

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, Keith Voight

ABSENT: Jeff Newsom, Sue Grissim, Michael Mitchell

4. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Commissioner Voight requested to amend the agenda by moving item 8.a. to Public Hearing 7.a. The Maker and Seconder agreed; motion carried unanimously.

Motion to Approve Agenda

Motion to approve the Meeting Agenda was made by Trustee Colaianne and seconded by Commissioner Murphy; Commissioner Voight requested to amend the agenda by moving item 8.a. to Public Hearing 7.a. The Maker and Seconder agreed; motion carried unanimously.

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

5. Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jul 28, 2016 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Keith Voight, Secretary
SECONDER:	Joe Colaianne, Trustee
AYES:	Colaianne, Murphy, Fox, Voight
ABSENT:	Newsom, Grissim, Mitchell

6. Call to Public

None

7. Public Hearing

a. Special Use Permit and Site Plan Application #542, 82nd Airsoft, LLC

Chair Fox described the public hearing process.

Chair Fox opened the Public Hearing at 7:03 PM and briefly introduced the project. He asked Planning Director Troy Langer to give an overview of the request.

Director Langer shared the location of the proposed use on the Zoning Map and mentioned there is an existing gravel pit operation on the property. The applicant, 82nd Airsoft, LLC, is requesting approval for a private Airsoft recreation facility that, at times, would not conflict with the gravel pit operation. The activities would take place on a portion of the site. Director Langer explained the process stating a private recreation facility is only permitted in the CA (Conservation Agriculture) district by Special Use Permit which requires the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation to the Township Board with the Township Board the final decision making entity. The Site Plan is under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. This Public Hearing is for

the Special Use Permit and will also serve as the initial Site Plan Review by the Planning Commission as this is the first time the Planning Commission has seen this project.

The Applicants, Mr. Mike Erisman and his business partner, Mr. Vince Nash, introduced themselves and requested the Planning Commission view a short video to introduce the Airsoft sport to anyone not familiar with the activity.

The Applicant stated the following:

- BBs are biodegradable.
- Safe sport.
- Intend to be strict on the rules.
- There is an existing six or eight-foot fence around three sides of the field with yellow rope marking the remaining forth boundary. Activities will be contained within that area.
- There will be a small “village” with small bunkers or forts for participants to use.
- The average Airsoft BB travels about 175 feet but after 50 feet the velocity drops off, no damage at that low velocity.

When the Applicant concluded their introductory remarks, Chair Fox asked for comments from the Public:

Shannon Wehner, Lone Tree Road, stated the following:

- Reminded her of news footage of the Iraq war.
- This is not something we want in this area.
- There is a soccer field nearby; we don’t want our children to hear these activities.
- Not a type of recreation desired for Hartland.

Chase Koppen, Lone Tree Road, stated the following:

- Concerned about 24 hour operation.

Eric Smith, Lone Tree Road

- Moved to that location for the peace and quiet.
- Concerned about noise and lights at night.

Larry Ciofu, Windmill Lane, stated the following:

- There are wetlands and lowlands on the site: who will be responsible getting MDEQ’s approval for these activities so close to the wetland area?
- Expressed concern about the noise level with potentially 100 people on the site. Sounds carry further at night.
- Concerned about the range of Airsoft weapons; some may travel farther than 175 feet. The possible use of smoke bombs or grenades seen on the website videos are concerning.
- Not concerned with biodegradable BBs but there is a non-biodegradable version that is cheap. Who is going to monitor the materials used and what will be the potential long term environmental effect of the non-biodegradables?

Chair Fox closed the Public Hearing at 7:20 PM

Chair Fox again reiterated the two-fold purpose of the process; the Special Use Permit and the Site Plan Review.

Director Langer explained the Special Use Permit review process, Uses By Right, and Special Land Uses. He continued by reviewing the Special Use Criteria in Section 6.6 of the Hartland Township Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Fox asked Director Langer to continue with the staff’s review of the Recreation Facilities and Commercial Outdoor Recreation Facilities standards.

Director Langer summarized the information for Setbacks stating the project as proposed would initially meet the required 75-foot setback but that the moveable nature of some of the temporary structures creates a potential enforcement concern for the future.

Chair Fox asked how often the structures would be moved and where would they move. The Applicant stated the only buildings that would be moved would be the village. The other structures would not move. They want to be able to adjust the structures to provide a variety of scenarios; have doorways face a different direction and/or move them closer together.

Chair Fox asked if they intend to do any clearing or remove trees. The Applicant replied they intend to keep the area as natural as possible; very little would be done to the field itself. They like the terrain. He stated that is the difference from paintball; this activity will not mess up the environment. They play scenario-type games.

Chair Fox commented the site plan presented is a little different than the Planning Commission is used to seeing. Director Langer stated he has been working with the Applicant for some time on this project and did bring them to the Township office to present an example of the kind of site plan typically provided; unfortunately there is an expense incurred for such things. The Applicant indicated that would have been far too expensive for this type of project. Director Langer continued it is problematic to apply the Ordinance with the information provided in their site plan. Chair Fox stated his willingness to proceed if the Planning Commission agrees. The Planning Commission concurred.

Chair Fox stated additional information recently provided indicated the south driveway as the access for this use. Director Langer stated the northern access would not be available for patrons; only the southern access. Chair Fox asked if the other access points associated with the Hartland Sand and Gravel are gated. The Applicant stated they both have gates.

Director Langer addressed the Impact on Surrounding Properties stating the proposed setback is 75 feet but in doing research found there is equipment with a greater range, up to 500 feet. Staff feels it does not have enough information to determine if the 75-foot setback is adequate.

The Applicant stated that they would be willing to modify the setback in the rear corner abutting the more populated residential area to 100 or 125 feet; that portion of the property will not be utilized often. Also, the topography and vegetation would be a factor in how far the BBs would travel. The Applicant stated all the equipment used on the course is pre-checked for velocity and tagged determining their engagement limit.

Chair Fox asked who is monitoring those factors. The Applicant stated there are two referees on the field shadowing the participants controlling the game at all times. Commissioner Murphy asked about the procedure for checking velocity. The Applicant stated they have a croning station manned by one of the referees. The machine checks the parameters of the Airsoft gun and is tagged with a colored zip tie indicating their minimum engagement distance so the referees can determine if they are participating within the rules of the game. Commissioner Murphy asked for clarification of the check-in process. The Applicant stated the following:

- Check in.
- Sign the waiver.
- Get a colored armband.
- Have their guns checked and tagged via the croning station for velocity.
- All guns are checked prior to game play to ensure they are tagged.

Commissioner Murphy inquired about the distance the projectile would travel. The Applicant stated it depends on the type of gun used and the weight of the BBs. He stated they have been involved with the sport for many years, both professionally and recreationally, and rarely does anyone shoot more than 150 feet. The projectiles can go 175 feet, some go farther, but the velocity really drops off. Commissioner Murphy clarified the distance is not checked. The Applicant stated it would be very difficult to check each participant's range. Chair Fox inquired if the Airsoft guns have a setting that could be dialed down to be less powerful. The Applicant stated that is possible but it would mean modifying the workings of the unit; an adjustment of that sort is not a feature on an Airsoft gun.

Commissioner Murphy asked if other equipment would be used on the course, such as the grenade launchers viewed on the website. The Applicant stated the grenade launchers typically use a Nerf football/dart. Commissioner Murphy asked if the decibel (dB) level for a grenade launcher is similar to the dB level for the guns, 80 dB. The Applicant stated the dB is the same as the guns although 80 dB is on the high side as many Airsoft items are now electric and very quiet, maybe 30 or 40 dB. There is one called the Thunder B which is maybe 120 dB. Commissioner Murphy asked if the dB level is checked on all the weapons. The Applicant stated the gas powered weapons use a standard 12 gram CO2 cartridge and cannot be modified. Chair Fox stated the application has the sound emitted at an approximate level of 80 dB, now it is up to 120 dB and this is within 75 feet of someone's backyard. Trustee Colaianne asked if there was a cumulative effect of many people firing at once. Chair Fox stated it is war-like so it is likely guns are firing everywhere. The Applicant responded that the electric guns are pretty quiet. It is loud but not that loud. What makes this a good area is that there are hills and vegetation that will muffle the sound. Chair Fox stated there is not a lot of residential development there but there is something there and whether it is five people in the area or 500, it is something that the Planning Commission reviews. Chair Fox continued, as Director Langer explained they also look at the Comprehensive Plan which indicates a fairly large residential development proposed across the street; there are things that are there today and more things that will be there tomorrow. We have to be careful and that is why this falls under the Special Use area.

Commissioner Murphy asked if there would be between 25 and 100 participants. The Applicant stated an average would be maybe 80 between a Saturday and a Sunday. Commissioner Murphy asked if that was all at the same time or for that particular day. The Applicant stated it is difficult to say, they have had events where 25 people have shown up and others where 125 people have shown up. Commissioner Murphy said they are trying to get a feel for the constant shooting. The Applicant stated you are not always going to hear shooting. It is not like paintball where you would hear people from both sides of the field coming together. Commissioner Voight reiterated Commissioner Murphy's question asking how many people would be on the course at the same time participating in an event. The Applicant stated maybe 60. Chair Fox asked if there is a limit. The Applicant stated no. Chair Fox said if 100 people showed up, you would let them in; if 20 people showed up, you would let them in; the event would be run no matter what. The Applicant stated pretty much. Chair Fox asked how many events are held in one day; the information he read stated one pays to play all day. The Applicant stated it depends on what scenarios they are running and what the participants want to do. There can be three to four scenarios in one day; they may range from one to two hours.

Chair Fox inquired about the hours of operation on the weekend. The Applicant stated Saturday would be 2:00 PM to 8:00 PM, and Sunday from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM. Commissioner Murphy read from page 4 of the staff report the hours proposed are Saturday 2:00 PM to 10:00 PM, Sunday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM with occasional night games from 5:00 PM to 11:00 PM. Chair Fox expressed concern there would be potentially 60 people running around 75 feet from the residents' back yards at 11:00 PM at night. The Applicant stated that is something they would like to do but it would not be all the time. They currently have night games twice a year. Chair Fox asked if they thought that was fair to the residents who live there. The Applicant replied the noise levels seem to be an issue. He stated there is not constant shooting for eight hours at a time; it is a rare thing to have them going for more than 20 or 30 minutes at a time. They are comparable to a couple of lawn mowers. Chair Fox expressed concern about having to hear a lawn mower for that many hours in a week. Trustee Colaianne stated he too has the right to mow his lawn on a Sunday afternoon or evening but he would not out of respect for his neighbors. It is one thing to have a one-day event, something that is temporary, but this is more than that. The Applicant continued stating one would hear very little noise in this setting with the woods. They have Airsoft fields in the middle of subdivisions; it's not that loud or that big of a deal. Trustee Colaianne asked if the subdivisions were there before the Airsoft fields. The Applicant stated yes. Commissioner Murphy commented if it were there, a homeowner would have a choice to buy or not buy in that area; in this case, there are people living adjacent to the property that do not have that choice because they lived there first.

Commissioner Murphy pointed out this activity would be used seasonally at some point when the foliage that blocks the sound and sight is off the trees. Chair Fox asked for clarification of the months the field would be in use. The Applicant stated from April to October. Commissioner Murphy surmised that if the participants were on the field in the evening at certain times of the year, they would have flashlights of some kind; light travels much farther than 75 feet. Lights and lasers used may shine through adjacent homes and future homes windows and be disturbing. Chair Fox stated it looks rural there but it is not. The Applicant stated it is rural there except

for some of the homes nearby and they have thought about that. Chair Fox disagreed and stated not only are there adjacent existing homes currently in the area, the Comprehensive Plan call for future residential possibilities across the street. Commissioner Voight added just because it looks that there is not a lot there, those people bought 5, 10, 15, 20-acre parcels to put their homes on because they like it quiet where nothing is going on. Besides interrupting those peoples' lives, there is a large residential development proposed at Pleasant Valley and M-59 that will bring in more people in that area that will be impacted by this proposed use. The Planning Commission briefly discussed the proposed site of the aforementioned development in relation to the Airsoft project and the topography between the two locations.

Chair Fox inquired about the proposed lighting and the use of generators. The Applicant stated a few LED lights would be used for night games and only in the registration area. Trustee Colaianne stated Hartland Township does not have lighting in most of the parks to purposefully limit any activities after sundown. The Applicant stated if they cannot do night games it is not that big of a deal; it is something they would like to do but not essential. There are other places they can use. Chair Fox stated that would virtually eliminate any weekday opportunities. The Applicant stated they are only requesting use on the weekends and then approximately every other weekend.

Chair Fox expressed concern about the lack of fencing in the northeast corner of the site, that a yellow nylon rope would be used to cordon off the area rather than a more permanent feature. The Applicant stated it is common to use this type of yellow or red nylon rope to designate the boundaries of game play along with signage. The written rules specify no game play is to occur outside of those marked boundaries. Commissioner Murphy asked about the height of the rope in relation to the ground. The Applicant replied three or four feet for safety purposes. Commissioner Murphy stated during daylight hours, one could probably see that rope but it would be really difficult to see it after dark. He expressed concern if game play were to occur near that 75-foot rope boundary, overshot BBs could end up in the backyard areas of the existing homes.

Chair Fox express concerns with the use at this location; this is not a rural location, it is residential. The Applicant stated the activities would take place more like 125 feet from anything in anyone's backyard. Commissioner Murphy asked if the 80 dB sounds would carry to the backyards of the abutting residents. The Applicant replied during the summer no, you would hear very little if anything. Commissioner Murphy referenced the following special use permit standard E. *Not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to the existing or future neighboring uses, person, property or the public welfare* and stated the noise from the Airsoft field, when it is in use, could be disturbing even if it were not very loud. Chair Fox stated the gravel pit has limited hours of operation for a reason and one of them is the neighbors. This use would take place during the "quiet time" already promised to those neighbors. Seventy-five feet is not very far. Commissioner Murphy stated the gravel pit is 500 feet away but of course the noise from the equipment is greater. Chair Fox stated the Applicant is equating the noise level to lawn mowers and electric drills. The Applicant stated that is one of the reasons he and his family moved to this area, because it is quiet. Commissioner Murphy stated a lot of people came before you and others will come after you, just like we did. If you picture 60 or 80 or 100 electrical drills with people running around shouting, that is different. Chair Fox again stated he is not opposed to the sport but is concerned that this is not the best location for this use. The Applicant offered to increase the setback near the residential area to give more of a buffer zone.

Chair Fox moved on to the proposed Parking Plan. He stated the Planning Commission is not used to seeing a parking area like this one. He expressed concern it is a compacted field created by gravel truck traffic. The Applicant stated the parking is adequate; they originally were estimating parking for 100 vehicles but since most people ride together, they would only need parking for 50 vehicles. Chair Fox asked if there are multiple events in one day. The Applicant stated it is one event; sometimes a few people might come and go, but it is one continuous event. Chair Fox stated a Parking Plan labeled only with the word "parking" is not sufficient. The Applicant stated they have provided a revised Parking Plan and intend to mark the area with orange cones. Chair Fox stated the Planning Commission has to deal with public safety and unless someone is there parking the cars, lining them up, he knows what it will look like and does not understand how 100 cars would get in there. The Applicant reiterated they are asking for parking for 50 cars, the number in the report is a misprint. Commissioner Voight stated we must have access for fire, EMS and police; if someone is not out there organizing the parking, people will park all over. The Applicant stated until people get used to it, they would

have someone out there showing them where and how to park. They would also intend to provide directional signage and cones to assist people in parking.

Commissioner Voight asked about the proposed cars shown on the plan for Village 1. The Applicant said they would be part of the game play as something to hide behind. Commissioner Voight stated according to the Ordinance, inoperable vehicles or junk cars are not allowed. Director Langer concurred stating that unlicensed inoperable vehicles in any other part of the Township are generally deemed a nuisance and a Code Enforcement issue; he is presuming these vehicles would not be operable. Chair Fox asked if the Applicant is required to obtain building permits or any other governmental approvals; if people are going to be climbing around in, out or on these structures, what are the safety considerations. He continued in Livingston County, people are required to get a permit for a deck; have you checked into that process. The Applicant stated that none of the paintball or other facilities they are familiar with had to obtain building permits for building two-by-four, single-story structures. Director Langer stated that if a structure is less than 200 square feet, it may be exempt from a building permit; however, the Applicant has proposed a shipping container as part of the plan and that did trigger some building permit review. After contacting Livingston County Building Department, the Applicant has verbally stated they will not be using a shipping container as part of this project. The Applicant confirmed this and stated they would be using a trailer to store and move materials on and off the site. The Planning Commission briefly discussed building permit regulations.

Trustee Colaianne asked about the waiver each participant signs during registration. The Applicant stated the players are signing a waiver to not hold the company responsible in case of injury while on the property participating in the Airsoft games.

Chair Fox commented the Planning Commission must complete the review of the Special Use Permit before they can move on to the Site Plan Review.

The Applicant stated the following:

- The deployment of the devices is not as loud as one might think.
- Good distance away.
- Berm on the north side of Lone Tree will block some of the sound.
- Less disturbing than a radio.

Chair Fox stated he thinks it would be more irritating than the sound of a radio due to the intermittent nature of the activity. The Applicant offered to demonstrate with his equipment. The Planning Commission declined the offer.

The Applicant stated the following:

- In spite of what is on the application the sound level is not truly 80 dBs.
- Less than a car radio going down the road.

Trustee Colaianne stated the Planning Commission has had to deal with audible nuisance impacts for a drive-through speaker with neighbors 100 feet away. He continued it is not just the deployment of the guns; it is the combination of guns, generator, and people yelling. The Applicant stated they have done this professionally for years and know the noise it puts out. The Planning Commission continued discussing the potential nuisance impacts to neighboring properties and the decibel level of the sport during play.

Chair Fox reminded the Applicant this is a Special Use and the use must match the criteria in order to be approved; if the use does not fit the criteria, then the opportunity to deny the permit is there. If this were a Use By Right, the situation would be different. The Planning Commission is determining if the use is even allowed, let alone if the site plan meets that criteria.

Commissioner Voight gave the following as responses to the special use permit standards:

- A. *Be harmonious and in accordance with the objectives, intent, and purposes of this Ordinance.* The activity is not harmonious to the area. This use does not comply with this standard. It is not just the noise but the extra people, extra cheering and yelling, extra traffic; all of that is not harmonious in his opinion.

- B. *Be compatible with the natural environment and existing and future land uses in the vicinity.* Due to the presence of the BBs, biodegradable or not, this use does not comply with this standard either in his opinion. There was a brief discussion of the type of materials that would be used.

Chair Fox continued and gave the following responses to the special use permit standards:

- C. *Be compatible with the Hartland Township Comprehensive Plan.* Extensive residential use is planned for the future in that area.

Trustee Colaianne stated many say Hartland is a rural community but that is open to debate depending on where one lives in the Township; there are parts that are rural, but there are also parts that are clearly moving in the direction of what Hartland has become, which is a bedroom community. On the weekends many people want to relax and enjoy where they live. Trustee Colaianne continued this is an intense use; if it were in a different location, maybe one of the industrial areas, it would be a better fit, but not at this location. This is not an area where this activity should be taking place, it is not compatible.

The Planning Commission discussed the next step in the process.

Chair Fox stated he does not have a problem with Airsoft as a sport, but he cannot support this use at this location. Commissioner Murphy concurred. Commissioner Voight agreed stating he could not support the activity in that area. Chair Fox stated it does not matter if it is five or 500 people; the Planning Commission is tasked with looking out for the people, present and future. The Applicant asked if they could gain the approval of the five people that live there would that make a difference. Trustee Colaianne re-stated Chair Fox's statement and continued they must decide if this is the right use at this location, if it is compatible with the uses that exist and future neighboring uses. We know it is going to be residential.

Chair Fox outlined the Applicant's options. The Applicant stated he believes the Planning Commission is basing their decision on an unfounded fear of the unknown of the possible noise. Commissioner Murphy stated if it were only the noise, that would be enough for him because that is a nuisance. After a brief discussion the Applicant chose to withdraw their application.

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

8. Old and New Business

- a. Tractor Supply Company Site Plan Application #541-A - Site Plan Amendment to Wal-Mart/Hartland Marketplace Planned Development (PD)

Chair Fox asked Director Langer to summarize the amendment.

Director Langer stated Tractor Supply Company (TSC) is looking to occupy a vacant building in the Hartland Marketplace/Wal-Mart Planned Development. They received Site Plan Approval from the Planning Commission earlier this year. They are now requesting to amend the previously approved site plan specifically to increase the height of the brick screen walls along the sidewalk display areas. There is not a special use component to this process as there was in the previous case. The decorative screen walls were approved to be four feet in height. The applicant is proposing to amend the previously approved site plans and allow for an increase in the height of the screen walls and wing walls. The drawing submitted with the Applicant's request shows a four-foot high brick wall/base topped with four-foot high ornamental fence panel to match the fence design of the Indoor/Outdoor Display Area, located on the west side of the building.

The Applicant, Mr. Stephen Alexander of Symmetry Property Management, stated this was a request from Tractor Supply. They have provided pictures of how the additional screen fence looks on some of the other TSC stores. They are seeking the approval of the Planning Commission for this change.

Chair Fox stated the proposed eight-foot high wall would be very overpowering, take away from the architecture of the building and lose the intent of how an outdoor garden center should appear. Chair Fox provided some photographs of other Tractor Supply Stores in the area for comparison. He stated:

- The Howell store has a 40 inch brick wall with a 23 inch fence for a total of a 63 inch wall.
- The Fenton store has a 44 inch brick wall with a 7 inch fence for a total of a 51 inch wall.
- The Hartland store is proposing a 48 inch brick wall with a 48 inch fence for a total of a 96 inch wall.

Chair Fox stated the height is overkill. The Applicant stated he agreed but that is what their client has requested. There was some talk of equipment planned for this yard area that is higher than previously approved plan and they want it to be properly screened from view.

Chair Fox stated the Howell store picture was taken the day before and nothing was higher than the wall, although there were some items chained to the fence using it as a display rack. The Fenton store had nothing above the wall structure and their total screen wall structure is shorter.

Commissioner Voight stated he is hearing the phrase “outdoor garden center” which was not the intent; it is advertised as an outdoor display area. He continued if we get an eight-foot fortress wall, it will become an outdoor storage area. He stated it will look like a fort. They originally did not want any screen walls at that location so that customers could see their products. Commission Voight continued they agreed to something similar to the Howell and Fenton stores which was a win-win for everyone; they said they would comply, the Planning Commission said it would work for our ordinance and would keep the focus off of the materials being displayed.

Chair Fox offered the option of adding a 12-inch fence to the top of the approved walls which would be close to the Howell stores’ 63 inches. Commissioner Voight stated he would like the pickets to be farther apart than 2 ½ inches. The Planning Commission discussed the limits of the storage in relation to the height of the wall and fence. Chair Fox commented he never sees material stacked out in front of the Howell store. The Applicant stated he imagines corporate is trying to evolve their stores to overcome some problems in the past by modifying the design features in certain areas. He also stated it would have been nice to not have to come back before the Planning Commission because they did a good job the first time but this is something that is done. In the future, maybe this will be part of their initial requests in other locations. Chair Fox referenced one of the photographs to compare the height of the proposed wall and fence.

The Planning Commission:

- Viewed the site plan.
- Discussed the various options.
- Discussed what has been done at the other stores in the area.
- Discussed what is allowed for storage, display and screening combinations.
- General agreement of the undesirable appearance of the eight-foot proposal.

Chair Fox stated he would be willing to support the five-foot wall and fence option which is basically the Howell store format. The Applicant proposed a six-foot combination of wall and fence. Commissioner Murphy suggested making the brick portion of the wall shorter to open up the visual area.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the items displayed hanging on the fence at the Howell store stating such a display would not be allowed at the Hartland store per our Ordinance and the PD agreement. Chair Fox pointed out the size of the outdoor display/storage area is nearly equal to the interior area; with all of that area, they should be able to keep any eight-foot racks behind what has already been approved.

The Applicant stated the following:

- His job is to satisfy their client, get them in the space and hope they stay a long time.
- They are honored and glad to have Tractor Supply occupy their property.
- TSC has asked for this change to possibly address a concern they have had on other sites.

- Requested the Planning Commission consider six feet to aesthetically match the height of the brick wall.

The Planning Commission again discussed the various options and combinations.

The Planning Commission discussed the wording of the motion.

Commissioner Voight offered the following Motion:

Move to approve Site Plan Application #541 with the requirements of the new screening wall be a minimum 40 inches on the brick with a maximum of 48 inches on the brick with a total maximum height of 63 inches including the fence in a similar style to what was shown in their plans using the typical spacing of fence pickets as per their drawing. Seconded by Trustee Colaianne. The motion carried unanimously.

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

9. Call to Public

None

10. Planner's Report

Director Langer briefly mentioned options for the golf outing.

Director Langer stated he has been contacted by The Shops at Walden Woods regarding available signage for the complex. They feel their businesses do not have as much sign accessibility at Walden Woods compared to more recent developments. Modifying the sign provisions would require a modification to the Planned Development (PD). They are hoping to install some tenant signs on either side of a dedicated monument sign identifying the name of the development. Director Langer stated this is all very preliminary. He is looking for comments, not a decision as to whether or not the Planning Commission would entertain amending the PD. They would have to go before the Planning Commission and the Township Board and are interested in knowing the Planning Commission's preliminary thoughts.

Trustee Colaianne stated he does not have a problem with that proposal; in his opinion it is consistent with what the Township wants for signage and what is being done. He stated it does need to be uniform in the way it is presented. Commissioner Voight stated he would be willing to discuss modifying the signage. He commented this complex at the four corners is a gateway to the Township. He has concerns that a blank placard when there is no tenant would not be as appealing; there may be issues getting everyone to agree on the same coloring and lettering with no logos. Trustee Colaianne said he did not state there should not be logos but he would also like to have consistency in the tenant signs.

Commissioner Murphy inquired as to the location of the monument sign. Director Langer stated there is an existing monument sign at that location but it does not have the tenant signage on each side. The PD required this monument sign identify the complex; there are other smaller monument signs for the purpose of identifying the businesses within the complex but this sign was supposed to be dedicated solely to the name of the development. The business owners want to know if they can add some kind of additional signage but it would require an amendment to the PD. Commissioner Murphy stated he is open to that possibility.

The Planning Commission discussed the preliminary drawing. Director Langer restated there is no formal proposal or request at this time. This is just a conceptual plan to see if they are open to amending the PD. If during the review, the Planning Commission wants to see a rendering of the sign with those features, he can relay that information to the potential applicants. Commissioner Murphy expressed concerns about potential driver distraction at the

intersection by adding tenant signs to the monument sign; if the lettering is so small they cannot be easily read, they might as well not have them. The Planning Commission discussed the proposed size of the additional panels.

Trustee Colaianne expressed concerns about treating this as a "gateway" to Hartland; this is the signage for this development and having tenant signs is consistent with what is proposed there. He continued the sign ordinance is fair; it is not overly conservative and not overly liberal. There are many considerations for signage such as location and road frontages. Chair Fox stated he did not hear anyone say it was not a good idea. Trustee Colaianne said he was concerned with the possibility some think is cannot be done and it can.

Chair Fox stated the following:

- He supports this possibility and thinks it is a good idea.
- This proposal is not much different than what was allowed for others in the area such as RAMCO, Meijer's and the Tractor Supply center.
- It is appropriate.
- They have changed the sign ordinance over the years and allowed a little more signage for recent developments.
- Might as well make it a fair playing field.

Commissioner Murphy stated he is in support but commented for future reference when they choose the plan; some signs in Hartland have text so close to the bottom of the sign it becomes covered by the landscaping and is no longer readable.

Commissioner Voight stated those of us who travel north and south on Old 23 spend a lot of time at the light; there is plenty of time to read a sign.

Director Langer moved on to the Strategic Plan Update and stated the following:

- Inherited this document when he came to the Township.
- Has been tasked with examining the Community Development area.
- There are three (3) potential Zoning Ordinance amendments.
- Goal is to decide if these are things the Planning Commission wants to review.
- Looking for feedback from the Commissioners.
- He understands there was discussion of these three items prior to his tenure with the Township.

1. Light Industrial Standards

Chair Fox stated he feels they should review the Light Industrial Architectural Standards and decide if they need to be more, less or unchanged. Director Langer clarified it would be placed on a future agenda with documents to review. Chair Fox stated the Planning Commission needs to decide whether they need to review it. Trustee Colaianne stated it would help to see some examples. Chair Fox stated they typically look at communities they like and investigate what they have done.

Director Langer summarized the Planning Commission is interested in reviewing the standards, would like to see examples of other communities standards and some pictures of Light Industrial-type buildings using that as a template for determining their preferences.

2. Site Plan Review Amendment Process

Director Langer stated Section 6.1.10 outlines how minor site plan revisions can be handled by staff in limited circumstances as follows:

- Changes in Right-of-Way easement area.
- Changes to accommodate unforeseen natural or environmental conditions.
- Changes to the drive/curb-cut access, sidewalks or angle of parking lots.
- Changes to some of the landscaped trees, species, etc.
- Changes to the location of accessory buildings.
- Changes to color, hue or saturation of structures.

Chair Fox stated the Planning Commission infrequently does Site Plan Amendments but feels it should be reviewed as it is not an Ordinance Section the Planning Commission deals with very often. He continued the Director is new to Hartland but not new to planning; he may have some suggestions that have come up during his experience that would be helpful. Trustee Colaianne concurred since Hartland has this resource available.

3. Planned Development (PD) Process

Chair Fox stated the PD process was reviewed not that long ago.

Trustee Colaianne suggested the Planning Commission review the first two now and save the third for later; the first two will take some time to complete but reviewing the PD process could take a lot more time. There are items such as changes in the Sign Ordinance from when the PD was approved that might be something staff could review without having to re-open/amend the PD. Chair Fox agreed; the last time they changed the PD process it was a tremendous amount of work and it is not that out of date.

Commissioner Voight added while they are looking at ordinances, we need to look at canopy lighting; that needs to be changed.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed a missing stop sign on a private commercial road system.

11. Committee Reports

None


12. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn

A motion was made by Commissioner Voight and seconded by Trustee Colaianne. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:16 p.m

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

Submitted by,



Keith Voight
Planning Commission Secretary