

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

April 25, 2024– 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 Eckman, Fox, Grissim, Mayer, McMullen, Mitchell, Murphy

Absent – None

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

A Motion to approve the April 25, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

a. Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of March 14, 2024

A Motion to approve the Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of March 14, 2024, was made by Commissioner Eckman and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Call to the Public:**

None

7. **Public Hearing**

a. Site Plan PD Application #24-003 Redwood Living Planned Development (PD) Phase II – Preliminary PD Site Plan

Chair Fox opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 PM stating all public noticing requirements have been met.

Director Langer gave an overview of the location and scope of this application stating the following:

- East of Cundy Road, south of M-59, west of Redwood Phase I currently under construction.
- Approximately 28.7 acres of the Hartland Glen Golf Course property.
- Continuation of Phase I, apartments with attached garages.
- There are 130 units in Phase II.
- Planned Development process is being used which is a three-step process occurring before both the Planning Commission and the Township Board: Conceptual, Preliminary and Final. The Township Board is the final decision maker. This project is at the Preliminary step.

The Applicants, Emily Englehart, Director of Acquisitions for Redwood Living; and Ian Graham, P.E., Civil Engineer with Bergmann Associates; introduced themselves stating the following:

- Offered some background information on Redwood and what they do, single story, low density, apartment neighborhoods.
- Grown to over 17,000 units in the Midwest.
- Owned and managed their units since 1991; never sold one.
- Offering a product for which many people see a need with an approximate 97% occupancy rate.
- Reinvented the idea of an apartment and who might live there.
- Not aged restricted but many of their residents are looking to downsize; seniors, empty-nesters, young professionals, people who are already living in the area but are making a change. The average age of their residents is 50.6 years old with 1.89 persons per unit. They perform extensive background checks for potential renters.
- Examine market research to focus on areas where their product will be a good fit.
- Single story units and attached two car garages are the features most in demand.
- Displayed a slide show of various housing styles.

Call to the Public:

- Christine Gregory, Hartland Township; has concerns about potential access onto Maxfield Road; emergency access is fine but not public access.
- Patricia Courie, Hartland Township; has concerns about access to their private unpaved road, current maintenance of the property and the potential increased traffic exiting via Hartland Glen Drive.
- Craig Wipple, Hartland Township. has concerns about access and what will happen to the buffer zone around the existing gold course. Thinks the current phase is set too close to existing houses.
- Kevin Ramus, Hartland Township; has concerns about the long-term plan for the golf course.
- Jason Thelen, Hartland Township; has concerns about multi-family construction – prefers single-family homes be constructed there, has concerns about wetlands and stormwater runoff, would like to see privacy screening around the project.
- George Poy, Hartland Township; has concerns about stormwater runoff, trespass from renters, would like to see some kind of barrier fencing.
- Cathy Ehgotz, Hartland Township; has concerns about increased traffic with all of the new development in the area.
- Randall Samuels, Hartland Township; has concerns about future development on the property, green space, road salt and stormwater negatively affecting the environment, potential trespass onto Maxfield Lake, would like to see a privacy fence or greenbelt for screening.
- Lou Ann Lathrop, Hartland Township; asked about water and traffic studies for this area, wants to know the future plans for the golf course, asked about the road master plan for Hartland Township, asked about the anticipated completion date for Phase I, and asked if golf cart traffic will be allowed in this development.
- Gordon Halt, Hartland Township; questioned the criteria for a traffic study, would like to see a comprehensive traffic study for the entire property and future developments, expressed interest in a funding mechanism to retain green space as some other townships utilize, expressed concern about junipers on the landscape plan.
- Gail Samuels, Hartland Township; has concerns about the legal notification process, access to the information online, greenbelts, would like to know the master plan for the golf course.
- Priscilla Fowler, Hartland Township; expressed concerns about Redwood Living, thinks we should wait and see how Phase I goes.

- Kathy Ballmer, Hartland Township; asked if Redwood Phase I is following through with the changes requested during their approval process, would like a bigger greenbelt and other amenities to make this as harmonious as possible.
- Jason Fowler, Hartland Township; has concerns about traffic and future plans for the roads, wants the developer to improve surrounding roads, interested in the tax generation of multi-family rental as opposed to single-family owner-occupied homes.

Chair Fox closed the Public Hearing at 7:57PM.

Chair Fox referred to the staff memorandum dated April 18, 2024.

Eligibility Criteria (Section 3.1.18.B.)

Commissioner Eckman stated he had questions regarding the Recognizable Benefits as stated in the January 4, 2024 letter from the applicant.

Director Langer stated there is a wide variety use and listed some recognizable benefits other projects have offered:

- Architectural design elements
- Additional open space
- Parks
- Additional landscaping
- Dedicating land for a fire station

Chair Fox listed some Redwood benefits as:

- Architecture
- Landscaping around the buildings when not required
- Participating in the water extension project
- Exceeding open space requirements

Commissioner Mayer stated at the Conceptual Review the Planning Commissioners offered comments. The meeting was brief as it is anticipated this phase will be similar to Phase 1. At the end of that meeting, three Planning Commissioners expressed a concern about benefits to the community and specifically said they look forward to seeing the list of Recognizable Benefits for this phase. He stated he is disappointed with the list as presented.

Planned Development Design Standards (Section 3.1.18.C.)

Residential Density

Director Langer stated the following:

- In 2020-2021, the Future Land Use Map was amended to show this area as a Special Planning Area which matched other Special Planning Areas to the east.
- Density was set at an average of 4 units per acre.
- As this property is larger than the others, a provision was built in to have the area closer to M-59 at a higher density and keep the area to the south at a lower density with an overall average of 4 units per acre.
- Phase II is consistent with the approved density in this Special Planning Area.
- Some asked about Redwood Phase III; there is no Phase III.

- Some asked about a master plan for the golf course; there is no master plan for the golf course. The property owners are present and are most likely working on future plans.
- Some mentioned the number of units that could be proposed in the future for the remainder of this property calculated using the acreage by the maximum density. Many factors affect the number of units per acre in any development; natural features, wetlands, general design, and the availability of REUs. Future development to the south will have a lower density as Redwood is above 4 units per acre.

Director Langer stated someone asked why this information is not available to the public. He explained the full packet is available on the Township website one week prior to any meeting and demonstrated where it can be found.

Minimum Yard Requirements

Director Langer gave an overview of the setbacks. These setbacks match what was approved for Phase 1.

Commissioner Murphy asked about the rear yard distance to the road in Phase 1. Director Langer stated they usually measure to the edge of a right-of-way or easement but in this case as there are no rights-of-way or utility easements, it is measured as 25 feet to the edge of the pavement.

Distances Between Buildings

Director Langer stated the minimum is 20 feet and all that all of the buildings comply. He pointed out a few places where it is closer than others.

Parking and Loading

Director Langer explained the Ordinance requires two spaces per unit, they have a two-stall garage and driveway that can accommodate two cars, totaling four per unit. They have also provided 29 additional off-street parking spaces. The property owners were present during the Phase 1 approval process and offered the golf course clubhouse parking area as overflow parking. He is unaware of such an offer for this phase. Redwood's policy to not allow parking on the street.

Open Space

Director Langer stated 35% is required, 52% has been provided. Over 27% will be usable open space, well above the standard.

Natural Features

Director Langer stated there are three regulated wetlands on the site. It was discovered that one area of the site contained poor soil, so the project was modified slightly to avoid that area. They intend to leave the wetland areas undisturbed. Municipal water will serve this site.

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access

Director Langer stated in the Redwood developments, sidewalks are located adjacent to the road. They are five-feet wide and colored differently than the roads or driveways. The Township had not seen this approach before so there was some hesitation and concern during the review for Phase I, but it was ultimately accepted and approved. They are proposing to continue this process for Phase II. They are not proposing any sidewalks or pathways outside of this development.

Commissioner Murphy asked about the process for dealing with on-street parking and snow removal.

The Applicant stated the following in response:

- The leasing office polices the parking situation.
- The 25-foot driveway can accommodate larger vehicles so there is no overhang into the road.
- When they plow, they can simultaneously plow the street and sidewalk as they are the same height. Having the sidewalks at the same level as the street maintains maximum accessibility.
- The sidewalk pavement is the same thickness as the road.
- No on-street parking is clearly stated at the time of lease.
- They try to work with tenants and not tow their vehicles or those of their guests, but will if needed.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the hours for the leasing and on-site maintenance staff. The Applicant stated they would confirm that information and forward it.

Commissioner Mayer stated he visited the site in Howell and read that the unit tour was self-guided, which he interprets as there are no on-site agents available. He asked how visitors know not to park on the street if there is no signage as in Howell. The Applicant replied it is up to each community; if Hartland desires signage, signage can be put in place. Commissioner Mayer asked about being four parking spaces deficient. The Applicant stated they can add more parking if it is desired. They also added they do maintain staff at the leasing office; the virtual tour is an option to accommodate after hours viewing.

Requirements for Preliminary Review (Section 3.1.18.E.ii)

Traffic Impacts.

Director Langer stated the Applicant has provided traffic information prepared by Colliers Engineering and Design, and also brought forward information about their existing developments in the Midwest. The numbers averaged less than 50 peak hour directional trips which is the threshold for requiring further traffic impact analysis. The Applicant clarified the directional statistic is a component; if there were 50 people leaving during peak hours, it might require further analysis per Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) standards, but their totals are both leaving and returning so that number is not high enough to warrant further analysis.

Fiscal Impacts

Chair Fox stated, with an assist from Commissioner Mc Mullen, Redwood said they expect to pay \$416,000.00 in taxes when Phase II is complete. He continued explaining apartments do pay taxes; the property owner pays. The apartment dweller pays rent, a portion of which goes to pay property taxes and other expenses. Commission Eckman commented they do not get the Proposal A Property Tax Exemption; like other businesses, they pay more than an owner-occupied property. The Applicant added the units are not completed so they did their best estimate based on other completed communities' assessed values. They can provide additional data using Phase I if desired.

Vehicular Circulation

Director Langer referred to the site plan showing the proposed private roads. Both main roads connect back to Phase I. There is a future stub to the south that will connect to Hartland Glen Golf Course and any future development. There is no access proposed to Maxfield Road, not even an

emergency access. There may have been discussions during the Phase I approval process, but no access is proposed.

Chair Fox stated they try to provide connections between neighborhoods wherever they can. The stub is to provide access to any future development. The property has REUs and is likely to be developed at some point. The Township asks applicants to provide possible future connections during the planning process.

Commissioner Murphy asked if there is emergency access required for Phase II. Chair Fox replied they are required to have two access points per fire department standards, and they do. It does not have to connect to M-59. Director Langer added they asked the Applicant to extend the stub to the property line and put in place documentation to ensure a future access if that property is further developed. The Applicant stated it is their preference that it be an emergency access only as the roads are private; they are also concerned about the feasibility of constructing a stub to the property line not knowing the future elevation of a future connection, but they will do what is required. Chair Fox stated either it will be paved to the property line, or the document will read, “When the access is required, Redwood will build it.” The argument occurs when the new development happens, the previous developer states they will not pay for the additional fifty feet of pavement when it is the new developer that needs the connection.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the change in grade at that location and if they have completed a traffic circulation showing the fire hydrants for the fire department. The Applicant stated the fire department did not request it, but they can. Commissioner Mayer expressed concern over the available turning radius near buildings M and N. The Applicant stated they can model that if desired.

Commissioner Murphy stated he would like to see a sidewalk added to the stub street to the south to maintain connectivity and walkability.

Commissioner Mitchell asked about Phase I showing an access to Cundy Road. The Applicant replied it is a watermain easement.

The Applicant mentioned that as part of the Phase I approval, they were requested to add an access to the east for a future development; one is being developed [Highland Reserve] so that will be another potential access in the event of an emergency.

Commissioner Eckman asked how the decision is made as to whether the access to the south will be emergency only or a public access for those residents. Director Langer stated this stub is labeled on the plans as an emergency access only. Maybe when the future development is constructed, it would serve the same emergency access purpose from that direction; however, if the Planning Commission desires something else, now would be the time to add that provision. It could be an emergency access with a gate for the fire authorities but still allow pedestrian access via the sidewalk. The Applicants have stated they would prefer it not to be public.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the merits of having that access for emergency use only or available for full access to a future development to the south, and the requested sidewalk.

Commissioner McMullen stated if Redwood wants to be a part of the community and embrace being part of Hartland, the stub road and sidewalk should be built along with Phase II. She does not care for gates as they impede neighborhoods from being cohesive with each other. Chair Fox clarified full access. Commissioner McMullen confirmed.

Commissioner Grissim agreed; full access and it should be constructed with Phase II.

Commissioner Mayer also agreed; full access and it should be constructed with Phase II.

Commissioner Mitchell stated he does not like to see roads and sidewalks to nowhere. He does not think it should be constructed now.

Commissioner Murphy stated full access.

Commissioner Eckman stated he would like it to be emergency access only but constructed with Phase II.

Char Fox stated the consensus of the Planning Commission is the road should be full access to the property line constructed with Phase II.

The Applicant asked for a compromise of signage indicating the access is for emergency only to mitigate people from driving through and allow them a little more control over their private roadways. The Applicant stated they can bring the road and a sidewalk to the edge of the property.

Chair Fox stated the sign will not stop anyone from driving through but he agreed with the Planning Director's comment that most people would not take such a circuitous route through Redwood Phase II and then Redwood Phase I to get to M-59, they would most likely use their own access to Hartland Glen Drive that would be required at the time the property to the south is developed.

After a brief discussion, Chair Fox stated the Applicant may have a sign.

Commissioner Mayer, responding to earlier questions regarding stormwater and pollutants, stated those issues are not determined by the Planning Commission but by professionals. He directed attention to the list of permits and the State and County permitting agencies that make those decisions. Chair Fox concurred stating we defer to them to make those determinations as they are the experts.

Landscaping (Section 5.11)

Landscaping Adjacent to Road (Sec. 5.11.5.A.ii.)

Commissioner Grissim stated the following:

- Prefer a street tree every 35 feet.
- 40-foot-wide driveways create a challenge.
- In Phase I, it was decided to find ways to add the required trees at the required size.
- Phase II should be the same.

The Applicant stated they received notes from staff, but the plans have not yet been updated with that information as they knew there could be additional landscaping requested. They acknowledge they need to add additional street trees and meet the quota.

Buffering or Screening (Sec. 5.11.2.G.i.)

Commissioner Grissim asked about enhanced screening between units R and W on the south. The Applicant stated yes they have agreed add that screening. In the staff letter there was a comment about providing a thorough visual screen in that area specifically in addition to what was shown. Also, some berming or plantings or a fence. They are hoping to present some options for one or the other. Commissioner Grissim stated a complete visual screen is the goal, not a wall, it is not about security, it is a visual screen between this development and the existing single-family homes. Director Langer indicated there is an existing swimming pool near the edge of this development, so they are looking for a pretty good screen, especially in that area. Commissioner Grissim stated a complete visual screen must be provided from any existing single-family lot to this more intense use according to the Ordinance. She stated the Applicant is welcome to submit one or two options. There is existing vegetation, grading to be dealt with, many factors, but if we can get a broad statement that you will provide a complete visual screen, we can work with that. The Applicant stated she is aware of those specific areas but in others where it is several hundred feet to the property line, they intend to provide landscaping which could be augmented if needed. The Applicant asked if the Planning Commission is asking for a fence all the way around the west side. Commissioner Grissim replied no. The Applicant stated they will work with the Township to provide the required screening for the residents of Hartland Township and their own residents. Chair Fox asked if the proposal is for a fence or for plants. Commissioner Grissim stated what has been proposed is either a berm or plantings, but she has not heard about a fence yet. The Applicant stated they are evaluating the two options: a berm with substantial plantings on the top or a privacy fence. They prefer plantings but if it is not sufficient, they could go with a fence.

Commissioner Mayer asked the Applicant to submit a Limits of Disturbance Plan to identify what existing vegetation can be preserved. He thinks those neighbors would appreciate limiting the amount of disturbance in that area. For the berm, behind Building T, there is a significant grade change of nine feet making that structure nine feet taller than the existing houses. Screening that structure, dealing with the stormwater as well as the plantings will be a challenge and there is only 31.7 feet to work with.

Commissioner Murphy asked if they would consider the intense screening discussed between units R and W for the entire development. The Applicant stated they do not see being able to do a fence around the entire development; they do not typically do fences, the goal is to cluster everything away from existing residents as much as possible. When they encountered the poor soils area, they had originally lengthened the development to the west, but modified to go farther south to limit those issues. They certainly can do a Limits of Disturbance Plan to see what vegetation can be kept and how they can further enhance the area but realistically they do not see a fence around the western property line. Commissioner Murphy stated he is not interested in seeing a fence at all, he would like it to look natural with a berm and plants.

Chair Fox stated there is some work to be done on the buffering and screening especially in areas that are close to existing residential.

Detention/Retention Area Landscaping (Sec. 5.11.2.H.)

Commissioner Grissim stated they need to update the plans to show the top bank elevation on the detention pond and determine the lineal footage around the pond. They have demonstrated they are aware of the requirements and have met that. She stated they are good.

Apartment Unit Landscaping

Chair Fox reiterated the Ordinance does not require any landscaping around the buildings, but the Applicant is landscaping around the front and exposed ends of the buildings in excess of what is required; that would be considered a community benefit.

Proposed landscape berms on west side of site

Director Langer stated the plans had a note if excess soils are found during grading, a berm would be created in that location but there were no details on what that might be, Landscaping was also shown in the same area which created some confusion about what is planned. In discussions with the Applicant, it has been hard to pin down as they are unsure of what they will have to work with. The Applicant stated they have run into this in other townships. If they find pockets of deep topsoil, it is to everyone's benefit to berm them to provide that buffer and screening. Until they put a shovel in the ground it is unknown what that will be like. The Applicant continued, they do not want a berm in an awkward location; they desire the landscape plan to be as harmonious as possible and to further enhance privacy with the additional berming. They thought it was best to note it on the plan with the privacy concerns and apologized for any confusion.

Commissioner Mayer asked if a cut/fill report had been completed. The Applicant stated it was somewhat balanced now, but they do have to bring in fill for the utilities. They ran into some bad soil in Phase I and were able to export it. Commissioner Mayer expressed concerns that a giant berm will be created negatively affecting drainage; he feels the plan is incomplete. The Applicant stated he is unfamiliar with the exact ordinance requirements for berms other than the slope, but they anticipate a berm of approximately five or six feet.

Shared Off-site Monument Sign

Director Langer stated the following:

- When Phase I was being approved, Redwood proposed to install a sign north of Cundy Road, south of M-59 on a triangular shaped parcel. There currently there is a sign for the golf course on that parcel.
- At that time, the Planning Commission stated if that was their desire, they should do one sign for all three entities: Redwood, the golf course, and any future development.
- Those discussions began to bog down the project, so Redwood abandoned that request.
- Redwood is now reinitiating the request to have an off-site monument sign which are typically not permitted but the PD process allows for some flexibility.
- The existing Hartland Glen Golf Course sign would be removed and replaced with this singular sign.

[Director Langer referred to the proposed drawings of the sign showing both Hartland Glen Golf Course and Redwood included in the packet materials.]

Commissioner Grissim stated she does not feel there is a need for a 10-foot sign. Director Langer stated the Ordinance typically allows for a seven (7) foot monument sign.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the sign, the site and the elevation.

The consensus of the Planning Commission is to permit the monument sign but limit the height to the Ordinance standard of seven (7) feet.

Commissioner Murphy asked about future additions. Chair Fox stated it is part of the PD as a two-panel sign. The PD would have to be amended to add another panel or one of the panels would need to be removed and replaced with another.

Architecture/Building Materials (Sec. 5.24)

Chair Fox stated the design is similar to Phase I. The Applicant agreed adding there are some units labeled “EX” which indicates an extended garage on three buildings, a new option that allows for slightly longer vehicles and has been very popular in other neighborhoods. Chair Fox confirmed the driveways are still 25 feet with the full area for parking. Chair Fox also stated there was a late addition of some buildings with enhanced sides. The Applicant referred to them as high-profile views.

Director Langer mentioned in the letter dated January 29, 2024, from Spalding DeDecker, the Township Engineer refers to street trees and landscaping not being permitted over water mains or utilities. This puts applicants in the middle as the Ordinance requires this landscaping and the engineers are not permitting them. The goal is to not have landscaping over utility lines but sometimes it is impossible to avoid. This is a directive from the Township Board; if it cannot be avoided there may be landscaping over utility lines.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the wetland delineation report as it was not included in the packet. The Applicant stated the regulated wetlands which they are not impacting, are shown on the map.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the required usable open space that is suitable for active recreation. The plan indicates approximately 8.16 acres, some of which is included in the area around the wetland in the northeast. Not only does the slope not conform to the required ratio around a pond but it would be very difficult for any kind of “active recreation” to occur. Chair Fox commented that historically the Planning Commission has counted any non-wetland area or area able to be walked as active recreation open space. Commissioner Mayer continued it is a highly wooded area, with a Limits of Disturbance Plan indicating you are only going so far north and showing that you are leaving the natural wooded area, you might please many of the residents in that area.

Commissioner Mayer asked if everything shown in blue on page L2.0 will not be mowed. The Applicant stated their intent is to leave it as natural as possible. Commissioner Mayer commented in August when the weeds are three-feet tall, how is that an active recreation area. He feels it is not. He also believes that there will be more children in the neighborhood than the average in most communities because of the quality of Hartland Schools. He would like to see an area included for active play.

Commissioner Murphy asked for a list of recognizable benefits. The Applicant replied yes, they will take a look at those and see if they can encompass everything into a list.

Responses to Questions from Call to the Public

Director Langer the Township does not have anything submitted for a long-term plan for the golf course. He has met with the owners; they want to do a development, but nothing is set in concrete. Chair Fox stated there are REUs on the property, sewer taps, something will happen at some point. Commissioner McMullen added some communities own their golf courses, but this one is private property.

Chair Fox stated the Township cannot require a developer to build roads, that is illegal. It is not under our control. There are traffic studies and other tools from outside agencies that determine what improvements are required for a development.

Commissioner Eckman mentioned trespassing is a criminal offense and beyond the scope of the Township. Chair Fox stated a fence would not look good around this property.

Commissioner Grissim asked about the current status of the property and weed control. Director Langer replied Redwood does not currently own the property, it is owned by Hartland Glen Golf Course. It is not being maintained as a golf course typically is, but there are no issues of blight to be addressed.

Chair Fox asked when Phase I might be complete. The Applicant stated they just received their first Certificate of Occupancy, so she expects at least another year, maybe by next summer. Chair Fox also asked if Phase II is approved and work commences, will the construction traffic will pass through Phase I. The Applicant stated they have a construction pod plan to try and mitigate the traffic and impacts to the roadway. If approvals go according to plan, they do try to keep their workers and subcontractors from one phase to the next, but it is more challenging currently.

Chair Fox asked about golf carts in existing Redwood neighborhoods. The Applicant stated she knows the staff uses golf carts but she is uncertain if their lease allows residents to use them. She will find out.

Commissioner Grissim mentioned a question regarding Juniper Rust and existing apple orchards. She stated she believes there is a distance factor, but it is something that will have to be looked into.

Director Langer responded to a comment that this property should be developed as single-family detached homes. He stated he is not sure that person knows how tricky that topic is. The Township is trying its best to get new single-family, affordable, detached housing. East of Redwood is a new development with single-family detached housing. There is such a demand in the rental market currently it is a huge issue. He is looking for the opinions of Planning Commissioners on that topic.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- It is about providing different types of housing the residential market wants.
- The residential housing market study done several years ago identified deficiencies in Hartland and one of them was available rental properties, we do not have enough.
- People who live here want them; it is not always strangers coming in.
- We take the projects as proposed; we do not go out and recruit them.
- We have the land, the zoning, the Future Land Use Map to guide us; this applicant is proposing something that fits within those parameters right now.

Chair Fox responding to the concern about transparency stated he hopes that was just a lack of knowledge of what is available online via the Township website. The Zoning Ordinance is posted also. Director Langer stated nothing was added since the packet was posted one week ago but the Township did receive a couple of communications from people who could not be at the meeting. People can do both; submit comments in writing and speak at the meeting. The Planning Commission did receive a plan of the high-profile elevations that was provided tonight as well. Chair Fox stated if there are any changes to the packet, typically there is an email notification, and he did not receive any.

Commissioner Murphy asked about the Public Notice requirements. Director Langer stated there is a Graphic Information System (GIS) tool that identifies properties within 300 feet of the parcel in question which is the State of Michigan requirement. Notices were sent to property owners within 300 feet of the entire property, currently the golf course. We stick to that requirement and treat every application the same. Commissioner Murphy asked if it is a physical letter mailed to that address. Director Langer confirmed it is mailed to the address the owner of record has provided to the Township for their tax bill. Chair Fox continued staff does the noticing according to the Statute, they follow the guidelines that are set forth by the State. He likes it when residents attend and the room is full, so people are getting the right information about a project in context.

Director Langer referred to a comment about the impact of this development on M-59, police services and the schools. M-59 is under the jurisdiction of MDOT. There is a lot of potential development in this area and a number of improvements are being looked at as part of that development. As for the police services, the Township has entered into an agreement with the Livingston County Sheriff's Office for some police presence here in the Township. As for the schools, he is not a spokesperson for Hartland Schools, this project was sent to the schools, in his meetings with the schools they are relying heavily on out of district kids and there is no guarantee how long that is going to last. They want as many kids as they can get. If we brought forth plans for a 1000 home subdivision, they would be happy. Chair Fox stated he thinks over 1000 kids in the schools are out of the district and they need those kids. If we do not provide a community which will bring our own kids in we need to draw kids from other communities, or the schools, that rate in the top six percent in the State of Michigan, that help to drive everyone's property values up, will be a different story. He has had many meetings with them, and they are looking for children.

Commissioner Eckman responding to a concern about maintenance of the property, stated he lives in a nice neighborhood with \$300,000.00 homes and some owners do not maintain them. In this situation it is nice the renters do not have to maintain the homes, but rather someone with a profit and loss motive will be doing so. If they are being filled to nearly one hundred percent, he is going to guess the quality of service must be doing well because renters can choose to not renew their lease if they are unhappy.

Chair Fox summarized there is a little work to do. The Planning Commission agreed.

The Applicant thanked the Planning Commission and the residents present for their comments stating the Planning Director has her contact information if anyone has additional questions. They will take everything under advisement and come back with a stronger set of plans with which they hope to seek your approval. Commissioner Murphy commented on the attendance and that people

April 25, 2024 – 7:00 PM

are interested in this project. The Applicant stated hopefully they can assuage most of their concerns or all of them ideally.

8. Call to the Public:

- Craig Wipple, Hartland Township; expressed concern about fire danger if the natural areas become dry, and fire department access.
- Lou Ann Lathrop, Hartland Township; expressed a desire for large evergreen trees for screening.
- Jason Fowler, Hartland Township; feels a traffic count should be done to ease the residents' concerns, wants a tax analysis completed, wants to see the list of community benefits, has concerns about gridlocking any future development on the southern portion of the site because of where Hartland Glen Drive ends, wants the developer to cooperate and help with infrastructure improvements, concerned that apartment dwellers' children do not stay in the school system for more than two years, concerned how developments impact current residents.
- Gordon Halt, Hartland Township; has questions regarding Special Planning Area requirements, the use of as shall and should and what the differences are, has concerns that having a multi-phased development precludes a developer from traffic study requirements.

9. Planner Report:

None


10. Committee Reports:

None

11. Adjournment

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Murphy and seconded by Commissioner McMullen. Motion carried unanimously. The Regular Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:15 PM.

Submitted by.



Tom Murphy
Planning Commission Secretary