

# HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

JULY 24, 2025– 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, and Murphy

Absent – None

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

A Motion to approve the July 24, 2025, 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 Regular Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2025.

A Motion to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2025, was made by Commissioner Eckman and seconded by Commissioner McMullen. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Call to the Public:**

None

7. **Old and New Business**

a. Site Plan/PD Application #25-008 – Highland Reserve Planned Development (PD)

Second Amendment to the approved Preliminary PD Site Plan (SP/PD #23-008) and Second Amendment to the Highland Reserve Planned Development Agreement (SP/PD #24-006 Final PD)

Director Langer stated the following:

- Gave an overview of the location and scope of the project.
- East of US 23 near Cundy Road.
- Original approval excluded an approximate two-acre parcel in the northwest corner of the site. The owner intended to develop it as a commercial use separately. Plan was approved with a potential future commercial use at that location.
- Applicant came back for Amendment I which included a redesign of a street to a temporary cul-de-sac due to MDOT issues and a redesign of a stormwater detention area. The adjacent property owners have met and have come to an agreement about the Hartland Glen entry design requirements.
- During that time, it became clear that a future commercial development could have access issues, so the owner worked out an agreement with Highland Reserve to have that portion included in the Highland Reserve PD. They intend to add six additional rental houses at that location, thus Amendment II.

- Two-step process; an amendment to the site plan, which the Planning Commission decides, and an amendment to the Planned Development which the Planning Commission offers a recommendation and the Township Board decides at a future meeting.

The Applicant, Mike West, Green Development Ventures, introduced himself and stated this amendment is about assimilating the northwest corner into Phase 1 of the Planned Development, with six additional rental homes. Everything else is the same. Total number of homes is 108.

Commissioner Grissim stated she is seeing both Preliminary and Final verbiage in the staff report. Director Langer stated both the Preliminary and Final Review have been approved. The Site Plan approval is related to the Preliminary approval, so this is amending the Preliminary Site Plan approval, and the Planned Development amendment is related to the Final Planned Development approval.

Commissioner Grissim asked about the addition of windows on the garage doors. The Applicant stated it was decided during the previous amendment process. The elevation included is an older version. They do intend to include that design modification.

**Commissioner Grissim offered the following Motion:**

**Move to approve Site Plan/PD Application #25-008, a request for a Second Amendment to the approved Preliminary PD Site Plan for Highland Reserve Planned Development, as outlined in the staff memorandum dated July 17, 2025.**

**Approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department's memorandum, dated July 17, 2025, on the Construction Plan Set, subject to an administrative review by Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a land use permit for the project, the applicant shall secure all applicable permits and approvals from the Michigan Department of Transportation.**
- 3. All prior conditions and requirements specified under SP/PD #23-008, SD/PD #24-006, and SD/PD #25-003 shall remain valid.**
- 4. The Second Amendment to the Highland Reserve Planned Development Agreement shall be in a recordable format and shall comply with the requirements of the Township Attorney.**
- 5. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, applicable 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.**

- 6. Applicant shall obtain any necessary approvals and permits from the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE).**

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

**Commissioner Eckman offered the following Motion:**

**Move to recommend approval of the proposed Second Amendment to the Highland Reserve Planned Development Agreement, a request for a Second Amendment to the Highland Reserve Planned Development Agreement, to address the revisions to the approved Preliminary PD Site Plan, as outlined in the staff memorandum dated July 17, 2025.**

- 1. The Planning Commission has determined the proposed Second Amendment summarizes the proposed revisions to the approved site plan, which includes minor revisions to the development layout, changes to the total number of residential units, and changes to the number of rental units.**
- 2. The Planning Commission has determined that the proposed amendment is consistent with the intent of the plans and documents approved under SP/PD #23-008 (Preliminary PD), SP/PD #24-006 (Final PD), and SP/PD #25-003 (Amendment to approved Preliminary PD Site Plan)**
- 3. The proposed Second Amendment document shall be revised to address comments provided by the Township Attorney, as applicable.**

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

- b. Site Plan Application #25-009 - Proposed LOC Credit Union with drive-through service at Shops at Waldenwoods PD**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Gave an overview of the location and scope of the project.
- West of US 23, north side of M-59 near Target.
- Already a Planned Development.
- Proposing a 2,100 square foot bank with drive-through lanes.
- LOC is currently operating from a store front in Fountain Square. Customers desire a drive-through option, owners would like better visibility for their storefront, so they are building a new building with a drive-through.
- Want to stay in the community.
- Here for Site Plan Approval from the Planning Commission.

The Applicant, Stephen Grech, CEO of LOC Credit Union; Wayne Perry, Desine, Inc.; Mike O’Leary, Lindhout Associates Architects; introduced themselves and stated the following:

- LOC Credit Union has been in Hartland for about 18 years.
- Endcap of the Fountain Square Development.

- When they opened years ago, the storefront visibility was better as the old Speedway building was smaller.

The Applicant displayed a sample board and described some of the proposed materials.

#### **SITE PLAN REVIEW**

##### **Off-Street Parking (Sec. 5.8, for Banks, Savings and Loan Offices)**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Based on the size of the building, the Ordinance requires 13 spaces, the Applicant is proposing 11.
- The Planning Commission may reduce the number of spaces based on historical knowledge of the actual number needed for a particular use.

##### **The Planning Commission agreed.**

Director Langer stated the access drive to the north of the site was approved with the original development and he is unclear if the front setback requirement should be applied in this case as there is no public road frontage. If it is considered a private road, it would meet the 20-foot setback requirement. The Planning Commission must determine if it is acceptable.

Commissioner Murphy asked what the address would be. Chair Fox replied Highland Road.

##### **The Planning Commission agreed.**

Commissioner Grissim asked about the geometry of the drive. The Applicant stated historically, the approved PD plans show a potential shared drive on the east side of LOC which is why it is squared off.

##### **Landscaping (Sec. 5.11 – Updated Landscape Ordinance version)**

Commissioner Grissim stated the following:

- Landscape looks great.
- There is a new updated ordinance for landscaping, unsure which was used, the design looks really nice but around the trash enclosure, shrubs are no longer required.
- Stone strip along the east and south sides, typically they are about two feet wide to keep it modest.
- Concerned about the type of plants leading up to the front door, may want to consider something that is more salt tolerant.

##### **Lighting (Sec. 5.13)**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Exceeds footcandle (fc) value allowed at the main building.
- Exceeds fc value under the canopy.
- Should revise drawing of the light pole and base to state the total height of pole and base.

Staff can work all of that out with the Applicant on the construction drawings.

The Applicant requested to have a higher fc under the drive-through canopy for security purposes.

The Planning Commission discussed permitting a higher fc value under the drive-through with the ATM. Chair Fox asked if the Planning Commission would allow the Planning Staff to work with the Applicant to resolve this issue. The Planning Commission agreed.

**Commissioner Mitchell offered the following Motion:**

**Move to approve Site Plan Application #25-009, a request to construct an approximate 2,100 square foot commercial building for LOC Credit Union, with drive-through service, on a vacant parcel, located in the Shops at Waldenwoods Planned Development, (Parcel ID #4708-20-400-017), as outlined in the staff memorandum dated July 17, 2025.**

**Approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department’s memorandum, dated July 17, 2025. Revised plans, if necessary, shall be subject to an administrative review by the Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.**
- 2. A land use permit is required prior to construction.**
- 3. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority, and all other government agencies, as applicable.**
- 4. The applicant shall work with the Planning Department on a revised photometric plan during the construction review.**

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

## **8. Public Hearing**

- a. Site Plan/PD Application #25-012 Urban Air Adventure Park PD Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan.**

**Chair Fox explained the process and opened the Public Hearing at 7:38 PM stating all public notice requirements have been met.**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Gave an overview of the location and scope of the project.
- East of Old US 23, south of M-59, vacant parcels behind Fountain Square.
- Includes a 38,400 square foot building for rock climbing, trampoline, zip line, laser tag, activities mostly geared toward children.
- Applicant proposed to develop this site using the Planned Development process which is a three-step process; a Concept Plan, Preliminary Plan, and Final Plan are all reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Township Board, with the Planning Commission making a recommendation and the Board having final approval at each step. This project is at the Preliminary Plan Review step.

- Final approval is essentially a rezoning to PD Planned Development.

The Applicant, Shannon Easter White, architect and owner of FUNchitecture LLC, and Nate Sumner, owner, introduced themselves.

**Call to the Public**

Lacey Cripe, business owner on Old US 23; had questions about water and sewer, concerns about traffic, timing of construction.

**Chair Fox closed the Public Hearing at 7:49 PM.**

Chair Fox referred to the staff memorandum dated July 17, 2025.

**Eligibility Criteria (Section 3.1.18.B.)**

**The Planning Commission made no comments.**

**Planned Development Design Standards (Section 3.1.18.C.)**

**Building Height**

Chair Fox stated the proposed building height is 36 feet 6 inches, slightly taller than the 35 feet limit. The Applicant has asked for a waiver.

**The Planning Commission granted the waiver.**

**Parking and Loading**

Director Langer stated there is no dedicated loading space shown but many other businesses do not have a dedicated loading space. Typically, trucks do not show up at peak business hours. There is an area near the dumpsters where a truck would logically unload, or they may pull up near the front door at off-peak times.

**The Planning Commission had no issues with this item.**

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

**Sewer and Water**

Chair Fox stated the Applicant is working with the Department of Public Works (DPW) for access to sewer and water.

Director Langer stated he can respond generally as he does not know which facility the commentor represents off Old US 23. He continued stating the following:

- Site will be served with municipal water and sewer.
- Hartland Township does not have its own sewage treatment facility.
- Sanitary sewer ultimately ends up in Genesee County and there are limits to that capacity.
- Hartland has not yet reached that capacity limit.
- DPW needs more information from the applicant regarding REUs as this is not a common use.

- Once there is a determination as to how many REUs for water and REUs for sewer will be required, the Applicant must purchase those prior to construction approval.
- Hartland Brewing Company experienced some issues with Genesee County Drain Commission due to the yeast involved in their brewing process, if that would end up in the sewer system, and how that might affect the sewage treatment process. The yeast issue required special filters to be installed. Resolving this problem took significantly longer than expected.
- Issues of that nature are not anticipated for this project.

### **Stormwater and Drainage**

Chair Fox encouraged the Applicant to communicate with the State of Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) regarding the wetland.

Commissioner Grissim inquired about plans for a fountain in the sediment basin. The Applicant stated they are still waiting on final engineering for the depth but would like to add a fountain if possible.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the issue stating it is up to EGLE to determine what can and cannot occur in an area that overflows into or near a wetland area.

### **Traffic**

Director Langer stated the following:

- Applicant provided information from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) manual.
- Two possible categories as there is not a specific one for Adventure Parks such as this: Land Use Code 435 (Multi-purpose Recreational Facility) and Land Use Code 436 (Trampoline Park).
- Provided PM Peak calculations as this is most likely not a heavy AM Peak use.
- Numbers shown are not significant.
- Applicant's proposal is to primarily use the southern access off Old US 23 through Hartland Town Center.
- The question of traffic cutting through private property is difficult for the Township to address; the Township can only plan for traffic coming and going to the proposed site.
- Applicant needs an easement to connect at the north end and at the southern end through the Hartland Town Center property.
- Any traffic calming devices would need to be added off of this site to address the issue, which is beyond the Township's or the Applicant's purview.
- Layout has been specifically designed for traffic to flow using the southern access.
- The north access is important as it allows better maneuverability for fire trucks as well as a second access.
- Use is primarily for children so the timing would be after school, evenings, and weekends most likely.
- Do not have a good answer for how people drive or what direction they chose to go; the Township has no ability to improve or change anything off of the site.
- There is no information as to when construction will occur for any project; even when there is a timeframe, it seems like those plans are often changed.

Chair Fox stated parking lots are connected by design, it is a big thing in Planning.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed their experiences with traffic at that location.

### **Site Requirements**

#### **Parking Lot / Driveway / Internal Roads Setbacks (Sec. 5.8.3.)**

Director Langer stated the following:

- All parking areas meet the setbacks.
- Parking on the west is a shared parking area; thus, parking setbacks here are not required.
- Applicant intends to improve the west shared parking area with some landscape islands and dumpster enclosures all of which are beyond the boundaries of their property, with the neighboring property owner's permission.

#### **Off-Street Parking (Sec. 5.8.4.H – Parking requirements for this use not listed)**

Director Langer stated the ordinance states 192 spaces are required; the Applicant has provided information from other facilities showing 154 spaces are adequate. They are proposing 161 spaces.

**The Planning Commission made no comments.**

#### **Landscaping (Section 5.11 – Updated Landscape Ordinance version)**

Commissioner Grissim stated the following:

- Appreciates how the Applicant intends to clean up the parking area to the west.
- Foundation plantings.
  - Some elevations show landscaping next to the building, but those items are not shown on the Landscape Plan.
  - With such a large building, the narrow width of the foundation planting area seems dwarfed and not in scale.
  - There is note that states for a building that is greater than 20 feet, longer than 70 feet, the foundation plantings should be a little larger in size to be in scale with the building.
  - Suggested the Applicant work with the Planning Department to ensure the overall look is pleasing.
- Use of stone mulch.
  - A 2-foot-wide stone maintenance strip is permitted along the foundation wall.
  - Proposed width of stone strip is 4 feet.
  - Suggested the use of bark mulch.
- Some mistakes regarding plant counts and incorrect landscape standards are listed but staff will work with the applicant regarding the corrections to the data for the Construction Plan set.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the height of the flagpole. Commissioner Grissim stated it is 40 feet with a flag sized for that height.

#### **Lighting (Sec. 5.13)**

Director Langer mentioned there are areas on the Lighting Plan missing the fc number which can be corrected on the Construction Plan set.



**Architecture / Building Materials (Sec. 5.24)**

Chair Fox stated rather than get into all the details, he asked if the Planning Commission likes the way the building looks.

**The Planning Commission stated they approve the Architecture and Building Materials as proposed.**

Chair Fox stated congratulations, it is very creative. The Applicant did well.

Director Langer stated there are a couple of comments about the height of the flagpole and the size of the proposed flags exceeding the requirements. Chair Fox stated it is a big building; standard size flags and poles would look a little wimpy, and it is a PD.

Commissioner Eckman stated he thinks it will look nice along the freeway. The Applicant confirmed that it is common for their sites.

**The Planning Commission approved the height of the flagpole and size of the flag.**

**Easement Plan**

Director Langer stated easements are typically part of the Final PD review, but the Applicant has shared a draft. The Township will ask the Applicant to incorporate the landscaping with irrigation for the parking lot islands into the easement.

**Signage Packet**

Chair Fox stated their signs are a little different than the Planning Commission is used to seeing, which brings him back to the question do you like how they look?

**The Planning Commission approved the signage package as proposed.**

Director Langer stated a monument sign has been proposed near Old US 23 since the Conceptual review; however, the exact location has not been determined. No information was included for the Preliminary review, so staff has asked the Applicant to provide the monument sign information as part of the Final PD process. The Applicant stated they are in the process of working it out with the property owner.

**Commissioner Eckman offered the following Motion:**

**Move to recommend approval of Site Plan/PD #25-012, the Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan for Urban Air Adventure Park Planned Development, as outlined in the staff memorandum dated July 17, 2025**

**Approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan for Urban Air Adventure Park Planned Development, SP/PD #25-012, is subject to the approval of the Township Board.**
- 2. Waiver request for the planned development project area to be less than 20 acres is approved.**

3. Waiver request for the building height to exceed 35 feet is approved.
4. The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department's memorandum, dated July 17, 2025, on the Construction Plan Set, subject to an administrative review by Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.
5. As part of the Final Plan Review, the applicant shall provide all applicable easement documents. The documents shall be in a recordable format and shall comply with the requirements of the Township Attorney.
6. The two (2) parcels that comprise the project area shall be combined prior to the issuance of a land use permit.
7. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority, and all other government agencies, as applicable.
8. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE), regarding applicable permits and approvals, if necessary.
9. Roof-mounted mechanical units (RTU) should be properly screened or not visible to the Planning Commission's satisfaction, as shown on the Final PD plans.
10. Monument signs shall be shown on the Final PD plans.

Seconded by Commissioner Mayer. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Call to the Public:

None

10. Planner Report:

None

11. Committee Reports:

None

12. Adjournment:

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:25 PM.

Submitted by.



Tom Murphy  
Planning Commission Secretary