

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

June 27, 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 June 27, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Eckman. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

a. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of May 23, 2024

A Motion to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of May 23, 2024, was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Call to the Public:**

None

7. **Old and New Business**

a. Site Plan PD Application #24-003 Redwood Living Planned Development (PD) Phase II – Preliminary PD Site Plan (Revised Plans dated June 6, 2024)

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

- Confirmed the location as south of M-59, west of Redwood Phase I
- 130 rental units proposed as a Planned Development (PD).
- Requesting Preliminary PD recommendation for approval tonight.
- Planning Commission did not make a recommendation at the Public Hearing held on April 25, 2024.
- Applicants have revised the plans and are here to answer questions.
- Tonight, the Planning Commission may recommend approval, the Township Board has the power to approve Preliminary and Final PD requests.

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:

- Appreciate Planning Commission's, staff's, and the public comments.
- Have revised and clarified the plan in response to those comments.
- Available to discuss any questions.

Chair Fox referred to the staff review memorandum dated June 20, 2024.

Director Langer explained:

- Widened the area between Building ZZ and Building CC.
- Added a berm and landscaping.
- Added additional off-street parking spaces.
- Modified the emergency access to the south to go all the way to the property line with a sidewalk.
- Added an amenity area with a Little Free Lending Library.
- Revised the Landscape Plan.

Chair Fox directed the Planning Commission to the Engineer's letter and asked if there were any questions or comments on Recognizable Benefits. The Planning Commission had no comments.

Director Langer stated there is a Minimum Yard Setback along the perimeter that scales at seventeen (17) feet; typically, it is forty (40) feet. Also, the Front Yard Setback is twenty-five (25) feet which allows for a larger vehicle to be parked without overhanging the sidewalk area; typically, it is forty (40) feet. These are no changes from the plan presented in April and are consistent with Redwood Phase I.

Commissioner Mitchell asked about the Perimeter Setback, pointing out Redwood owns both properties. Director Langer replied Phase I and Phase II are owned by slightly different entities, thus there are two properties and there is a boundary line.

Commissioner Mayer asked if Buildings CCC, DDD and FFF meet the forty (40) foot setback. Director Langer stated they do.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the twenty-five (25) foot driveways. The Applicant stated in Phase II they are offering some units labeled EX that have an extended garage for larger vehicles, but the twenty-five (25) foot driveways should accommodate those as well. The Planning Commission had no additional comments on Setbacks.

Director Langer stated for Parking and Loading, they have added additional off-street parking spaces but the total number of spaces, including garages and driveways, far exceeds the requirement. The Planning Commission had no comments.

Director Langer referred to the revised Open Space Plan stating the following:

- PD required minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) open space; they have 52.6%.
- PD requires ten percent (10%) be usable open space; modified plan has 27.3%.

Commissioner Murphy asked about the Limits of Disturbance Plan. The Applicant clarified that line shows the area that will be disturbed during construction, the area outside of that line will remain as it is. The Planning Commission had no additional comments regarding the Limits of Disturbance.

Director Langer referred to the Sidewalk Plan stating the following:

- Sidewalk ties in with Phase 1 and to the south for a future connection.

- The concrete for the streets and sidewalks is poured at the same time.
- There is no separation between the street and the sidewalk.
- Sidewalks are on one side of the street only.
- The joint cuts in the sidewalk are tighter than the street so there is a visual difference between the two; this is the same as Phase I and what was proposed in April.

Commissioner Muphy asked if the sidewalks are a different color. The Applicant replied they are and added they now pour the street and sidewalk at different times so that the color for the sidewalks can be incorporated into the concrete rather than only on the top. The Planning Commission had no additional comments regarding Sidewalks.

Commissioner Eckman asked about the Fiscal Impact and if Redwood pays the non-homestead tax rate. The Applicant confirmed they are a commercial entity and will always pay the higher non-homestead tax rate. The Planning Commission had no additional comments regarding Fiscal Impact.

Director Langer stated there was a question about Vehicular Circulation, specifically about the fire truck turning radius. The Applicant has supplied a drawing demonstrating the how a fire truck would maneuver within the development. This plan was sent to the Fire Authority; they had no comments. The Planning Commission had no comments regarding Vehicular Circulation.

Commissioner Grissim stated the following regarding Landscaping:

- In Phase I, with the larger forty (40) foot wide side by side driveway, it is difficult to add the street trees.
- Other places were found to work in the required number of trees in Phase I.
- The submitted plan is getting closer but there is still room for getting closer to the requirements.
- She visited the Phase I site, but the required trees were not yet in.

The Applicant apologized for the miscommunication with their landscape installer explaining the delay, also stating the larger required trees are coming from North Carolina and will be installed accordingly. They also stated their landscaping contractor has seen the plan for Phase II and is aware of the parameters. They would appreciate any suggestions about possible locations for adding in the additional trees.

Regarding Screening, Commissioner Grissim asked if the fencing used for screening could be tan to blend in. The Applicant stated they would make that change.

Commissioner Mayer stated he really likes what is proposed between Building ZZ and Building CCC, the new design makes a huge difference. Commissioner Mitchell added he agrees and also appreciates the additional effort.

Director Langer stated in order to calculate the required Detention/Retention Landscaping, staff needs a top of bank line drawn onto the construction set drawings. It is a simple formula based on lineal feet.

Commissioner Mayer asked to see the Mowing Plan. The Planning Commission had no additional comments regarding Landscaping.

Chair Fox stated the Architecture/Building Materials proposed are the same as Phase I. Director Langer stated the Planning Commission was pretty hard on Redwood in the area of Building Materials for Phase I; it is the Applicant's intent to match those. Chair Fox stated he visited the site and there is a noticeable difference in the Hartland Township Redwood Development; it looks really good. The Applicant agreed. The Planning Commission had no additional comments regarding Architecture/Building Materials.

Director Langer stated the following regarding Off-Site Signage:

- Proposing a sign north of their site, north of Cundy Road, south of M-59.
- Off-site signage is typically not permitted for any commercial business.
- Currently, there is a sign at that location for Hartland Glen Golf Course.
- Redwood would like to install two signs.
 - The temporary sign proposed is twenty-four (24) square feet in area, low to the ground.
 - Does not fit the temporary signage options.
 - Both the existing sign and the temporary sign would be removed once the project is complete.
 - The permanent sign would be a shared monument sign off-site for both Redwood and Hartland Glen Golf Course.

Commissioner Grissim asked about the sign panel construction. The Applicant was unsure but is assuming it will not be lit.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the signage as follows:

- If the sign is lit, there are standards that will be applied through the Sign Permit process.
- Height of the sign was reduced from 10 feet to 7 feet.
- No construction or grading is planned for the sign location.
- Temporary sign will remain until the permanent sign is constructed, possibly next year.
- The Applicant would like the temporary sign as soon as possible.
- Process for changing a panel on a permanent sign should Hartland Glen cease to be in existence and another entity occupy the property. The top of the permanent sign could be removed if needed.
- Many details have not been worked out but will be during the permitting process.

The Applicant asked about the process for obtaining a grading permit to possibly regrade the sign site if needed. The Director explained the process and how that affects stormwater runoff also stating if it began to look like a berm or mound was being created to raise the height of the sign, the current staff would most likely have questions. If it were general grading that did not affect stormwater flow and was within the standards, they would be able to do so. The Planning Commission had no other comments regarding Off-site Signage.

Chair Fox asked about the section titled Other Comments. Director Langer stated those are typographical items he is confident can be corrected on the Construction Plan documents.

Commissioner Grissim offered the following Motion:

Move to recommend approval of Site Plan/PD #24-003, the Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan for Redwood Living Planned Development Phase II, as outlined in the staff memorandum dated June 20, 2024.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan for Redwood Living Planned Development Phase II, SP/PD #24-003, is subject to the approval of the Township Board.**
- 2. Waiver request for the development monument sign to be located off-site is approved.**
- 3. Waiver request for an interim sign to be located off-site is approved.**
- 4. The applicant shall adequately address the outstanding items noted in the Planning Department’s memorandums, dated April 18, 2024, and June 20, 2024, 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 a Planned Development (PD) Agreement that includes any applicable ingress-egress access easements and agreements between all applicable parties. The applicant, and/or any future owners shall agree to not interfere with or object to any future roadway connection to the south. All applicable easements and documentation for the off-site signage shall be submitted with the Final PD submittals. The documents shall be in a recordable format and shall comply with the requirements of the Township Attorney.**
- 6. The applicant shall obtain approval of a land division for the parcel associated with the proposed project.**
- 7. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Township Engineering Consultant, Department of Public Works Director, Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE), and all other government agencies, as applicable.**

Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Call to the Public:

None

9. Planner Report:

Director Langer and the Planning Commission discussed lot coverage limits in the Woods Edge Condominium Development, the challenges of the 20% impervious surface limit that was approved as a condition, applicability of the SR Suburban Residential zoning standards, the difficulty of doing an amendment now, the PDs that have been amended for similar reasons, the errors in calculating lot coverage by previous staff/administrators, attempts to correct those issues moving forward, the

June 27, 2024 – 7:00 PM

interpretive authority of the Planning Commission regarding site plans, the effects on stormwater runoff that drive the standards, and the definition of impervious surface in the zoning ordinance.

The Planning Commission agreed to the SR standards for lot coverage being applied in Woods Edge Condominums.

10. Committee Reports:

None

11. Adjournment

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner McMullen. Motion carried unanimously. The Regular Meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:06 p.m.

Submitted by.



Tom Murphy
Planning Commission Secretary