

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

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

ABSENT: Thomas Murphy

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 Colaianne. Motion carried unanimously.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Jeff Newsom, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Joe Colaianne, Trustee
AYES:	Colaianne, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight
ABSENT:	Murphy

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jan 25, 2018 7:00 PM

A Motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of January 25, 2018 was made by Commissioner Grissim and seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Sue Grissim, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Michael Mitchell, Commissioner
AYES:	Colaianne, Fox, Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell, Voight
ABSENT:	Murphy

6. Call to Public

None

7. Old and New Business

a. Hartland Towne Square Planned Development (PD) Amendment

Director Langer gave an overview of the current development and stated the following:

- The Applicant came to the Site Plan Review (SPR) Committee recently to discuss a change in the northwest 20 acres of the Hartland Towne Square Planned Development (PD).
- Change would include converting commercial area to a residential use which would require amending the PD.
- SPR Committee felt this should be discussed by the Planning Commission and Township Board rather than a Committee, as in a formal concept plan review.
- The Planning Commission is being asked to provide comments regarding this proposed change and advise the Applicant on whether to proceed; and, if they do, what are the major concerns/comments the Planning Commission would have at the next phase.
- Following the Planning Commission's opportunity to comment, the Applicant will proceed to the Township Board for their comments, tentatively scheduled for February 20, 2018.

- Pending those comments, the Applicant will decide whether they should proceed. If they do, they would provide a fairly detailed Preliminary Plan showing exactly how this area might be developed. The Planning Commission would then have to establish all of the residential ordinance requirements that would become part of the PD.
- There is no particular plan but the Applicant is working with the company Redwood Apartment Homes.

Edward Eickhoff, Senior Vice-President of RAMCO Gershenson, owner of the Hartland Towne Square development and the Applicant, introduced himself and stated the following:

- This is a very preliminary conversation about this proposed change.
- It has been challenging to lease this property. When this development was first created before the recession, the world was a lot different: retailers and homebuilders were expanding at a much greater pace. For the last nine years they have struggled.
- Emagine Theatre changed the original Planned Development Agreement as they had previously anticipated having two retail establishments in that location.
- Asked the leasing department to open up their horizons for possible developments. Does not desire industrial projects; would like an office, medical or residential complex.
- Would need to amend the PD to allow for residential and add residential design standards, as there are currently none for residential.
- He is representing RAMCO Gershenson Trust, not Redwood.
- His goal is to see if the Township has an interest in allowing this change to residential, and, if the Township Board agrees, then begin meetings with the Site Plan Review Committee to explore such a residential development.
- Redwood has a variety of communities with different price points and finishes.
- He has shown them the current PD Design Standards with the understanding something similar would need to be negotiated with the Township for residential.
- He explained the colors on the site plan: purple are the portions they are selling, the northwest corner and Outlot 1; pink are the properties where they are collecting rent; green is Emagine Theatre.

Commissioner Newsom asked if they had any interest at all from a hotel chain as that was the original plan for that area.

The Applicant stated there is an area near the theater they are marketing to hotels, but they have not found one yet to enter into a lease or sale; there is still a space allocated for a hotel.

Commissioner Colaianne stated he is curious as to how this proposal could affect Emagine; it was expected their site would be surrounded by commercial uses and restaurants that would support their business and now a more mixed use concept is being proposed. How will this play to the existing businesses and would it remain attractive to restaurants or other commercial uses.

The Applicant stated they still have six out-parcels to develop that could be food uses, so there are plenty of opportunities. The challenge they have is when looking at the density of the intersection, there are not enough people. People are driving seven miles and going to Brighton. This proposal for the 20 acres may have approximately 100 units or more and those are families, people who will go to the restaurants or theater.

Commissioner Colaianne stated he understands, he is wondering how it will affect the overall development. He is concerned there is a movie theater, grocery store, and hotel planned with single family residential proposed to be stuck right in the middle.

The Applicant stated technically it is multi-family, not single-family. The development in Troy has similar uses and most new developments these days are mixed use. He stated retail in the US is changing; the US has 24 square feet of retail per capita, the UK has five and China has 2. Currently only 10% of retail sales occur on the internet and sales are up; but where the sales are down is in brick and mortar stores.

Commissioner Colaianne stated he understands all of those things, he is wondering how it will affect the overall plan and future development of the site aside from the retail.

The Applicant stated what he has tried to consider the way the current development is situated on the site; this proposed residential parcel is almost an entity unto itself. There is still a large chunk of retail. Also, Meijer and Emagine are approving parties and will need to sign off on any change in use.

Commissioner Colaianne stated he would be willing to consider this change for multi-family residential but it would have to be fairly high quality in design, something like the townhomes near downtown Milford. He does not like what he sees at Latson Road. This product is not something he could support.

The Applicant stated he would be selling the land and intends to let the developer work out the design standards with the Township. Some things work out and some things do not.

Commissioner Newsom stated he is not opposed to residential in this development, he thinks it fits but he feels the same as Commissioner Colaianne. He also does not like what is at Latson Road and what is proposed in the examples in the packet. The Township has had some opportunities for multi-family developments that did not come to fruition; this seems like a perfect opportunity for that. It is buffered on all sides, it is a high density development, and he cannot see any reason why something like this would not fit here.

Commissioner Mitchell asked if Redwood builds multi-level residential developments.

The Applicant stated he does not believe they do but could not be certain. Most of the communities they have built are the single-family ranch style with attached garage type developments.

Commissioner Grissim stated she concurs with what the other commissioners have stated.

Commissioner Voight stated the following:

- The Applicant initially stated it is difficult to establish retail but it seems other areas around Hartland have growing retail and commercial developments.
- Maybe the reason people go to Brighton is because there is nothing here for them. Which is first? The chicken or the egg? Maybe they need a reason to stop.
- Residential is already happening in the area.
- Disappointed this project has not developed as quickly as hoped. Other areas seem to be growing. All we have seen in the last 6 to 12 months is Emagine and Culvers.
- There are many businesses expanding in other areas that people in Hartland would enjoy. When approved the community had hopes for a new family restaurant but that is not the case.
- People will be concerned that we are giving up potential commercial space for residential. Hard to justify making this change.
- As the other Commissioners have said, the only way residential will occur at this location is if it is the right development. The Planning Commission will work with the developer to make sure the standards

are high, but because it will be part of the PD, we are going to want higher design standards in the Pattern Book to drive developers into producing a residential proposal that is above and beyond a typical MDR development.

Chair Fox stated if a residential component were to be added in this area, it would be in that corner. His concern would be what is it going to be; that will come in the next step. He would add that as this property is being marketed to Redwood, they should be made to understand in advance their standard program is not going to work here in Hartland. The worst thing to happen would be following the sale, they come in to amend the PD, and the project is not acceptable. I am hearing from the Planning Commission that with the right development, we can work with it. Redwood needs to know the right development is not what has been seen so far; they are going to have to up their game. Design standards have not been discussed but that is his opinion.

The Applicant stated he is no stranger to Hartland Township and has acknowledged up front that he has a fiduciary responsibility to bring all opportunities to the table, some work and some do not. He does not have much experience with this developer but at this time, this is the only interested party he has, which does not mean another will not come along. They may surprise us or they may not. He appreciates the feedback and will relay what has been said. The main purpose tonight is so he knows how much time and energy to invest in trying to figure this out.

Chair Fox stated he agrees an amendment to the PD would be the appropriate way to go; there is no need to pull it apart and have another. Just modify what we already have to accommodate this change should you decide to pursue it.

Commissioner Newsom stated the rent ranges in the proposed Redwood plan are similar to the multi-level options, \$1100 to \$1900, and there could be more units. He is not opposed to that.

Director Langer stated Commissioner Murphy sent him some of his thoughts via email. Commissioner Murphy stated the PD was originally planned as a mix of commercial and he could not support a change in this area to residential use.

The Applicant stated he appreciated the feedback.

RESULT:	INFORMATIONAL
----------------	----------------------

8. Call to Public

None

9. Planner's Report

Director Langer stated he received the Rose Township Master Plan update. He has forwarded a link to their website where the update is posted.

Director Langer stated he will be attending a meeting with Hartland Schools next Wednesday for a discussion of new developments and the number of Land Use Permits for some of subdivisions.

Director Langer stated he has been asked to arrange a time for a joint meeting with the Township Board in March. The Board cannot meet on a Thursday this year as they have done in the past. He asked for the Planning Commission's comments.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the options. The general consensus was either March 13 or March 27.

10. Committee Reports

None

11. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn

A Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Newsom and seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:33 PM.

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

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary