Commission.

- Also submitted a revised Landscape Plan.

Chair Fox asked the Planning Commission for a determination on vacuums in the front of the site.

Director Langer explained the following:

- The front yard of a site is the area between the building and any road frontage.
- This site has two front yards; one on Blaine and one on M-59.
- That ordinance about car wash vacuums was written during a time when the type of vacuum associated with a car wash was the large, self-contained canister style vacuum. This style of vacuum is the hose only with the central motor tucked in an enclosed area.

Director Langer went on to explain the Planning Commission can make a determination or interpretation that this type of vacuum is permitted but they cannot legislate the number of vacuums; they either are permitted, or they are not permitted. Such a determination can have implications beyond this site. As the Site Plan Review Committee discussed this issue further, their desire was to bring the topic back. Essentially there are two possible answers; yes, these are only hoses not vacuums and shall be permitted or no, these are still vacuums and shall not be permitted.

Commissioner Mitchell stated the following:

- Hartland Township has requirements for Car Wash facilities Section 4.1.7.
- Section 4.1.7.1. it specifically states vacuum systems are not allowed in the front yard, it has no further detail or description of components.
- He does not feel comfortable going against the Township's established Ordinance saying they can define a type of vacuum system that is allowed versus those that are not.  
[Director Langer displayed a photo of a newer car wash facility in another community with a hose and small canister vacuum.]
- Would this hybrid type of vacuum station be permitted?
- He feels it is a bigger issue and that the Planning Commission should stand by the existing Ordinance which does not permit vacuums in the front yard.
- He cannot support this design.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- He was the one who gave the historical significance of the Ordinance and that it was written before this product existed.
- It does not define what a vacuum is.
- His concern is if these are allowed, what happens the next time when it is something different, but vacuums are now allowed.
- He cannot support the plan as it is proposed right now.

Chair Fox would like to canvas the Planning Commission on who supports the Ordinance which does not allow for vacuums in the front yard.

Commissioner Grissim agreed, she supports the Ordinance and cannot approve this plan as presented.

Commissioner Mayer agreed the Planning Commission should abide by the Ordinance.

Commissioner Mitchell reiterated the Planning Commission should abide by the Ordinance.

Commissioner McMullen agreed the Planning Commission should abide by the Ordinance.

Commissioner Eckman stated the same, that Planning Commission should abide by the Ordinance.

Chair Fox summarized vacuums are not permitted in the front yard no matter what the style and the Planning Commission will abide by the Ordinance. The plan cannot be approved as presented.

Director Langer stated the following:

- Earlier the Planning Commission discussed traffic and that there was no need for a traffic study; however, the Applicant did provide some additional information using the ITE Manual.
- ITE offers information about estimated traffic generated by similar uses around the county.
- A car wash was compared to the traffic generated by a fast food restaurant with a drive-through and was shown to generate less traffic.
- A resident provided an actual traffic study of a car wash in Colorado as part of that they used a car wash in Grandville, Michigan. This information was provided earlier this week in an email.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the options going forward; to ask the Applicant to revise their plan and return or forward this Site Plan with Special Use to the Township Board with the Planning Commission not recommending approval.

Chair Fox asked the Applicant what they would like to do. The Applicant indicated they would like to revise the plan and come back.

**8. Call to the Public:**

None.

**9. Planner Report:**

None

**10. Committee Reports:**

None

**11. Adjournment:**

**A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner McMullen. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:28 PM.**

Submitted by.



Tom Murphy  
Planning Commission Secretary