

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

March 11, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

This meeting was held via video conference in compliance with the Department of Health and Human Resources Emergency Order of February 4, 2021 under MCL 333.2253

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Fox called the meeting to order at approximately 7:05 p.m.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance:**
3. **Roll Call and Recognition of Visitors:**
Present – Commissioners Fox (via video from Hartland Township, MI), Grissim (Hartland Township, MI), LaRose (Hartland Township, MI), McMullen (Hartland Township, MI), Murphy (Hartland Township, MI)
Absent – Commissioners Mitchell, Voight
4. **Approval of the Agenda:**
A Motion to approve the March 11, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner LaRose and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.
5. **Approval of the Minutes:**
 - a. Planning Commission Minutes of February 11, 2021
A Motion to approve the February 11, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes was made by Commissioner LaRose and seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously.
6. **Call to Public:**
None
7. **Public Hearing:**
 - a. **Site Plan Application #20-011 Villas of Hartland Planned Development (PD) – Preliminary Site Plan.** A request for Preliminary Planned Development approval for a 55-unit residential development on two parcels; 4708-19-300-013 and 4708-19-300-014, totaling approximately 24.51 acres, in Section 19 of the Township.

Chair Fox explained the Public Hearing process.

Chair Fox opened the Public Hearing at 7:11 PM stating all noticing requirements have been met.

Director Langer summarized the request, location and process stating the following:

- Located north of M-59 and east of Hacker Road.
- Planned Development (PD) is a three-step process: Concept, Preliminary and Final. Each review is before both the Planning Commission and the Township Board.
- Tonight, is the Preliminary phase which requires a Public Hearing.

Wayne Perry of Desine, Inc. representing the Applicant, Joe Rotondo stated the following:

- Development is at the Preliminary stage.
- Currently proposed as a 55-unit condominium development with private roads, a gated community.
- Mr. Rotundo feels this provides a style of ownership that is desired by buyers in today's market.
- High quality single-family homes without large lawn areas.

Chair Fox confirmed that all of the written communications will be included in the record of this meeting.

Call to Public

- Henry Nykiel, N Hacker Road, Oceola Township; commented on some experiencing lack of connectivity for the meeting.
- Roger Myers, Attorney representing Walnut Ridge Homeowner's Association, Michigan Avenue, Howell; stated the following:
 - Concerns about connecting road and unrestricted gate to private roads within Walnut Ridge.
 - Walnut Ridge HOA will not grant ingress-egress access per Condition #6 of the proposed resolution.
 - Would prefer a restricted gate with unpaved emergency access connecting the two developments.
- Jim Jablonski, N Hacker Road, Oceola Township; expressed concerns about runoff negatively impacting existing wetlands and ponds. Would like the State of Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) to review the project.
- Henry Nykiel, N Hacker Road, Oceola Township; expressed concerns with [unintelligible] runoff negatively impacting existing wetlands and ponds and would like the developer to test the pond water, future flooding, and increased traffic.
- James Quigley, Hacker Road, Hartland Township; expressed concerns about the safety of foot traffic on Hacker Road, increased vehicle traffic, and increased trespass onto his property.
- Derek Niederquell, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; concerned about increased traffic due to connecting road.
- Sue LaRoy, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; concerned about increased traffic and safety due to connecting road.
- Joe Napieralski, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; agrees with previous comments, has concerns about connecting road (annex), speeding traffic, about not being able to have their concerns heard by the neighboring HOA, construction traffic in Walnut Ridge, and wear and tear on the existing roads.
- Dennis Pate, Walnut Ridge HOA President, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; his members are concerned about traffic and safety, tired of construction and all that comes with it, maintenance of the private road, opposed to connecting road.
- Steven Cotter, N Hacker Road, Oceola Township stated the following:
 - Feels this development is not compatible with the intent of the zoning.
 - Concerned about construction noise, increased traffic, light pollution, runoff into ponds and wetlands.
 - Request the Planning Commission require a buffer with a berm and evergreens, consider relocating the entrance farther to the south.

- Courtney Samson, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; concerned about safety and traffic.
- Gary LaRoy, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; concerned about traffic and safety as their development has sidewalks on one side of the street only.
- Aaron Harkness, Torrey Pine Court, Hartland Township; oppose the connecting road, concerned about traffic and safety.
- Chris Lucier, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; concerned about traffic, safety and preserving the family-friendly character of their development.

Chair Fox closed the Public Hearing at 7:59 PM

Chair Fox referred to the staff memorandum dated March 4, 2021.

Eligibility Criteria (Section 3.1.18.B.)

1. **Recognizable Benefits.** *The planned development shall result in a recognizable and substantial benefit to the ultimate uses of the project and to the community and shall result in a higher quality of development than could be achieved under conventional zoning.*

The applicant outlined the community benefits that the Villas of Hartland PD will provide as listed below:

- Preservation of natural features as open space areas.
- Provision of a low to no maintenance community that is in demand in Hartland Township by professionals and senior citizens.
- Luxury homes comprised of high-quality materials.
- Residents of the development may provide an increase in utilization of local businesses as they engage in the Hartland community.
- Provision of vehicular and pedestrian connections to the adjacent residential development, Walnut Ridge Estates PD, plus sidewalks are provided within the Villas development.
- Extension of municipal sanitary sewer and water service to accommodate the proposed development, built to the Township and County standards.

2. **Minimum Size.** *Planned Developments must be a minimum of 20 acres of contiguous land.*

The proposed project is approximately 24.51 acres in size, thus complying with the minimum size requirement.

3. **Use of Public Services.** *The proposed type and density of use shall not result in an unreasonable increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities, and shall not place an unreasonable burden upon the subject site, surrounding land, property owners and occupants, or the natural environment.*

- Review letter from Livingston County Road Commission (LCRC), dated September 29, 2020, outlines their comments and lists the required modifications to the proposed plans.
- Hartland DPW will manage a water capacity study for the total fifty-five (55) units (earlier modeling was based on forty (40) units.)

- Developer will be required to upgrade the existing pump station with the purchase and installation of two new (2) pumps to provide the additional sewer capacity.
 - Director Langer stated the following about Traffic:
 - It is anticipated development will not rise to the level of requiring a Traffic Study with the recent addition of a traffic signal at Hacker Road and Highland Road.
 - When Walnut Ridge was originally proposed, the two developers discussed the connection between the two developments and planned for it.
 - Concept was to have a connection to Hacker Road where a signal would eventually be installed at M-59 allowing the residents of Walnut Ridge the ability to make a safe and efficient left turn with the aid of a traffic light during peak times of traffic on M-59.
- 4. Compatibility with Comprehensive Plan.** *The proposed development shall not have an adverse impact upon the Comprehensive Plan for the Township. Notwithstanding this requirement, the Township may approve a Planned Development proposal that includes uses which are not called for on the Future Land Use Map, provided that the Planning Commission and Township Board determine that such a deviation from the Future Land Use Map is justified in light of the current planning and development objectives of the Township.*

Chair Fox stated this development shall not have an adverse impact on the Comprehensive Plan; this will be discussed in detail later in the meeting.

- 5. Unified Control.** *The proposed development shall be under single ownership or control such that there is a single person or entity having responsibility for completing the project, or assuring completion of the project, in conformity with the Ordinance.*

The applicant has provided a copy of the Warranty Deed which shows the sole ownership of the subject property (two parcels) is under Hacker Road, LLC.

Planned Development Design Standards (Section 3.1.18.C.)

- 1. Permitted Uses.** *The predominant use on the site shall be consistent with the uses specified for the parcel on the Township's Comprehensive Plan for Future Land Uses.*

Chair Fox stated the following:

- Single-family residential is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and would be permitted.
 - Fairly consistent with other Medium Suburban Density Residential (MSDR) developments in the area such as Walnut Ridge Estates PD, Hartland Estates, San Marino Estates, Meadow View Estates, Fiddler Grove, and Autumn Woods.
- 2. Residential Density.** *Residential density in a planned development shall be consistent with the density designation within the Township's Comprehensive Plan.*

Director Langer stated the following:

- Preliminary Plan proposes a density of 2.24 dwelling units per acre exceeds the density allowed for in the MSDR, density of 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre.
- Planned Development process allows the applicant to seek up to a forty percent (40%) bonus density.
- Without the bonus density, forty-nine (49) dwelling units would be allowed.
- With the maximum bonus density, sixty-nine (69) dwelling units could be allowed.
- Proposed development has fifty-five (55) dwelling units; consideration of a density bonus is applicable.
- Planning Commission, and ultimately the Township Board, must decide if the project meets the requirements for the density bonus.
- If the density bonus is awarded, this development will be consistent with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). If not, it would then be inconsistent with the FLUM.
- More information in the staff report for historical reference.

Commissioner LaRose expressed the following concerns:

- Density bonus is being considered but a waiver for some Landscaping requirements has been requested.
- Trying to understand the grading plan and proposed drainage, unsure if greater density can be accommodated.
- Building envelopes shown are pretty close together compared to what the Zoning Ordinance generally allows.

The Applicant stated the following:

- Building envelopes being proposed rather than lots.
- Various house designs provided which are all smaller than the building envelopes.
- Everything related to the residence must be constructed within the envelope depicted.
- Envelope will not be filled completely but decks and porches must be contained within that area.
- Envelope approach allows for some flexibility rather than proposing a specific footprint.
- Separation between units will not be less than what is depicted but probably more based on the house sizes provided.
- Conventional drainage is planned as the site is regraded, front to the road, back toward the rear.
- Not requesting a reduction in Landscaping but rather a modification which is up to the Planning Commission; change in percentage of deciduous trees to evergreen. They feel it is a better mix, but if the Planning Commission does not agree, they will comply.
- Feels the street trees cannot be placed in the location the Zoning Ordinance requires.

Commissioner LaRose asked if there is anything in the by-laws requiring a certain distance between the houses. The Applicant replied there are no setbacks but the minimum distance between building envelopes is fourteen (14) feet. Chair Fox asked the Applicant to confirm the house designs proposed do not fill the building envelopes left to right. The Applicant concurred.

- 3. Design Details.** *The applicant shall prepare a detailed description of design details to be implemented in the proposed planned development, to be presented in a Pattern Book.*

Chair Fox stated the Applicant has provided three (3) elevation plans giving some direction as to the look of this development. Mr. Rotondo also built Hartland Estates, a neighboring development to the east. The quality of that development speaks to what is being proposed here.

4. Minimum Yard Requirements.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- Setback from Hacker Road is 125 feet exceeding the standard of 50 feet.
- Along the perimeter the standard is 40 feet; proposed is 50.4 feet (east) 41.0 feet (north) 44.3 feet (south).
- Along an internal collector or local road 40 feet is required; 23.5 feet is the proposed setback from private road as measured to closest point of unit envelope

Commissioner Murphy asked the Applicant if any elements can exceed the building envelope. The Applicant stated the driveway, and sidewalks only. Commissioner Murphy asked if any elevated building materials could extend outside of the envelope. The Applicant stated if it is a deck or any other part of the house, it cannot extend outside of the building envelope.

Commissioner Murphy asked if there is enough room to walk around an average sized or larger vehicle parked in the driveway without covering the sidewalk. The Applicant stated they believe there is enough room.

Commissioner Murphy asked if sidewalks are planned for both sides of the street. The Applicant affirmed they are.

5. Distances Between Buildings. *Spacing requirements for buildings in a planned development are outlined in Section 3.1.18.C.vi.b. Any detached single-family structure shall be located at least thirty (30) feet from any other detached single-family structure and shall provide a minimum side yard of fifteen (15) feet on both sides.*

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the possibility of two houses being 14 feet apart if pushed to the extreme edges of the envelopes.

6. Building Height. *No building in a planned development shall be greater than thirty-five (35) feet in height.*

Chair Fox stated with two-stories they will meet the height limitation.

7. Landscaping.

Chair Fox stated the Landscaping would be discussed in depth later in the meeting.

8. Open Space. *Open space shall be provided to complement and accentuate the high-quality design of the proposed planned development. At minimum the planned development shall provide open space consistent with the previous zoning designation for the site.*

Director Langer stated the following:

- Two separate Ordinances apply:
 - Section 3.1.18.C.vi.f. CA Conservation Agriculture requires 85% but is more for traditional developments
 - Section 3.15 Residential Condominium Developments requires 25% with 10% usable open space
 - Proposed is 42% open space and 15.3% usable open space.

- 9. Natural Features.** *Consistent with the stated intentions for creation of these regulation, the preservation of the natural features of the Township are an important planning consideration. A PD proposal must consider the natural topography and geologic features, scenic vistas, trees and other vegetation and natural drainage patterns that exist on the site and propose a development pattern which preserves and avoids disruption of those natural features as much as possible.*

Director Langer stated the following:

- Two types of wetlands present on the site: regulated and nonregulated.
- Only the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) can determine if a wetland is regulated or nonregulated.
- Several are present on the site.
- Applicant intends to fill some and not others.
- Off-site wetland in the vicinity of the connection road would be partially filled.
- Tree Inventory indicates the Applicant intends to keep some existing trees on the exterior portions of the site as part of the required screening as well as others throughout the site.

Commissioner LaRose expressed concern with proposed walkouts in the vicinity of wetlands.

- 10. Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access.** *The applicant must demonstrate the PD site and all uses within the site will be connected to any existing pedestrian and nonmotorized vehicle paths and trails within a public right-of-way or easement open to the public.*

Chair Fox stated a five-foot-wide sidewalk is shown on both sides of the street and a sidewalk on the north side of the future road will connect Walnut Ridge Estates and The Villas of Hartland.

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

1. Stormwater and Drainage Systems.

Commissioner LaRose expressed the following concerns:

- Wetland areas could cause potential flooding.
- Drainage between the homes.
- Wetland across Hacker Road.
- One retention basin soil boring started at 14.5 feet, what kind of soils were present in those 14.5 feet, only the last 1.5 feet was sandy soils. Unsure if the retention basin will work as designed. Needs more review.

- Not opposed to the development but not yet comfortable with the information and reviews provided.
- Potential impact of water downstream, it appears the pond does not have much room for additional water.

The Applicant stated the reason they proposed a retention basin rather than a detention basin was specifically to avoid any downstream impacts. The basin is designed in accordance with Livingston County Drain Commission specifications. It holds a 100-year storm, has an excess of three feet of freeboard and will hold at least two 100-year storms prior to any potential failure occurring. The soils are clay on top with sand underneath. All the way to the east to Hartland Estates there is sand underneath the clay. The soil borings confirm an extensive layer of sand capable of handling the run-off. Additionally, the Drain Commissioner now requires they create an infiltration chamber system at the bottom of the basin in the sand so even if the native sands at the bottom of the basin begin to plug off, the retention basin does not fail from an infiltration standpoint, the basin will continue to function.

Director Langer asked the Applicant about the overflow or outlet on the site plan towards Hacker Road and how that might work. The Applicant replied that is a requirement of the Livingston County Drain Code for any stormwater management system, retention or detention basin, you are required to provide an emergency overflow that would function should it ever need to. Normally in a detention basin situation, there is a significant possibility they could be put into use as detention basins do not have infiltration capability, that is why they have an outlet. They are designed to handle one 100-year storm. This retention basin is designed to handle one 100-year storm only to the high level and then there is over another three feet of storage for a second 100-year storm event. With the infiltration chamber system in the bottom, this system is anticipated never to use the required emergency overflow.

2. Fiscal Impacts.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- The Applicant stated the proposed development will bring revenue to the Township via taxes which will also benefit the school district.
- Schools will not be impacted much as it is intended for residents 55 and older.
- As some local residents relocate to this development, other housing will become available also increasing the tax base.

3. Other.

Internal Vehicular Circulation

Director Langer stated the following:

- Difficult to talk about The Villas without Walnut Ridge Estates
- Walnut Estates is required to have a secondary access due to the number of units.
- Two options were given: an emergency access that would connect to the church in case the main road was blocked, or a connection to the west.
- Two units were reserved for the access; whichever one was used, the other could be converted into another site for a home.

- Timetable in place of six years, if the property was not developed in that time frame, then the site could be used as a home site and the church option would be used.
- Same is true with The Villas; they also need a secondary access.
- Connection will serve both.
- The connection would also serve as a way for Walnut Ridge residents to make a safe left turn onto M-59 during peak traffic using the newly installed signal at Hacker Road.
- Roads for The Villas were designed for traffic calming to reduce speeding.
- Developer for The Villas is proposing a gated community.
- Will open automatically for any vehicle, if there was a loss of power, the gates can be manually opened.
- If gate system were one that would not allow traffic to flow through, consideration should be given to a secondary access for The Villas. The developer chose one that does allow all traffic to pass through.
- Comprehensive Plan states it is best for the community to have interconnectivity between neighborhoods to create better access for emergency vehicles, school buses, and mail carriers.
- Having interconnectivity is generally thought to reduce conflict points with major roadways such as M-59.
- Encourages walkability between subdivisions.
- Gates will act as a speed reducing device but also accomplish interconnectivity.

Char Fox added the following:

- Served on the Planning Commission during the review of Walnut Ridge Estates and can provide some history and context for the connection decision.
- Concept of the connecting road is Walnut Ridge is the benefactor from the traffic safety standpoint.
- Unlikely Villas residents would travel east through Walnut Ridge, other than possible church attendance.
- Safe alternative for teen drivers traveling back to the school complex during peak traffic times on M-59.
- Not stating a position, just sharing information.

Landscaping (Section 5.11)

A. Landscaping of Divider Medians (Sec. 5.11.2.A.vii.)

Chair Fox asked if a crossover should be added like Hartland Estates to allow vehicles to turn around and not enter the gate area. The Applicant stated the Hartland Estates gate was originally not intended to open for all vehicles, so the crossover was needed to exit the gate entry area. School buses were not intended to enter the community, so the turnaround had to be large enough to accommodate a school bus. That situation is not present in The Villas of Hartland as the gates are an aesthetic amenity and will open for all vehicles.

B. Greenbelt Landscaping (Sec. 5.11.2.C.i.)

Commissioner Grissim offered the following comments:

- Hacker Road north of the entrance is an approximate 20-foot-wide gravel road cradled on either side by large mature Hickory and Oak trees which is a huge traffic calming feature.

- Understands the desire to pave the road per Livingston County requirements but now it will be 35 feet wide with acceleration/deceleration lanes making it 47 feet wide in places.
- Due to the water main and utilities, the trees are pushed back to 50 feet making it feel like a highway.
- Going to increase speed, not be as safe, and will not have the feel it has today.
- Would like to see the shade trees as close to the road as they can to minimize the impact and bring back the character that is there today.

C. Canopy trees along Internal Roadways (Sec. 5.11.2.C.ii.)

Commissioner Grissim stated the following:

- Visited both Walnut Ridge and Hartland Estates.
- Ordinance requests street trees be within 15 feet of the edge of the road for the same reason, a traffic calming device and to create the street environment.
- Applicant stated they cannot plant trees over the utilities in the right of way. [Photos of Walnut Ridge and Hartland Estates were compared]
- Areas with the trees in the right of way create a much better feel to the road; trees farther back feel like a highway and can encourage traffic to go faster.
- It can be done. Really pushing for those trees to be with 15 feet of the road.

The Applicant stated the following:

- It is the developer's desire to plant the trees between the sidewalk and the edge of the road; unfortunately, the Township Engineering Standards do not allow trees in the public utility easements.
- Caught between the Zoning Ordinance and the Township Engineering Standards.
- Open to do whatever the Planning Commission decides but cannot satisfy all parties involved.

Chair Fox asked what occurs in other communities.

The Applicant stated often sewer is under the pavement, but Hartland does not favor that placement of sanitary sewer. Placement is preferred back of curb, same with water main. Or there are communities that do not restrict the placement of trees within public utilities. There is lots of variability.

Director Langer commented they spoke with the Public Works Director who restated they do not prefer to have trees planted over water or sewer mains, but he did review the depth of the utilities and is willing to work with the Applicant and the Planning Commission to find a place for the trees.

Commissioner Mitchell stated he agrees with Commissioner Grissim and prefers the trees in between the sidewalk and the edge of the road, it is much more pleasant; he hopes they can work with Public Works to find an appropriate location.

Commissioner Murphy stated he too agrees with Commissioner Grissim and appreciates her comments. Whether it is the entrance to Hacker Road or the internal roadway, he agrees with both Commissioners Grissim and Mitchell.

Commissioner LaRose stated the following:

- Opposed to putting trees over the infrastructure.
- More costly to repair.
- People get very attached to trees and object when they are removed for a repair.
- Reason is root systems can cause damage those utilities.
- Her preference would be to avoid the utilities.

Commissioner Grissim disagreed responding with the following:

- Utilities are down quite deep.
- Root systems typically stay within the top three feet; utilities are down about five feet.
- Has not found it to be that expensive to remove a tree to do a repair and it does not happen very often.
- In many different developments there is an understanding if there is a problem, it is a non-issue with the developments she has been involved with.
- Would like to push the same issue along Hacker Road to keep the character.

Bob West, Township Manager commented the following:

- Familiar with Hartland Township Public Works.
- Positioning not only for the water main and sewer main but also for the private infrastructure. Tree roots can grow and damage sidewalks which can cause an issue with replacement and the homeowner.
- Where there is curb and gutter, those can be impacted.
- Root system may not be deep, but the edge drain is also not deep.
- Public Works will work with the Planning Commission and the Applicant but that is the recommendation.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed other communities that have street trees close to the road.

Commissioner McMullen agreed with Commissioner Grissim, she likes the look and has not seen too many issues with street trees and utilities.

Commissioner Murphy asked if items could be adjusted, utilities, sidewalk, to find a compromise, maybe trees that are slower growing with different root structure, to satisfy both departments.

Commissioner Grissim replied there are tree varieties that have more compatible root structures than others. She also commented the distance between the sidewalk and edge of road is ten feet which is much larger than some; usually five feet. Yes, different trees can be utilized, and elements can be moved around.

Chair Fox summarized saying he is hearing the Planning Commission would like to see the trees closer to the street between the sidewalk and the road, there could be a possible tree selection that would minimize impact to utilities and sidewalks.

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

Commissioner Grissim stated she believes the screening on the north and south with the existing trees remaining and the supplemental trees as shown should be adequate. The way the retention area is laid out, it should meet the Ordinance.

Street Lighting

Director Langer asked if the concerns about light trespass to the west are addressed in the Site Plan. Commission Grissim stated yes, there is a long distance, there are only two pole lights near the entrance, the rest are from the residences. She does not feel there will be light trespass; there are no streets lights in this development.

Architecture/Building Materials (Sec. 5.24)

Chair Fox stated according to the renderings submitted they look similar to what we have seen before; they seem to be very high quality and nice-looking units. The Planning Commission agreed.

Chair Fox asked if the Applicant had any comments on the consulting review letters. The Applicant had none.

Director Langer stated there is a lot to take in and appreciated participants' patience as well as all the comments shared and submitted. Hopefully, the Township and the Applicant can ultimately reach something that is good for the community.

Chair Fox agreed. He feels they need to send the Applicant back to do a few things.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the proposed distance from the edge of the right of way to the building envelope. The Planning Commission is satisfied with the distance shown.

Commissioner McMullen stated the following:

- She has a problem with the gates; it is not truly a gated community.
- Gate is not a welcoming factor.
- Perception of not being inclusive to the community.
- Promotes a lack of diversity.
- She does not think that people move to Hartland to be in a gated area, sectioned off from the community.

Commissioner Mitchell stated the following:

- Was not originally in favor of the gates but feels better about them after this discussion.
- Not coded.
- Will visually discourage through traffic.
- Not a safety issue.

Commissioner LaRose restated her concerns about Landscaping that can hopefully be worked out. Also, she would like to see a more detailed review of the stormwater design by Livingston County Drain Commission. She felt the Engineering review was vague and she would like to see a more in-depth review. It can be a pretty substantial change if something has to be redesigned following a drainage review.

Chair Fox stated he is not prepared to make a recommendation to the Board tonight. He asked if the Planning Commission is comfortable asking the Applicant to do some of the things requested, Landscaping modification, drainage review.

Commissioner Mitchell stated he would like to see an updated Landscaping Plan showing the trees closer to the road as Commission Grissim has requested.

Commissioner LaRose stated she appreciates the people who spoke this evening about traffic and safety, she has children too and understands their comments. Nevertheless, she feels the connection road is a strong benefit and will be safer from a travel perspective as kids are learning to drive. The design does promote driving slower.

Commissioner Grissim agreed with Commissioner LaRose and the Planning Director. She grew up in a development where the streets were connected, and it still felt like a neighborhood. One of the community goals is to have a walkable and driving network. She wants to encourage the connection.

Commissioner Murphy stated he also agrees. He too was a Planning Commissioner when Walnut Ridge Estates was going through the approval process and recalls the discussion of the connector road being a benefit for those in Walnut Ridge trying to make a left turn during peak traffic, especially for newer drivers. It is a plus for safety. Also, as Commissioner Grissim mentioned, the neighborhood aspect. He feels Commission Grissim painted a good picture of how to use Landscaping to close in the open area of the entrance somewhat. He also would like to see what can be done to get the street trees between the sidewalk and the edge of the road as recommended by Commissioner Grissim.

Director Langer stated since we have asked the Applicant to make some modifications, he would ask the Planning Commissioners to listen to the Public Comment later tonight. Maybe some of the residents did not know the history of the connection road and maybe some will have a rebuttal. He would ask that they keep an open mind. It is a very important topic and worth taking some time to think about.

Commissioner Mitchell stated it should be pointed out that construction traffic will not be passing through Walnut Ridge.

The Applicant stated he had no further comments other than he would appreciate direction from the Planning Commission. There are a number of issues the easiest being placing the street trees on the other side of the sidewalk. Regarding the connection, they need some direction, or they can move forward.

Commissioner Mitchell clarified he is only in favor of the access if it has the electric gates that open up, it should not be a wide-open access.

Chair Fox asked if the Applicant needed any additional clarification. The Applicant stated he understands the Planning Commission position on the access and the rest of the comments they can work through.

Chair Fox stated this item will return to the Planning Commission at a later date, the difference being tonight was a Public Hearing that requires noticing property owners within 300 feet of the proposed project. The next meeting will not be a Public Hearing so there will not be a written notification. Interested residents can access the Hartland Township website and view upcoming agenda items. It will appear as Site Plan Application #20-011 Villas of Hartland

Planned Development (PD) – Preliminary Site Plan. Today was different as it was a Public Hearing. It will take much longer than a week or two to return.

The Planning Commission chose not to make a recommendation on Preliminary Planned Development.

8. Call to Public:

- Joe Napieralski, Walnut View Drive, Hartland Township; appreciated the history, still strongly opposed to the annex. Will follow up with the Homeowners and additional communications. Does not agree with the traffic benefit going all the way down to Hacker Road to make a left turn.
- Henry Nykiel, N Hacker Road, Oceola Township; still very concerned about water running over the road. He believes that eventually the water will reach the overflow. When filling wetlands, the water has to go somewhere. Concerned about the pond. Could be an issue in the future.

9. Planner's Report:

None

10. Committee Reports:

None

11. Adjournment:

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:50 p.m.

Submitted by,



**Keith Voight,
Planning Commission Secretary**