

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 18, 2025– 7:00 PM

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

2. **Pledge of Allegiance:**

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

Present – Commissioners Eckman, Grissim, Mayer, McMullen, Mitchell, and Murphy

Absent – Chair Fox

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

A Motion to approve the December 18, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner McMullen and seconded by Commissioner Eckman. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

a. Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2025

A Motion to approve the Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of November 6, 2025, was made by Commissioner Grissim and seconded by Commissioner Mayer. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Call to the Public:**

None

7. **Public Hearing**

a. Site Plan Application #26-001 Proposed restaurant with drive-through service (Chick-fil-A) at 10587 Highland Road, Preliminary PD Site Plan

Vice-Chair Mitchell opened the Public Hearing at 7:03 p.m. stating all noticing requirements have been met.

Director Langer stated the following:

- Gave an overview of the location and scope of the project.
- Located east of US 23, north of M-59, on the east side of Hartland Road formerly the site of a Big Boy restaurant.
- Three points of access: in from Hartland Road, in and out with a right turn only onto M-59, in and out onto Rovey Drive.
- Building is proposed in the same location as the existing building with the addition of a double drive-through.
- Parking is planned to the north of the building as it was previously.
- Applicant chose to develop this site using the Planning Development process, a three-step process consisting of a Conceptual Review, a Preliminary Review, and a Final Review, all of which are heard before both the Planning Commission and the Township Board.

- Tonight is the Preliminary Review where the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Township Board. The Township Board will make the final decision.

The Applicant, Jordan Chapman of Chick-fil-A, and Leslie Accardo, Senior Project Manager, PEA Group, introduced themselves stating the following:

- Working to obtain easements for the drives mentioned above.
- Goal is to use as much of the infrastructure as possible, not including the building, but the drives, parking and landscaping.
- Intend to replace the monument sign but keep the retaining wall.
- Very similar building as was shown at the previous meetings but more of a square shape.
- Still planning for the three signs and a welcome sign at the front door.
- Keeping the parking lot islands but giving them a refreshed look.
- Likes this project layout.
- Location seems to be a better fit for the community.
- Displayed the proposed traffic flow turning movements.
- RTUs will be screened and not be visible from any public rights-of-way.

Call to the Public

None.

Vice-Chair Mitchell closed the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m.

Vice-Chair Mitchell referred to the staff memorandum dated December 11, 2025.

Eligibility Criteria (Section 3.1.18.B.)

Recognizable Benefits

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the applicant submitted four examples which are included in the packet.

Minimum Size

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated per the applicant, Chick-fil-A is requesting a waiver for the 20-acre requirement due to the redevelopment of a vacant parcel and associated site constraints.

Use of Public Services

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the applicant is proposing no additional use of public services other than what is already provided at the site.

Compatibility with Comprehensive Plan

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the proposed project appears to be consistent with the intent of the Commercial designation in the FLUM and Comprehensive Plan.

Unified Control

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the proposed development will be leased by Chick-fil-A from a single ownership.

Planned Development Design Standards (Section 3.1.18.C.)

Permitted Uses

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated this was already covered.

Residential Density

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated this standard does not apply to the proposed project.

Design Details

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the design details are provided for the proposed project via the submitted site plans, architectural drawings, and sign program.

Minimum Yard Requirements

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated they do not meet the front setback requirements from Hartland Road or Highland Road.

Director Langer stated the applicant is proposing to construct the building in the same location as the current building.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the history of the former Big Boy structure and the past redevelopment of the abutting site and roadways.

Other structures and setbacks - Drive-through Canopies

Director Langer stated the following:

- Proposing two canopies; the east canopy complies with the setback, the west canopy does not.
- Canopies are treated like fuel island canopies.
- Advantage of a PD is the Planning Commission is able to grant some flexibility as part of that process.

Commissioner Eckman commented it is an interesting spot with the location of the retaining wall, you do not see much because of the wall. He thinks the setbacks are reasonable. If the building were moved to the north, the parking would be impacted. It is pretty much the same footprint as it is now except for the canopy. He likes it.

Building Height

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated they meet the requirement of 35 feet or less.

Parking and Loading

Director Langer stated for loading, most trucks do not come when a restaurant is at peak capacity, so a designated loading area is often not provided.

Director Langer stated the following regarding parking spaces:

- Required to have 52 parking spaces and 10 drive-through stacking spaces, they are providing 69 parking spaces and 42 drive-through stacking spaces.
- Applicant provided a letter explaining why the corporate standard requires more parking.

Commissioner Eckman asked if 42 stacking spaces is more than normal. The Applicant stated it is; the typical amount is 30 to 35.

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the Applicant is proposing 69, nine by twenty-foot spaces, the standard is ten by twenty-foot spaces.

The Applicant stated they could not meet their corporate standards. In other communities the spaces are nine by eighteen.

Commissioner Mayer suggested they increase the size of the ten northernmost spaces to ten by twenty feet, losing one space, to allow for larger vehicles. The Applicant stated they can look at that.

Commissioner Eckman stated he thinks it is a market driven issue. It is not going to affect the neighbors or traffic flow; it will be an inconvenience for someone with a larger vehicle.

Commissioner Murphy stated he thinks Commissioner Mayer's suggestion is a creative idea.

Landscaping

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated this would be discussed later.

Open Space

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated 75% is permitted; they are proposing lot coverage of 6.98%.

Natural Features

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated it is a redevelopment of an existing commercial site.

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated there are 7-foot-wide sidewalks along the Highland Road and Hartland Road frontages, with a three-foot-wide sidewalk on all sides of the building.

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

Sewer and Water

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated they intend to utilize existing water and sewer.

Stormwater and Drainage Systems

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the stormwater management plans will be required as part of the Construction Plan set.

Traffic Impacts

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), was submitted. There is also a letter from Livingston County Road Commission (LCRC), he summarized if there are no changes they do not have any comments or require any revisions.

Director Langer mentioned one of the attachments was incorrectly listed as coming from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) but is from LCRC. The Applicant is currently working with MDOT. They have an access onto M-59, but this is a slight change in use from a sit-down restaurant to a fast-food restaurant with a drive-through. The Applicant has indicated in those conversations there have been no concerns. In the event that MDOT requires a change to the access

point to M-59, depending on the change, if it impacts the site in any way, the Applicant would have to come back to the Planning Commission with an amendment to their site plan.

Vehicular Circulation

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated this was covered earlier.

Commissioner Murphy asked about the width of one of the access points. The Applicant stated they are the standard 24 feet. Commissioner Murphy asked if they could be wider and farther to the north. The Applicant suggested they could remove the island and stripe it to create a wider access area. Director Langer stated 24 feet complies with our standard as does the parking island. Sometimes the Fire Department requires an access to be 26 feet but not at this location.

Vice-Chair Mitchell asked if any internal signage is proposed to aid customers as they exit the site. The Applicant stated there currently is a sign at the Rovey Drive exit indicating access to M-59 is to the right. Commissioner Mayer stated at the previous meeting there was discussion about adding some off-site signage to help drivers understand what their options are for added safety. Commissioner McMullen also expressed concerns about the flow of traffic entering and leaving the site. The Applicant stated they understand the concerns. They closed one of the curb cuts to prevent drivers from making a U-turn to return to M-59, which is why it is designed the way it is; it also allowed the trash enclosure to be closer to the building for added safety for their staff.

The Planning Commission discussed various options and limitations for traffic entering and leaving the site.

Fiscal Impacts

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated this was covered earlier.

Site Requirements

Fast-food and Drive-through Restaurants (Sec. 4.28)

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated they meet the requirements.

Outdoor Seating and Dining (Sec. 4.47)

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated an outdoor seating area is planned with four tables and chairs with a three-foot-high fence on all three sides. All applicable details and information will be addressed on the Construction Plan set.

Dumpster Enclosure (Sec. 5.7)

Vice-Chair Mitchell stated the information is shown and meets the requirements.

Off-Street Parking (Sec. 5.8.4.H – Fast food restaurant with drive-through service)

Vice-Chair Mitchell indicated this has been covered. Barrier-Free Parking is provided. A Loading space is not shown but it is typically not required.

Landscaping (Sec. 5.11 – Updated Landscape Ordinance version)

Commissioner Grissim stated the following:

- Regarding Greenbelt Landscaping, there are existing constraints along M-59 with an easement where no trees are permitted; they are trying to do the best they can with the space provided.

- Requested they overlay the lighting plan over the landscaping plan because there are light poles in three locations where trees are also proposed.
- The existing utility box is proposed to be screened with evergreens; however, it is a tough spot in the middle where there will be salt and snow. In lieu of using evergreens, a low screen fence can be utilized, along with some of the low grasses. The evergreens will not survive in those conditions.
- The intention is to save the existing plantings, but during construction some may be in worse condition and might need to be replaced.

Commissioner Mayer stated he understands they intend to keep the retaining wall; if something unexpected occurs during construction and it must be removed, he asked that it be replaced with a nicer wall. The Applicant stated a portion is planned to be removed for the drive-through installation, they intend to replace it with a nicer retaining wall that will match the building. The new wall will be on the east side of the building.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the west retaining wall and screening.

Lighting (Sec. 5.13)

Director Langer stated the proposed Lighting Plan exceeds the permitted footcandle values by one or two footcandles in a couple of locations. There is some tweaking that can be done and shown on the Construction Plan set. The Applicant has requested a waiver for the footcandle values under the canopies.

Sign Program – Monument Sign and Wall Signs

Director Langer stated the Sign Program is essentially the same as was presented for the former Burger King location. They intend to replace the non-conforming monument sign in the same location, and plan to have three (3) wall signs; typically, two (2) are permitted but the total size is less than the requirement as was shown previously. Direction signs are proposed. Any off-site directional signs will require permission from the property owner.

Director Langer stated there is a small portion of property at the Hartland Road entry and they are in the process of working on an easement with the new owners as there is no record of an easement for that existing access drive. He also mentioned Condition 3, which reads as follows: “Upon the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the Hartland Road access drive shall be temporarily closed for thirty (30) days.” The intent is to lessen any potential congestion when the restaurant first opens. A similar condition was proposed for the Burger King location.

Commissioner Grissim offered the following Motion:

Move to recommend approval of Site Plan/PD #26-001, the Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan for Chick-fil-A Planned Development, as outlined in the staff memorandum dated December 11, 2025.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The Preliminary PD Site Plan for Chick-fil-A, SP/PD Application #26-001, is subject to the approval of the Township Board.**

2. The applicant shall address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department's memorandum, dated December 11, 2025, on the Construction Plan set, subject to an administrative review by Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.
3. Upon the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the Hartland Road access drive shall be temporarily closed for thirty (30) days.
4. Any revisions to the connections to Hartland Road or Highland Road will be considered an amendment to the site plan, to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
5. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, the Fire Code requirements, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), Livingston County Road Commission (LCRC), Livingston County Drain Commission (LCDC), and all other government agencies, as applicable.

Seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

8. **Call to the Public:**

None

9. **Planner Report:**

None

10. **Committee Reports:**

Commissioner Grissim commented on the twenty (20) acre lot minimum required in the Planned Development Ordinance and whether they should be reviewed. Director Langer offered some history and suggested the full Planning Commission should be involved in that discussion but if the Planning Commission would like to review those requirements, the Ordinance Review Committee could look at them.

11. **Adjournment:**

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner McMullen and seconded by Commissioner Eckman. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:11 p.m.

Submitted by.



Tom Murphy
Planning Commission Secretary