

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

March 18, 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), McMullen (Hartland Township, MI) Mitchell (Hartland Township), Voight (Hartland Township)
Absent – Commissioner Murphy
4. **Approval of the Agenda:**
A Motion to approve the March 18, 2021 Planning Commission Special Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner LaRose. Motion carried unanimously.
5. **Approval of the Minutes:**
 - a. Planning Commission Minutes of February 25, 2021
A Motion to approve the February 25, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes was made by Commissioner Voight and seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously.
6. **Call to Public:**
None
7. **Old and New Business:**
 - a. **Site Plan #21-006 Newberry Place Planned Development (PD) – PD Concept Plan Review**

Chair Fox opened discussion on SP PD #21-006, Newberry Place PD Concept Plan review.

Director Langer outlined the request as well as outlined the process of the project, by highlighting this is the conceptual review, which requires comments from both the Planning Commission and Township Board. The next step would be Preliminary review, which would require a public hearing at the Planning Commission, and a recommendation by the Planning Commission to the Township Board. The Board would make the final decision regarding the Preliminary Review. The last step would be the Final Review, which would involve review of the Planned Development (PD) Agreement and Master Deed documents by both the Planning Commission and Township Board.

Bob Schroeder and David Straub representing the Applicant Mayberry Homes, spoke about the project and outlined the changes to the project from the previous submittal.

Commissioner Grissim indicated she had concerns with the Single-Family district, as it contains attached units, such as the Quad Motor Court units. Typically, those would be considered Multi-Family units.

The Applicant indicated there are two (2) Single-Family districts, one is Single-Family only, and the other is a Single-Family district, which allows single-family homes, as well as attached units, such as the Motor Court units. He indicated they could simply change the name of the district, if preferred.

Commissioner Grissim asked for comments from Director Langer.

Director Langer indicated that staff focuses on the uses that are permitted in each district and would not focus on the title of the district, as much. Director Langer indicated that regardless of the name of the district, the Planning Commission should be comfortable with the proposed uses in that district.

Commissioner Voight indicated he had concerns with the Quad units on the property on the north side of M-59. He did not recall there were Quad Units on that property in the previous submittal.

The Applicant indicated that although the previous conceptual plan did not show Quad units, the district could have allowed them.

Commissioner LaRose questioned if there could be changes in the conceptual plan.

The Applicant indicated the conceptual plan represents how it could be developed, but it could change. However, the proposed conceptual plan also identifies specific amounts of units, as well as maximum square footage of commercial in the various districts. Although there could be changes, he would still be limited to a maximum number of dwelling units in each district as outlined.

Chair Fox indicated that apartments were originally shown on the property on the north side, and residents objected to those apartments on the north side, so the apartment units were moved to the south side, on a 40-acre parcel that is no longer part of this development. Chair Fox indicated some concerns with the mix of different residential. If a Quad unit is constructed and the market changes so they are no longer desirable, will that be okay with just the one Quad unit.

Commissioner LaRose had questions about the mix of residential units, as well.

The Applicant indicated that if the market changed and Single-Family became more popular, he would not be able to get enough units in that district to accommodate all the Residential Equivalency Units (REU) that he has purchased. He will be forced to do a blend of units.

Commissioner McMullen had questions about the access to M-59 and Pleasant Valley Road.

Chair Fox indicated that the access to M-59 is within the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) and Pleasant Valley Road is the jurisdiction of the Livingston County Road Commission. Chair Fox also asked if there were going to be a traffic light at the intersection of M-59 and Pleasant Valley Road.

The Applicant indicated that he is working with MDOT on required improvements to M-59. He is also working with the Livingston County Road Commission on access to both Pleasant Valley Road and Fenton Road.

Commissioner LaRose asked if these items would be figured out by the Preliminary Phase.

The Applicant indicated that he desires to have some flexibility in how this site is developed as the market could change in the next few years.

Commissioner Mitchell raised some concerns with the phasing of the development and wanted to know if they deviate too much from the conceptual plan, what that could mean. Also, concern with Condo units in the middle of a Single-Family residential area. Would this make the Single-Family or Condo units undesirable.

Chair Fox had a question on the Mixed-Use district and if just the apartments were built, what would that look like.

The Applicant discussed that he originally thought about selling this portion off but has decided to try to work with this. He is limited to just 66 apartment units. Typically, an apartment complex management company would not be interested in just a 66-unit development. Also, if he only developed the apartments, he would not be capturing all of the REU's that he has invested in this property. He needs commercial to use the REU's to recapture his investment in this property.

Commissioner Mitchell asked what phase the Mixed Use might be developed.

The Applicant indicated that the Commercial district has already been sold, so that will probably be the first to be developed. The Mixed-Use district develop later when there is interest in the Commercial.

Chair Fox asked if the Commercial district was sold to a gas station operator.

The Applicant indicated that it was.

Commissioner Voight asked if this Mixed Use could be converted to strictly residential.

Chair Fox asked the Planning Commission their thoughts on no Commercial in the Mixed-Use district, or very little Commercial in that district. Chair Fox also indicated that Commercial district should indicate the architectural design elements that were part of the original PD pattern book for the Commercial.

The Applicant indicated that because he has already paid for sewer REU's he needs to recapture those costs, and to lose Commercial would be very difficult. So, he can understand those concerns by the Planning Commission, but does not think it is feasible.

Commissioner Grissim indicated she has concerns with the way the motor courts lay out on the conceptual plan. The access to the front door, via the sidewalk is not clear. There is no sidewalk along the front of some of the units, as shown, so she is not sure how people would access their front doors. Commission Grissim also indicated that three-car garages should be discouraged. Large wide driveways should be prohibited. Preferably a side load garage in the Single-Family developments to eliminate that view of the garage doors.

Chair Fox thanked both Bob Schroeder and David Straub for attending.

8. Call to Public:

None

9. Planner's Report:

None

10. Committee Reports:

None

11. Adjournment:

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Voight and seconded by Commissioner LaRose. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:10 p.m.

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Keith R. Voight". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending from the end.

**Keith Voight,
Planning Commission Secretary**