

**1. Call to Order** - THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN LARRY FOX AT 7:00 PM

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Roll Call**

PRESENT: Joe Colaianne, Thomas Murphy, Larry Fox, Jeff Newsom, Sue Grissim, Michael Mitchell, Keith Voight  
ABSENT:

**4. Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Motion to Approve the Agenda

A Motion to approve the Meeting Agenda was made by Commissioner Newsom and seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

**5. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jun 14, 2018 7:00 PM

A Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of June 14, 2018, was made by Commissioner Voight and seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Keith Voight, Secretary
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Thomas Murphy, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

**6. Call to Public**

Matt Germaine, Bullard Road, Hartland Township, introduced himself and stated he is running for Livingston County Commissioner.

**7. Old and New Business**

a. Site Plan #18-004, Hartland Township Water Treatment Plant Storage Building

Director Langer summarized the location and scope of the request.

- Hartland Township DPW would like to construct a 40 feet by 60 feet building next to the 113-foot tall water tower.
- Needed for storage as the DPW expands its maintenance activities for snow plowing and lawn mowing.

Chair Fox reviewed the staff memorandum.

- No additional parking is required.
- Using the existing landscaping.
- No lighting is planned at this time but if it is added or required, it will meet the ordinance requirements.
- Will comply with any Fire Department requirements.

Commissioner Voight asked about the façade materials. Director Langer stated there have been very few requests for commercial accessory buildings. Generally, the façade materials of an accessory structure are designed to match the principal structure of a complex. We are taking the word of the Department of Public Works that they will do their best in this area.

Commissioner Voight asked if there are any future plans for the structure. Will it always be used for storage? Director Langer stated he cannot list everything that will ever be stored there but they do fill up quickly.

**Commissioner Grissim offered the following Motion.**

**Move to approve Site Plan Application #18-004 a request to amend the previously approved site plan and construct a detached storage building, approximately 2,400 square feet in area, at the Hartland Township Water Treatment Plant, 9751 Highland Road. 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 19, 2018, on the Construction Plan set, subject to an administrative review by the Planning staff prior to the issuance of a land use permit.**
- 2. Applicant complies with any requirements of the Department of Public Works Director and Hartland Deerfield Fire Authority.**

**Seconded by Commissioner Voight.**

Commissioner Grissim asked for clarification on the size of the structure. Director Langer explained one figure included the mezzanine area and the other did not.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Sue Grissim, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Keith Voight, Secretary
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

## **8. Public Hearing**

Chair Fox opened the Public Hearing at 7:15 PM.

Director Langer summarized the following ordinance amendments:

- a. Zoning Amendment #18-001, Automotive Fueling Station Canopy Lighting
  - Lighting standards did not permit adequate lighting under fuel station canopies.
  - Ordinance Review Committee (ORC) convened to discuss this issue.
  - Staff did a study of other fuel stations in the area.
  - Michigan Chapter of the American Planning Association has produced a memo on lighting with some exceptions for slightly higher levels for fuel station canopies.
  - ORC made a recommendation to amend the ordinance from 10 footcandles (fc) to 20 fc.
  - Since that time, an amended version has been distributed with a correction and additional clarifying language added as subsection 2.E and a recommendation to modify language in 2.D from "average" to "a maximum".
  - The intent is to allow fueling stations a little more leeway for lighting under the canopy.

- b. Zoning Amendment #18-002, Automobile Fueling Station Canopy Sign
  - Canopy signs are not specifically identified in the Zoning Ordinance.
  - The ORC examined this at great length as signs can be controversial.
  - They looked at signs, lighting, colors, striping, etc.
  - Also examined hundreds of pictures of other fuel stations throughout the country.
  - Followed the language for wall signs as a template.
  - Draft ordinance identifies canopy signs as a separate sign, made provisions to allow canopy signs, similar to wall signs with certain size limitations, provision for one accent color limited by a certain percentage, added language to address a fuel station with two canopies.
- c. Zoning Amendment #18-003, Amend Expiration of an Approved Site Plan
  - Currently, if a site plan approval expires after one year, the applicant must come back to the Planning Commission for re-approval.
  - The Planning Commission expressed a desire to extend the site plan approval to two years, with an allowance for staff to grant one one-year approval.
- d. Zoning Amendment #18-004, Site Plan Amendment Process
  - Intent is to clarify what is considered a minor amendment and allow those to be handled administratively rather than being required to return to the Planning Commission for re-approval.
  - Minor amendments include such things as lighting, some landscaping, and relocation of parking as long as it complies with the ordinance.
- e. Zoning Amendment #18-005, Amend Performance Bond Reduction Process
  - Bonds for ongoing projects cost developers to renew. The cost is based on the amount of the bond. Currently, a request for bond reduction must go before the Township Board.
  - The Township Board asked if this could be handled administratively by staff.

**Call to the Public:**

None

Chair Fox closed the Public Hearing at 7:25 PM

**a. Zoning Amendment #18-001 Automotive Fueling Station Canopy Lighting**

Director Langer asked the Planning Commission about adding clarifying language to subsection C, D, and E.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the additional language and agreed.

Commissioner Voight offered the following Motion:

**Move to recommend approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment #18-001, as listed below:**

**AUTOMOBILE FUELING STATION CANOPY LIGHTING****Section 5.13 LIGHTING**

- 2. Intensity. For commercial, office, industrial and multiple-family residential:

- A. The level of lighting shall not exceed 0.5 footcandles at any adjacent residential property line or 1.0 footcandles at any adjacent non-residential property line. The light intensity shall be measured at 5 feet above ground level on a vertical plane.
- B. The average footcandles shall be between 2.4 and 3.6 in the main parking area and an average of 5.0 footcandles at the main building entrance and entry/exit drive measured at 5 feet above the ground level on a vertical plane.
- C. **Except as otherwise provided in Section 5.13.2.E.,** the level of lighting shall not exceed 10 footcandles at any location on the site.
- D. **Except as otherwise provided in Section 5.13.2.E.,** for vehicular canopies, the level of lighting shall not exceed an average of 5.0 footcandles. The canopy fixtures shall be installed so that the lens cover is recessed so that the fixture is adequately shielded.
- E. **For automotive fueling station canopies, the level of lighting shall not exceed a maximum of 20 footcandles. The canopy fixtures shall be installed so that the lens cover is recessed so that the fixture is adequately shielded.**

Seconded by Commissioner Newsom.

Commissioner Colaianne suggested adding “with the changes discussed this evening.” The Maker and Seconder agreed. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 8/21/2018 7:00 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Keith Voight, Secretary	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman	
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight	

b. Zoning Amendment #18-002, Automobile Fueling Station Canopy Sign

Chair Fox asked about the 40 square feet maximum size and the size of the Mobile canopy sign. Director Langer stated the formula is one square foot per lineal feet up to a maximum of 40 square feet. Forty is half of the maximum size for the wall signs. If there is not have enough frontage, they could not have a 40 square foot sign on the canopy.

Chair Fox inquired about the panel of logo signs. Director Langer stated a box would be created around the whole thing to determine the size.

Commissioner Mitchell offered the following Motion:

**Move to recommend approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment #18-002, as listed below:**

**AUTOMOTIVE FUELING STATION CANOPY SIGNS PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

**Section 5.26**

- N. **Automotive Fueling Station Canopy Sign:** In addition to the permitted Wall Sign(s) and the permitted Monument Sign(s), Automotive Fueling Stations shall be permitted a Sign affixed to the Canopy over the fuel pumps, if such a canopy exists.
  - 1. A permitted canopy sign(s) shall only be located on the vertical face of the canopy fascia and may be permitted on any side of the canopy fascia. Generally, canopy signs should be located parallel to the road right-of-way of the automobile fueling station.
  - 2. If the automobile fueling station is located on a corner or double frontage lot, a second canopy sign may be permitted, but no more than two (2) canopy signs in total. One sign may be permitted on the canopy’s primary frontage and an additional sign may be permitted on the canopy’s secondary frontage; however, the placement of the signs may be permitted on other canopy fascias, provided no more than one (1) sign is on the same canopy fascia.

3. For automobile fueling stations that are permitted two (2) canopy signs, the second canopy sign shall be permitted, regardless if the property contains a second monument sign.
4. The maximum size of the canopy sign(s) shall be limited to one (1) square foot in sign area for every one (1) lineal foot of canopy frontage, up to a maximum of forty (40) square feet in size. Only one (1) canopy sign shall be permitted on the canopy fascia.
5. The permitted canopy sign shall not project above the vertical face of the canopy.
6. The canopy sign may be illuminated in a similar manner to wall signs and the canopy sign shall be individual letters or logos, similar to wall signs.
7. A logo or panel sign, as part of the permitted canopy sign, shall not exceed ten (10) square feet in area, in combination with the maximum permitted size of the canopy sign. However, the overall size of the canopy sign, which includes the panel sign, shall be limited to either forty (40) square feet or the size determined by the formula of one (1) square foot per lineal foot of frontage; whichever is the more restrictive.
8. All panel signs that are part of a permitted canopy sign, which are within and internally illuminated, shall be constructed with an opaque background and translucent letters and symbols. (Opaque means that material must not transmit light from an internal illumination source.)
9. Any sign placed on the automotive fueling station canopy shall be raised from the fascia of the canopy and shall not be painted or flat against the fascia of the canopy.
10. The automobile fueling station canopy shall comply with Section 5.24.3 of the Zoning Ordinance, which pertains to colors. Except one (1) accent color may be used as a stripe on the canopy. The accent color may not exceed forty percent (40%) of the overall canopy fascia width. The accent color shall not be illuminated or have lights directly emitting light on the canopy.
11. In the event that there are more than one (1) automotive fueling station canopy on the site, the site shall be limited to a maximum of one (1) sign, unless the property is located on a corner or a double frontage lot, a second canopy sign may be permitted, but no more than two (2) canopy signs shall be permitted on the property, regardless of the number of automotive fueling station canopies.

Seconded by Commissioner Murphy. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 8/21/2018 7:00 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Thomas Murphy, Commissioner	
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight	

- c. Zoning Amendment #18-003, Amend Expiration of an Approved Site Plan

Commissioner Colaianne offered the following Motion:

**Move to recommend approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment #18-003, as listed below:**

#### EXPIRATION OF A SITE PLAN

#### Section 6.1.9

9. Expiration of Site Plan Approval. Approval of the site plan is valid for **two (2)** calendar years **from** the date of Township approval of the site plan. If actual physical construction of improvements of a substantial nature as contained in the approved site plan has not commenced and proceeded meaningfully toward completion within that period and if a written request for extension of the approval has not been submitted by the applicant, the approval of the final site plan shall be deemed null and void. The Township may grant **an extension** to the site plan approval where **a** written **request** for an extension is filed with the Zoning Administrator prior to the site plan becoming null and void. The Township may grant an extension in compliance with the following:

- A. If there have been no changes to the Zoning Ordinance that would affect the site plan, **and there are no changes to the approved site plan**, then the Zoning Administrator may grant the extension. The Zoning Administrator may grant **a one year extension** from the date of the original approval by the Township. **If the Site Plan has not commenced and proceed meaningfully toward completion at the conclusion of the original two (2) year approval and after the one (1) year extension, then the site plan must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.**
- B. If there have been changes to the Zoning Ordinance that could affect the site plan, then the request for extension shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission to determine if an amended site plan must be submitted for approval to comply with the new Ordinance amendments.

If any approved site plan has become null and void as set forth herein, no permits for development or use of the subject property shall be issued until all applicable requirements of this Article have been satisfied.

Seconded by Commissioner Newsom.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed how needed and helpful this amendment will be.

Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 8/21/2018 7:00 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Joe Colaianne, Trustee	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman	
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight	

d. Zoning Amendment #18-004, Site Plan Amendment Process

Commissioner Newsom offered the following Motion:

**Move to recommend approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment #18-004, as listed below:**

**SITE PLAN AMENDMENT**

Section 6.1.10.

Modifications to an Approved Site Plan. Administrative review may be conducted by the Zoning Administrator for site plans that involve minor modifications. A minor modification shall constitute the following:

- A. Change to the rights-of-way and public or private easements to accommodated essential services for the proposed developments on adjacent properties.
- B. Change to the site plan to accommodate unforeseen natural or environmental conditions or natural or constructed features, for example, underground water or geological features, existing structures and improvements and items of historical or other significance. **Changes to the site plan may include building and parking lot setbacks as long as the changes still meet the minimum Ordinance requirements and landscaping as long as those changes meet the intent of the approved site plan.**
- C. Change to the drive and/or approach, curb radii, sidewalk width, angle of parking stalls, use of bumper blocks which further enhance vehicular and pedestrian movements and are consistent with the Engineering Design Standards for the Township.
- D. Changes to the location, species and size of specimens or spacing of required trees, shrubs or the type of ground cover to be used as designated on the site plan; **provided that any changes to the landscape plan shall continue to comply with the landscape requirements of this Ordinance.**
- E. Change to the location or size of an accessory structure as determined necessary to address site conditions, **as long as the total square footage, height and setbacks of the accessory structure do not exceed the requirements of the Ordinance.**

- F. Change the proposed color consistent with the hue, saturation and tone approved by the Planning Commission.
- G. **Changes to the number and location of off-street parking spaces, as long as the total number of constructed off-street parking spaces do not exceed the total number approved by the Planning Commission; and also complies with the minimum required by the Ordinance.**
- H. **Changes to the location and the required loading spaces.**
- I. **Changes to the approved lighting plan where the proposed light fixtures still meet the style and intent to the approved plan. Other changes may include location of the light fixtures, replacing existing light fixtures with more efficient style Light Emitting Diode (LED) fixtures; as long as, the proposed light fixture style and location still meet the lighting requirements of this Ordinance (i.e. light levels at the property lines, average lumens, and maximum illumination, etc..) A photometric plan shall be submitted as part of the request to make changes to the approved site plan.**

Seconded by Commissioner Voight. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 8/21/2018 7:00 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Keith Voight, Secretary	
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight	

- e. Zoning Amendment #18-005, Amend Performance Bond Reduction Process

Commissioner Murphy offered the following Motion:

**Move to recommend approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment #18-005, as listed below.**

BOND REDUCTION-RELEASE

Section 6.4.2.D.

- D. The Township Zoning Administrator shall determine the means of releasing portions of the performance guarantee in proportion to the amount of work completed on the covered improvements. The Zoning Administrator shall work with the Township's Engineering Consultant, Public Works Department, and any other department that has an interest in the release of the performance guarantee. All required inspections for improvements for which the performance guarantee is held shall have been completed before any release shall be made.**

Seconded by Commissioner Grissim. Motion carried unanimously.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]</b>	<b>Next: 8/21/2018 7:00 PM</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Thomas Murphy, Commissioner	
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Sue Grissim, Commissioner	
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight	

## 9. Other

- a. Retail Market Analysis

Director Langer summarized the current Future Land Use Map indicating the areas for commercial property. He continued stating:

- Developers have come to the Township asking for permission to develop land designated for commercial use for residential uses stating there is less of a demand for commercial property and greater demand for other uses.
- All have read or heard that stores are closing due to a change in demographics or the way people shop.

- Developers are claiming there is too much commercial; we need more rooftops in the community before it can sustain that amount of commercial.
- The Planning Commission's perspective is maybe the demand is down today but if it is changed to residential and in five or ten years, the demand for commercial sites increases, the commercial option is lost.
- We are trying to shape the community beyond five or ten years; we are trying to shape the community for decades to come. Maybe it needs to be looked at.
- During a joint meeting with the Township Board, an expert spoke on the topic stating that big-box retail is struggling but walkability makes a difference; those commercial developments are thriving if it is done right.
- The Township Board must approve an investigation into the Retail Market.
- Looking at three proposals for a Retail Market Analysis.

Chair Fox stated he thinks having a study done is a good idea as the consequences are permanent. We are not looking to be built out in five years but are building for many decades to come. He supports the concept but selecting one of the proposals is a much more difficult task.

Director Langer stated it was difficult for him to make a recommendation as the company that made the presentation has offered a proposal. There may be some bias there.

Commissioner Grissim stated she had to read them multiple times and look at the deliverables. Retail Coach included not only the study but also a sort of marketing package to give to developers more information to make the community more competitive which is the next step. Since we do not really know what that is, maybe we should find out more about that component.

Commissioner Voight stated we could use the help marketing ourselves to the community; however, just because they offer a package, we still need someone to do the job. Having it may not be enough. The gentleman that came to the meeting and spoke seems to understand Hartland Township and our needs the most. He was here and seemed to have an understanding through viewing the Future Land Use Map and listening to all of our questions. It is still a tough decision. It would be nice to have a marketing package available as part of the study. He cannot believe one company would offer this marketing package while the others would not for the same fee.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed gathering more information about what would be included in the study.

Commissioner Voight stated it was also hard to know if some of the communities were similar in size, growth rate and type to Hartland Township.

Director Langer stated they did list many different communities; however, he is not sure in the presentation given by Mr. Gibbs to the joint meeting of the Township Board and the Planning Commission if those communities were similar to Hartland Township.

Chair Fox concurred they were not similar and asked the Planning Commission how they should move forward.

Commissioner Colaianne stated presentations are costly. Probably any one of the three would do a fine job.

The Planning Commission discussed their options looking at the following:

- Township Board is looking for a recommendation.
- In-State companies vs. Out-of-State companies.
- Cost is a factor.
  - One company is including all of the travel costs.



- Get what you pay for.
- Could staff take a look and provide more information.
- Narrow down to two and have the other come to a Planning Commission meeting.
- Deliverables: what is next?
- Hard to understand how the written proposals apply to Hartland Township.
- Helpful for Master Planning purposes.
- Think of Wixom or Novi and the improvements made there; what would an area like that look like here.
- The Township Board's commitment and support.
- Not ready to make a recommendation at this time.

Director Langer listed the three options and asked which two the Planning Commission is interested in following up with:

- Land Use USA, Laingsburg, Michigan. \$10,000
- Gibbs Planning, Birmingham, Michigan. (presented at the joint meeting) Level II Study \$15,000
- Retail Coach, Tupelo, Mississippi. \$20,000

The Planning Commission indicated interest in the two Michigan companies.

Director Langer stated he would set up a time when both companies could meet with the Planning Commission and each have approximately 30 minutes to give a brief presentation.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>INFORMATIONAL</b>
----------------	----------------------

## 10. Call to Public

None

## 11. Planner's Report

Director Langer reported the following:

- Hartland Plaza LLC request for Site Plan Approval extension. There are no changes to the approved plan and there have been no changes to the ordinance that would affect the site plan. The current language in the ordinance is a little ambiguous as to how that extension can occur. With the Planning Commission's approval, the Director indicated he would like to approve a one-year extension. The Planning Commission concurred.
- The Communications Director contacted Director Langer with the idea to create a webpage with information about the Planning Commission members as there is for the Township Board members. Director Langer will speak with each Planning Commissioner individually in the near future.
- Director Langer shared some data on Land Use Permits and activity in the Township.
- Newberry came in for a meeting regarding water options for the development. There will be a follow up meeting in August. A possible community well and the location was discussed. David Straub will be the new project manager for Mayberry. The Township has been contacted by a potential buyer of the Hartland Glen property for possible development. No plans have been provided at this time.
- Cancellation of the August 9, 2018 meeting.

## 12. Committee Reports

None

**13. Adjournment**

Motion to Adjourn

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Mitchell and seconded by Commissioner Newsom. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:07 PM.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman
<b>AYES:</b>	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight

Submitted by,



Keith Voight  
Planning Commission Secretary