

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 11, 2013
7:00 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** *Chairman Fox called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.*
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL AND RECOGNITION OF VISITORS:**
Present: Chairman Fox, Commissioner Hopkins, Commissioner Summerfield, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Newsom and Commissioner Voight. Absent: Commissioner Grissim

Also Present: David Campbell, Township Planning Director
Kim Scherschligt, Township Planner
4. **APPROVAL OF THE MEETING AGENDA:**
Move to approve the April 11, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda. Motion Hopkins. Second Voight. Voice Vote. Motion Carried 6-0-1.
5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**
Move to approve the February 28, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion Voight. Second Newsom. Voice Vote. Motion Carried 6-0-1.
6. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:** *No one came forward.*
7. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

A. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION #511-P RIVER COMMUNITY CHURCH

APPLICANT: MARK FREGO
OWNER: THE RIVER COMMUNITY CHURCH

Planned development preliminary site plan for a 38,750 square foot church on 76.2 undeveloped acres located on the north side of Highland Road (M-59) between Cullen and Hacker Roads (Parcel ID: 4708-19-300-019)

Present: *Brent Lavanway – Boss Engineering*
Dave Richardson – Lindhout Architects
Mark Frego – River Community Church

Chairman Fox: Explained to the public how the public hearing would be conducted.

Open the Public Hearing at 7:04 P.M. for Applicant: Mark Frego and property owner The River Community Church, Parcel ID number 4708-19-300-019. The applicant is proposing to construct a 38,750 square foot church on 76.2 undeveloped acres.

For the record, all Public notice requirements for this Public Hearing have been met.

Director Campbell: Summarized the proposal and outlined his review letter dated April 4, 2013.

Mr. Lavanway: Provided an overview of the site design.

Mr. Richardson: Presented the architectural designs and materials being proposed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Commissioner Hopkins: Explained that the township received a letter from Tinley Smith a resident that could not make it to the meeting this evening but wanted to express her concerns about the architectural design of the building and the traffic flow of the project.

Mr. Meo 1767 Andover Blvd. – Asked the applicant if they were planning to build a school as well as residential on this parcel and wondered if the housing would be open to anyone or if it would be just for River Church members.

Mr. Karwowski 8612 Maria Ct. – His house is located at the end of Maria Ct. adjacent to M-59 and closest to the proposed development. He expressed his concern for the privacy, safety and comfort of his home if the church is allowed to construct so close to his home. The parking lot being only 90 feet from his property line and an access drive possibly being as close as 25 feet has him and his wife considering putting their house up for sale. He asked the Commission members to imagine living 90 feet from Target's parking lot with traffic, bright lights, noise and safety matters, he believes that this is why it was not built next to residential property. Believes that allowing building to go on so close is against what they and others moved out to places like Hartland for. He feels that with there being over 70 acres available that it could be designed to minimize the impact on the neighboring residences.

Ms. Merola 8615 Maria Ct. – Explained that she lives directly across the street from the previous resident and would like to know what the plans for lighting on the site will be. She explained that her house is quite a bit higher than the site for the church and doesn't feel that the landscaping will be able to adequately screen the site. Asked how the Township would insure that the screening material gets planted.

Public Hearing closed at 7:42 P.M.

Chairman Fox: Explained the Commission would follow the format of the Planning Director's review letter to ensure that all issues are addressed.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT:

Commissioner Newsom: After verifying that there is no plan to develop the large open space to the north of the Maria Ct. cul-de-sac in Hartland Estates, stated that he feels the buffering of the homes on the abutting cul-de-sac needs to be increased and the east drive is located way too close.

Commissioner Hopkins: Stated that he agreed that the east driveway is too close to the existing residential and believes the applicant should look at building more of their northern parking so they can move the drive and east parking lot away from their property line.

Chairman Fox: Verified with the applicant that they will be providing an outline of their future uses on the property.

Commissioner Hopkins: Asked if the applicant had looked at just a single drive or restricting movements to one way in and one way out similar to the old High School where they currently hold their services.

Mr. Frego: Stated that he believes that they have done a good job amongst themselves managing their traffic at their current location and will monitor the traffic to see if they need to restrict east bound and west bound traffic to certain drives. He also pointed out that they currently hold their services just a mile down the road so the impact of their traffic is already felt in the community and is just proposed to be moved down the road.

Commissioner Newsom: Pointed out that the major difference between the two sites is that in their current location they have a signaled exit point versus sixty mile an hour traffic.

Director Campbell: Verified that MDOT has been reviewing the proposals from the applicant for impacts, location and spacing of access points and has given their conditional support and the applicant will be seeking a final approval from them when they apply for their driveway permits that would most likely occur after final site plan approval, but stated that there is currently about 600 feet between the two driveways and if the eastern driveway moves he doesn't think MDOT will have a problem until it would get down to the 300 foot range.

Commissioner Newsom: Questioned how the PD Agreement would be structured to address the issues brought up by the Assessor and if it is the role of the Planning Commission to address such issues.

Mr. Lavanway: Outlined the applicant's list of what they feel are the recognizable benefits of the project; Enhanced storm water management and use of low impact design elements, providing a water loop around their building and participating in the township's water study for the area, providing improvements to M-59 and using a passive solar and construction elements to minimize the building's energy consumption.

Commissioner Voight: Stated that he did not see any community benefit identified in the documentation the applicant provided or their statements here tonight. He feels that the things that they have identified are only benefits to the building and the owner and feels they need to do a better job of providing and identifying the community benefits.

Mr. Frego: Mentioned that participating in the water study is a benefit to the community and the problem with the water in that area is not caused by them.

Commissioner Voight: Stated that there is not a problem with the water as it now stands and that anyone developing on that site would need to do the studies with the water system, finds it hard to support their development of this site for their use and it having an exempt status and not seeing any recognizable community benefits.

Commissioner Mitchell: Expressed concern with the timing of their services and only having ½ hour in-between each service might cause a massive traffic backup with cars coming and going at the same time. Stated that he is not sure that the two-drive configuration is the best design for the site.

Director Campbell: Explained that in the meeting with MDOT they were supportive of the two-drive configuration for the site and that the township's Zoning Ordinance also requires two points of access for such a development.

Commissioner Mitchell: Asked that if the site was developed with a one way traffic pattern (one drive in and one drive out) would that be considered two points of access for emergency purposes.

Chairman Fox: Clarified that he believes the emergency responders would use whichever drive they needed to get into the site.

Mr. Lavanway: Explained the traffic patterns and the benefits of the two drive configuration.

Mr. Frego: Explained the arrival and departure patterns that he witnesses on Sundays.

Commissioner Voight: Agreed that the eastern parking lot should be reconfigured to allow the drive to be moved westward and that additional screening should be added to buffer the residential use from this site.

Commissioner Newsom: Stated that he supports that comment as well, he believes the site is way over parked and he would like to see less impervious material.

Chairman Fox: Asked if there might be an opportunity to place the evergreens at the top of the hill on the Hartland Estates property rather than at the bottom of the hill where they won't buffer very well. Also asked if the applicant ever looked at pushing the building to the north where it would be adjacent to the open space of Hartland Estates, then the drives could be relocated easier.

Commissioner Newsom: Asked for clarification on the bio-swales and the drainage system.

Mr. Lavanway: Explained the drainage paths on the site.

Commissioner Newsom: Stated that he supports the use of this type of system. Verified that the applicant would be able to comply with the items mentioned in the review letter such as the infiltration rate and maintenance agreement.

Mr. Lavanway: Answered that they would be able to comply.

Chairman Fox: Asked the Commission if they were alright with the omission of the required curbing in the north parking lot.

It was the consensus of the Commission that this would be acceptable. Also the Commission would like to maintain the 20 foot deep parking spaces.

Chairman Fox: Asked if the parking lot at their current location is adequate for them now.

Mr. Frego: Answered no.

Commissioner Hopkins: Explained that based on the numbers stated in the applicant's impact report, there appears to be an opportunity to eliminate some of the parking spaces being proposed.

Mr. Frego: Explained that it is typical to see a church increase its membership by 25-30 percent when they open a new facility.

Chairman Fox: Explained that the applicant may want to submit a statement on their parking requirements and look to bank some of their desired needs.

Director Campbell: Explained what the applicant is required to submit and the type of light fixtures allowed per the Township's Zoning Ordinance. He also verified that the information submitted by the applicant is with ordinance requirements. Asked the applicant based on their limited use what their plans for lighting the site when not in use.

Mr. Frego: Stated that he assumed they would put them on some sort of timer.

Commissioner Voight: Explained that on the Wal-Mart site they were asked to turn off a portion of their lights during low foot traffic times. He suggested that maybe they should light the exterior of the building and the area close to the building, this would seem to go along with their energy conservation efforts as well.

Commissioner Hopkins: Stated that he agreed with Commissioner Voight, mentioned that at night when he looks in the direction of the commercial area at M-59 and US 23 you can see the sky lit up. Explained that even though we talk about foot candles at the property line being zero the lights reflect off the pavement and light up the sky. Stated he feels that the lights need to be turned off at night.

Director Campbell: Explained some questions that need to be answered regarding the proposed landscape proposal.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that; the berm area along M-59 is acceptable as proposed, the number of plantings being proposed is acceptable and the green space planting within the parking area is acceptable.

Chairman Fox: Explained that he felt that the requirements of 50 percent of the area in each parking lot island be planted and that all landscaped areas are to be irrigated should be met.

Chairman Fox: Asked the applicant to show the Commission the sample materials they brought this evening and explain where they are being used.

Mr. Richardson: Gave an explanation.

Chairman Fox: Explained that he felt that some of the color used on the building needed to be reduced for his liking. He felt that the red should be removed from the building around the roof area and the louvered area on the east side of the building.

Commissioner Hopkins: Stated that he felt the brown from the roof being used in place of the red around the roof would look better than the red and still offer an element of visual interest. Stated that he is not a fan of the use of the blue metal band being planned on the building either. Asked

for clarification on the construction method of the performance area and clarified that his understanding is that the construction method could be used to support a brick face on the exterior.

Mr. Richardson: Verified that it could but it would be quite costly.

Commissioner Hopkins: Stated that generally he feels the building elevations have been improved since the conceptual submittal but feels the north elevation looks quite institutional and in the future you are planning to ask people to buy houses looking at that.

Commissioner Mitchell: Asked for clarification on the wall materials being used.

Commissioner Summerfield: Stated that overall he likes the way the building is laid out other than the comments made tonight about the colors that he is not that opposed to. Feels the plan is much improved from the previous submittal.

Director Campbell: Explained the comments in his review letter regarding a pathway connection.

Chairman Fox: Suggested that maybe as part of this plan the applicant should provide an easement along the east drive that would be used to construct a sidewalk connecting to the future development on the north portion of the property.

Commissioner Hopkins: Stated that he felt there should also be provisions requiring the applicant to put in the M-59 sidewalk if the walks on the adjacent properties are ever built or if the Township implements a walkway plan. Also stated that if the Township ever puts in place a fund to which developers who are deferring their sidewalk installation are placing funds on deposit for the implementation of a path and sidewalk plan it would make sense the applicant be required to contribute.

Director Campbell: Explained the issues pertaining to the water lines being extended to the site.

Commissioner Hopkins: Asked why we would not be requiring the applicant to extend the water main to their property line as was done in Hartland Estates.

Director Campbell: Explained that question would be one best posed to the Public Works Director or the Township's engineer.

Commissioner Newsom: Asked if the water study currently being conducted is including what the demands of the northern portion of the site may be.

Director Campbell: Answered that they are including a number that the applicant provided as a possible build out of the residential portion.

Commissioner Voight: Stated that he shared the concern of why if we have required developers in the past to extend the water main to the property line why are we not requiring this developer.

Chairman Fox: Pointed out to the applicant that they needed to specify the color of their light fixtures and bollards and remove the note regarding asphalt curbs. He also pointed out to them that they needed to be more specific regarding the materials being used to construct their dumpster enclosure including the gate which should be wood, not chain link.

Mr. Lavanway: Stated that they were planning to use the split face material.

Commissioner Hopkins: Mentioned that they might want to look at the enclosure on the Township Hall site where split face was used up part way and then brick product above similar to the construction of the building wall.

It is the consensus of the Planning Commission that the applicant make revisions based on the comments made tonight and resubmit.

8. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC:**

Ms. Merola 8615 Maria Ct.- Stated she understands the applicants desire to use the property to its fullest but feels that the neighboring residents would be best served by the building pushed back to the north, that way it would minimize the impact on the residential.

9. **PLANNER'S REPORT:**

Director Campbell: Introduced Kim Scherschligt, the new part time Planner hired by the Township. Informed the Commission of upcoming issues and items upcoming on the Commission's agenda.

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Commissioner Hopkins: Informed the Commission that one of the issues that the Board will be discussing at their Tuesday special meeting will be the Private Road SAD Policy and how it is impacted by the private road standards included in the Zoning Ordinance.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Move to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 10:24 P.M. Motion Mitchell. Second Newsom. Voice Vote. Motion Carried 6-0-1.

Respectfully submitted by,

Larry J. Hopkins
Hartland Township
Planning Commission Secretary