

# HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

March 17, 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, LaRose, Mayer, McMullen, Mitchell, Murphy  
Absent – None
4. **Approval of the Meeting Agenda:**  
A Motion to approve the March 17, 2022 Planning Commission Special Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner McMullen. Motion carried unanimously.
5. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**
  - a. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 13, 2022  
A Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of January 13, 2022 was made by Commissioner Grissim and seconded by Commissioner LaRose. Motion carried unanimously.
  - b. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2022  
A Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2022 was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.
6. **Committee Appointments**  
Chair Fox made the following 2022 Committee Appointments:  
Site Plan Review Committee: Fox, LaRose, Mayer  
Ordinance Review Committee: Grissim, Murphy, Mitchell
7. **Call to the Public:**  
None
8. **Old and New Business:**
  - a. **Site Plan Application #22-003 – Redwood Living Planned Development Final Plan.**  
  
Director Langer gave an overview of the location and scope of the request stating the following:
    - Located SW of Cundy and Hartland Glen Lane; 27 acres in the northern portion of Hartland Glen Golf Course.
    - Concept, Preliminary & Final Planned Development (PD) reviews required at both the Planning Commission and Township Board.
    - Preliminary approval was granted for the request for 148 units in 30 single-story buildings.
    - Final PD is mostly the legal documents: the PD Agreement, easements.

- Planning Commission will make a recommendation, the Township Board will render the final approval.

Representing the Applicant, Emily Englehart of Redwood Apartment Neighborhoods, and Ian Graham of Bergmann, Redwood's consulting engineer introduced themselves.

**Final Plan (Exhibit B)**

Director Langer explained the Final Plan (Exhibit B), dated January 28, 2022, was submitted and includes the civil site plans, landscape plans, and architectural plans for the proposed planned development, in a 24" by 36" format (paper size), which is not considered a recordable format. Staff is suggesting a site plan of the planned development could be provided and be designated as the Final Plan (Exhibit B).

Director Langer stated the following:

- Intent is to include a plan that shows what the development looks like, not necessarily the entire plan set.
- Final plans submitted required some modifications; thus, the approved final plan will be the construction set of plans.
- Staff received a PDF showing the changes and have complied with the requested modifications.
- The Application is ready to move on to Final PD and then the construction phase.

**Access Easement (Exhibit C)**

Director Langer stated a portion of Hartland Glen Lane will now be part of the Redwood development but will still serve the golf course and any future development to the south. The Access Easement is to allow Redwood to use this road as well as the Hartland Glen property. For example, Redwood could not put up a gate that would prohibit access to Hartland Glen golf course.

**Offsite Landscape Easement (Exhibit D)**

Director Langer stated during the Public Hearing, it was suggested the northernmost units be moved to the south to allow space for a landscape buffer; however, Mr. Yaldo the property owner, stated he also owns the properties to the north and offered to place the landscaping on those properties, outside of the Redwood development. The recorded exhibit ensures the approximate 15-foot wide offsite landscape easement will be provided on properties north of the Redwood Planned Development and is intended to provide screening and buffering between the Redwood PD and single-family residences to the north.

Commissioner Mitchell asked if Redwood is responsible for maintaining the landscaping within the easement. The Applicant confirmed that is the case; they will maintain the trees and cut the lawn.

**Offsite Sign Easement (Exhibit E)**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Redwood is proposing to install a sign on the north side of Cundy Road which is not part of the Redwood development; generally, offsite signage is not permitted.
- The property owner is willing to grant that easement.
- This monument sign was shown on the Preliminary Plans.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- Concerned as it is written now, Redwood would get an exclusive sign.
- Approximately up to 700 homes possible in the Hartland Glen Golf Course.
- Every future development will also want a sign, “sign alley.”
- Typically, this type of sign would not be allowed.
- Should it be viewed as a development sign for Hartland Glen Golf Course and the residential developments within, like an office condominium sign.
- Trying to avoid the eventuality of several off-site signs along M-59, one for each development.
- PD would allow an easement for this one sign that says Redwood now, but there has to be language in the PD that allows this development only one sign, but the verbiage on the sign must change as this development grows.
- This is the place to address this issue.

Director Langer stated he spoke with Redwood about this sign serving Redwood, Hartland Glen and the future developments. Redwood did not have any concerns but some of it is out of their control. Redwood is having a conversation with Hartland Glen about the sign.

The Applicant stated the following:

- They wanted to hear the Planning Commission’s thoughts.
- Their primary goal is to have the Redwood sign as designed on M-59 with the best exposure.
- There is an existing sign at that location for Hartland Glen.
- One suggestion is that the Redwood sign be allowed, and the existing sign remain which could be altered as future developments occur.
- They are trying to figure out what the Planning Commission wants and how to make it all work.
- Redwood would like to have the sign on M-59, but it is at the generosity of Mr. Yaldo to allow that, and also the Planning Commission.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- If this were not a PD, the sign would not even be in the discussion as off-site signage is not permitted.
- The thinking is they did not pay for property with M-59 frontage, so they do not get M-59 advertising. The same is true for commercial property in that second row.
- Possible development sign, such as for an office park.
- Future developments will also want signs along M-59, most likely multiple developments.
- Allowing Redwood an exclusive sign sets a precedent.
- An argument in the future can be avoided if we deal with it today.

Commissioner Mitchell suggested the monument sign for Redwood be placed on the east side of Hartland Glen Lane on Redwood property. He is not in favor of seeing the triangle piece dotted with development signs. If the sign is going to be off-site, he feels it should be one sign.

Director Langer cautioned the Planning Commission that the boundary lines on aerial images are not accurate. He also indicated Hartland Glen owns the land in between Redwood and M-59 on the east side of the road as well.

Mr. Graham mentioned part of the area being discussed is part of the road right-of-way where signage is not permitted.

Commissioner Mitchell asked about the Redwood development in White Lake and if there is a sign on M-59 at that location.

The Applicant stated they proposed the sign knowing that it might be allowed as part of the PD and Mr. Yaldo was amenable; normally they would not have the opportunity for an off-site sign. Redwood does not want this to hold up the project. They are open to having a shared sign if Mr. Yaldo can accommodate them. They would be open to having a monument sign on their property near the leasing office. They believe all parties agree to having a unified sign along M-59 if that is possible.

Commissioner Grissim stated she is happy the Chair thought this through for our future, a unified sign would be acceptable and makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Mayer agreed.

Commissioner LaRose also agreed.

Commissioner Murphy concurred and mentioned the property in White Lake does have a sign on M-59. He does not think there is enough room to place a monument sign on the east side of Hartland Glen Lane. One larger sign would be more appropriate.

Commissioner McMullen stated she agrees but asked if a new monument sign is constructed, will the other be dismantled?

Chair Fox replied that is part of the discussion. He would propose one sign for the Hartland Glen property with verbiage to be determined by the owner of the Hartland Glen property and the individuals that are part of his development. It will be reviewed by the Planning staff. He has no preference for what is on the sign.

The Planning Commission discussed the following sign options:

- Proposed sign is five (5) feet tall; seven (7) feet is permitted.
- Any addition to the sign may make it larger than seven (7) feet.
- Some larger developments have ten (10) foot signs.
- Sign could be designed, and the Applicant could come back for the approval.
- Adding length to the proposed sign could be problematic as it is already ten (10) feet from the M-59 road right-of-way on one side and three (3) feet from the Cundy Road right-of-way, which is already too close.
- PD states a specific sign with specific dimensions; if approved, any change to the that sign would require an amendment to the PD. Very little room to modify the sign through the staff review process.
- Typically, the signage shown in a PD is the signage approved. In this case, the approval would be for the size and location not for the design.
- Concerned that in the future, Redwood will want or need a sign at the entrance to their property as other developments come along.
- Remove sign easement from the PD. Any signs on Redwood property would fall under the sign ordinance.

The Applicant suggested the proposed sign be moved onto Redwood property, the existing Hartland Glen sign stays. If the owner modifies that sign in the future, would Redwood be allowed to be part of that sign.

Director Langer replied there are two options: amend the PD with a new sign diagram; or when Hartland Glen Golf Course is developed through the PD process, that PD signage could incorporate multi-development Redwood sign.

The Applicant indicated they would like to remove Offsite Sign Easement (Exhibit E), move the monument sign to their property, and work out a future sign with an amendment later.

Director Langer stated the draft language staff proposed no longer applies. A condition should be added regarding the sign.

**The Planning Commission agreed.**

**Offsite Pump Station Easement (Exhibit F)**

Director Langer stated the pump station is for sanitary sewer which requires an easement from Hartland Glen.

Commissioner LaRose suggested another condition be added allowing the easement to be modified, if necessary, following the County Drain Commissioner review.

**The Planning Commission agreed.**

Commissioner LaRose asked if the Easements need to be recorded separately. Director Langer stated they need to be recorded as they provide for all the required access in the event the Hartland Glen Property is sold. The entire PD will be recorded including the Exhibits, so they do not need to each be recorded separately.

**Rezoning of the subject parcel**

Director Langer explained as part of the PD process acts as a rezoning. In this case the current zoning of the subject property is HDR (High Density Residential) and CA (Conservation Agriculture). Once approved the property will be zoned PD (Planned Development) and will remain with the property as the zoning designation.

Director Langer stated the Township Attorney had some technical revisions and the Planning Commission has that information.

The Applicant asked that approval be conditioned subject to the Township Attorney's final approval of the document to allow their attorney to review it again.

**The Planning Commission agreed.**

**Commissioner LaRose offered the following Motion:**

**Move to recommend approval of Site Plan Application #22-003, the Final Planned Development Site Plan for Redwood Living Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The Final Planned Development Site Plan for Redwood Living Planned Development, SP/PD Application #22-003, is subject to the approval of the Township Board.**
- 2. Final approval of the Redwood Planned Development (SP/PD Application #22-003) shall require an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to revise the zoning map and designate the subject property as PD (Planned Development). The subject property, which constitutes the planned development project area (27.14 acres total), and is to be rezoned to PD, is as follows:**
  - a. Tax Parcel ID #4708-26-100-020 (27.14 acres in size); currently zoned HDR (High Density Residential) and CA (Conservation Agriculture).**
- 3. The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department's memorandum, dated March 10, 2022, on the Construction Plan set, subject to an administrative review by Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.**
- 4. The Planned Development Agreement and any easements shall comply with the requirements of the Township Attorney.**
- 5. As part of the Final Plan Review, the applicant, and/or any future owners shall agree to not interfere or object to any future roadway and/or pedestrian connections to the east. Any future ingress-egress easement agreement shall comply with the requirements of the Township Attorney.**
- 6. The applicant shall obtain any permits from the Livingston County Road Commission for any and all improvements to Hartland Glen Lane within the road right-of-way of Cundy Road.**
- 7. Municipal water shall be available for this development. In the event that municipal water is not available for this project, the developer shall re-submit plans to be approved by the Planning Commission and Township Board that provide an acceptable water source.**
- 8. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority, and all other governmental agencies, as applicable.**
- 9. Sign easement Exhibit E shall be removed from the PD Agreement, The PD Agreement will be amended to move the sign onto the Redwood property, The sign shall conform to the Zoning Ordinance and is subject to review and approval by the Planning Department.**
- 10. The off-site pump station easement in Exhibit F shall be modified as needed based on the review by the Livingston County Board of Public Works.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously.**

- 9. Call to the Public:**  
None

**10. Planner Report:**

Director Langer shared the following:

-Hartland Schools Athletic Field Complex.

- Located at Hartland and Dunham Roads.
- Schools are an anomaly as to whether they need to go through a formal review.
- Intent is to share the information with the public.

-Yatooma Oil signage request for two monument signs.

- Most commercial is located on M-59 or Old US 23.
- Ordinance seems to reference only M-59, US 23 or Old US 23.
- Does the punctuation change the meaning?
- Should the Ordinance be interpreted as pertaining to any public road or only those listed.
- Most have two.
- Does the amount of traffic make a difference?
- Should it be clarified in the Ordinance?
- Old US 23 properties have frontage on both sides, US 23 and Old US 23.
- Director Langer summarized the majority interpretation is two monument signs are permitted, and the Ordinance Review Committee may want to review the verbiage in the future to clarify.

-Free-standing solar panels on CA zoned parcels.

- Ordinance refers to accessory structures.
- In CA, accessory structures are permitted in the front, side or rear.
- Is this an additional limitation in the CA zoning district?
- Two cases, in both instances the majority of their property is in the front yard with little space in the rear.
- Zoning Board of Appeals could be instrumental in determining whether they should be allowed in the front or side of CA zoned properties; must prove a practical difficulty.
- Director Langer summarized the majority interpretation was it is an additional limitation in the CA zoning district and solar panels are only allowed in the rear.

-The March 24, 2022 Regular Planning Commission Meeting will be canceled.

**11. Committee Reports:**

**12. Adjournment:**

**A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Murphy and seconded by Commissioner Mayer. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:32 PM.**

Submitted by,



Michelle LaRose  
Planning Commission Secretary