

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
AT THE TOWNSHIP HALL

AUGUST 24, 2006

7:00 PM

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL
4. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 24, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 10, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MINUTES
6. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 10, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
7. CALL TO PUBLIC

THE COMMISSION REQUESTS THAT CALL TO PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS PROCEED TO THE MICROPHONE ON THE FRONT DESK WHEN ADDRESSING THE COMMISSION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL NOT DEBATE OR RESPOND AT THIS TIME.

3-MINUTE TIME LIMIT

PUBLIC HEARING

OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

8. **SET A DATE FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2006**
 APPLICANT: TROWBRIDGE HOMES / BRAD BYARSKI **"PRELIMINARY" SITE PLAN / PLANNED DEVELOPMENT**
APPLICATION #409.P SECTION 32 ZONED CA (CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE) "ECHO WOODS"
 136 UNITS 160 ACRES
9. APPLICANT: ALLIED SIGNS **SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION #572** WALL SIGN SECTION 22
 ZONED GC "SHERWIN-WILLIAMS"
10. APPLICANT: LEO STASSINOPOULOS **SITE PLAN APPLICATION #419** SECTION 22 ZONED GC
 "LEO'S CONEY ISLAND"
11. APPLICANT: M-59 LLC / TERRY NOSAN, MANAGER **"PRELIMINARY" PLANNED DEVELOPMENT / SITE**
PLAN #383 (386) SECTION 23 & 26 ZONING CA MIX USE DEVELOPMENT "NEWBERRY PLACE &
 NEWBERRY WEST"
12. CALL TO PUBLIC
3-MINUTE TIME LIMIT
13. PLANNER'S REPORT
14. COMMITTEE REPORT
15. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETINGS

SEPTEMBER 14, 2006
SEPTEMBER 28, 2006

@7:00 PM
@7:00 PM

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
AUGUST 24, 2006
7:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

- 3. ROLL CALL:** Present: Chairman Fox, Commissioner Voight, Commissioner Crouse, Commissioner Hopkins, Commissioner Newsom and Commissioner Rataj. Absent: Commissioner Hill.

*Also Present: Amy Chesnut & Heather McPhail, McKenna Associates
Denise Lutz, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Mike Bernardin, Fire Marshall
Leslie Sauerbrey, Recording Secretary*

4. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 24, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Move to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Agenda for August 24, 2006.
Motion Hopkins. Second Rataj. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

5. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 10, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MINUTES

Move to approve the August 10, 2006 Planning Commission Work Session Minutes.
Motion Hopkins. Second Crouse. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

6. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 10, 2006 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Move to approve the August 10, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
Motion Hopkins. Second Rataj. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

7. CALL TO PUBLIC - No one came forward.

8. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION #409.P

APPLICANT: TROWBRIDGE HOMES/ BRAD BYARSKI
ECHO WOODS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Move to set a Public Hearing for Preliminary Site Plan Application #409.P, Echo Woods on September 28, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.
Motion Newsom. Second Rataj. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

9. SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION #572

APPLICANT: ALLIED SIGNS
WALL SIGN FOR SHERWIN WILLIAMS

Present: Patrick Stever, Allied Signs Inc. (representing Sherwin Williams)

Commissioner Rataj: Stated he has reviewed the application and has no objections.

Move to approve Sign Permit Application #572 for Allied Signs for a Sherwin Williams wall sign.
Motion Hopkins. Second Rataj. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

10. SITE PLAN APPLICATION #419

APPLICANT: LEO STASSINOPOULOS
LEO'S CONEY ISLAND

Present: Ole Anderson, Johnson & Anderson, Inc.
Bob Zafarana, RMZ Construction Management

Ms. McPhail: Summarized the McKenna letter dated August 16, 2006. The applicant is present to receive guidance from the Planning Commission on three open issues:

- **(1) SETBACKS:**

The applicant would like a modification from the required 80-foot setback to 70-feet because parking is in the rear of the building.

Commissioner Crouse: Can you move the building with parking in the rear to 80-feet from M-59?

Mr. Anderson: Adding the landscape island in the rear parking lot does not allow us to use an 80-foot setback from M-59.

Commissioner Hopkins: Can you reduce the 13'5" dimension of the landscape island to 8-feet and move the building so an approximate 75-foot setback from M-59 is possible?

Mr. Anderson: We would be agreeable to that.

Commissioner Newsom: Can you move the parking lot and the building back?

Mr. Anderson: There is a regulated MDEQ wetland behind the parking lot. We can not move back any further.

Commissioner Crouse: Are the number of parking spaces proposed per the Ordinance?

Ms. Chesnut: Yes.

It was the consensus of the PC that a reduced setback from M-59 to approximately 75-feet is acceptable. This will be accomplished by a reduction in the rear parking lot landscape island to 8-feet. This will result in an increase of approximately 5 1/2-feet in the green space between the front of the building and the service drive.

- **(2) EASEMENT:**

The 50' ingress/egress easement goes through the sidewalk and landscaping in front of the building.

Ms. Chesnut: Asked if and why the applicant needs a 50-foot easement.

Mr. Anderson: The 50-foot easement matches the easement of the neighboring car wash. We will still landscape the easement area including the installation of the sidewalk. He also expressed concerns with getting the legal review of the easement documents completed timely.

Ms. Chesnut: When the building is relocated we will re-evaluate the necessity to reduce the 50-foot easement.

Chairman Fox: We will follow up with the Township Attorney to get the easement agreements reviewed.

It was the consensus of the PC to review the 50-foot easement after the plan is redrawn.

- **(3) LANDSCAPING:**

a. Reviewed the proposed landscaping on the east and west side of the site.

It was the consensus of the PC to accept the east and west landscaping between commercial properties as proposed.

b. Reviewed the proposed landscaping on the southeast side of the site. Comments regarding the screening from the residential properties to the south were discussed.

Mr. Zafarana: The owner would be agreeable to increasing the evergreen trees in the southeast corner to 8-feet in height and add additional shrubs in that area. The landscape architect will make the changes and they will be presented at our meeting for Site Plan Review.

It was the consensus of the PC that the evergreen trees in the southeast corner of the site should be increased to 8-feet in height and the planting of additional shrubs should be included to provide additional screening between this site and the residential area.

Mr. Anderson: Described the underground water detention system being proposed.

Mike Bernardin: The underground storm water management system must support a vehicle weight of at least 22,000 pounds.

Mr. Anderson: Stated it is engineered and rated for HS20 street loading and will meet that requirement.

The applicant will complete the changes discussed this evening and return for a complete Site Plan Review.

11. SITE PLAN APPLICATION #383

APPLICANT: HARTLAND M-59 LCC.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF NEWBERRY PLACE & NEWBERRY WEST PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Present: Terry Nosan, Hartland M-59 LLC. (representing the north, east and west properties)

John Iacoangeli, Beckett & Raeder, Inc.

Deb Cooper, Beckett & Raeder, Inc.

Mark Young, Atwell-Hicks

Mr. Young: Described the storm water system of the project. The storm water from the project flows south into the Huron Watershed. The basins and forebays meet the LCDC standards for basin size and flow rates.

Commissioner Crouse: Requested clarification of the overflow for the detention basins.

Mr. Young: Emergency overflow designed into each basin will direct the water to a safe route where no building or agriculture would be harmed.

Commissioner Crouse: Asked how the silt on the bottom of the basin will affect the water in the future.

Mr. Young: Every basin requires maintenance. A storm water management plan may be required.

Commissioner Voight: Asked about use of the existing culvert underneath M-59 and whether this culvert will be interrupted during construction.

Mr. Young: The culvert is sufficiently large enough to accommodate the flow and he does not expect any interruptions.

Mr. Nosan & Deb Cooper: Explained revisions to the plan after the Planning Commission's comments at the August 10, 2006 meeting:

- a. The boulevard has been redrawn to 110-feet wide with an 8-foot sidewalk and 2½-foot clear space in front of the buildings. The bump-outs for crosswalks are now shown. The plan also includes a 28-foot wide island in the boulevard. These changes will add an additional 5-feet of space behind each of the buildings along the boulevard. This space may be filled as green space.
- b. A break in the landscape island on the main boulevard has been added just before it ends near the park. This will allow vehicles to turn around or enter into the Kroger parking area safely.
- c. The town homes on the north property have been flipped around. This will increase the greenbelt abutting the property near Deer Path Lane. The park width has also been reduced and the community building has been moved to the south side of the park. The berm on the east side of the property is now 30-feet wide and 3-feet in height. It will be planted heavily with dense evergreens to provide additional screening to the residences on Fenton Road.
- d. The alleys are now shown with a 20-foot right-of-way. This will meet the requirements of the Fire Marshall.
- e. All chimneys will be brick. This will be reflected in the updated Pattern Book.

The PC continued the review of the McKenna letter dated August 10, 2006. (Page 4, Discussion Item 2f. – Design Details)

- **ARCHITECTURE (2f. / g.)**

Ms. Chesnut: EIFS should be limited to accent and trim in the commercial and mixed use buildings. Group 1 still allows 25% EIFS

Mr. Nosan: We have looked at using Use Group 1 Architecture Standards in the commercial and mixed use product. We do not want to use all of the materials that are permitted in Use Group 1.

Commissioner Hopkins: Asked for clarification regarding the 2-story buildings.

Mr. Nosan: We are going to change the building height of the 2-story unit. It will be reduced, similar to the 1½-story. We will give it to the architect to be redrawn. Stated windows will be approximately 50% of a front by area and 70% of a front by length in each building. Stated sides of buildings will meet Group 1 excluding the window requirements. We will emphasize the fronts that face streets and/or are visible from M-59.

Chairman Fox: Suggested we see what the architect comes up with using Group 1 because of the 50% windows and minimum 30% brick requirements.

It was the consensus of the PC to let the applicant redraw the commercial and mixed use buildings and the PC will review their proposal after re-submittal.

- **SINGLE FAMILY GARAGES (2h.)**

Ms. Chesnut: Requested the pictures and drawings in the Pattern Book coordinate with one another and be as clear as possible to accurately depict what will be permitted.

Mr. Nosan: The garages on the Village and Cottage lots can be designed to be offset to the rear from the front of the house. The garages will be front or side entry depending on the lot location.

Commissioner Hopkins: Asked if a number of the houses can have a minimum or variety of setbacks.

Mr. Nosan: Stated they will develop a standard to create a variety and it will be spelled out in the Pattern Book.

It was the consensus of the PC to let the applicant redraw the buildings and the PC will review their proposal after re-submittal.

- **TRAVEL LANES, PARKING & SIDEWALKS (2i. / j. / k.)**

These topics were addressed earlier this evening with the presentation of the 110-foot boulevard.

It was the consensus of the PC that the 110-foot boulevard proposal is acceptable at this time. Further review and comment on the boulevard width may occur when the plan is redrawn.

- **WINDOWS ON FIRST FLOOR OF COMMERCIAL & MIXED USE BUILDINGS (2l.)**

This topic was addressed in 2f. and g. above.

- **SIDEWALKS (2m.)**

This topic was addressed in 2i., j. and k. above.

- **BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY (3)**

Ms. Chesnut: Asked what the PC might identify as a public benefit.

Chairman Fox: Improvements that are required for a development should not be considered a public benefit.

Mr. Nosan: Asked about the formality of the identifying the benefits of this development.

Ms. Chesnut: Indicated that because this is a PD a resolution will be used to approve the plan and the benefits should be in one of the findings.

Commissioner Newsom: Some of the amenities within the development should not be considered public benefits.

Commissioner Hopkins: Cautioned crediting the sewer and water contributions as a public benefit. At one point a location for a new fire station was discussed as a public benefit. Perhaps a Township water storage facility should be looked at.

Mr. Nosan: We can redefine the benefits to more accurately reflect what the PC feels are public benefits. Possibly park improvements or storm water management systems above what is required by the LCDC.

Move to set a Work Session for Site Plan Application #383 Newberry Place for September 7, 2006 at 7:00 pm. Motion Newsom. Second Rataj. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

12. CALL TO PUBLIC

John Wasolek, 4440 Fenton Rd.: Stated objections to the Newberry Place development. The development is ruining the country atmosphere. The PC should consider the residents and their desire to maintain the rural atmosphere of the Township.

Katie Schlueter, 1575 Shoreline Dr.: She discussed Leo's proposed development and the wetlands behind it. Saturation of the wetlands is making the yards underwater in the Tri-Lakes subdivision. The wetland needs more breathing room. She also stated that the landscaping should shelter the residents from the development.

Sally Norris, 2105 Fenton Rd.: Asked how the Newberry development is going to impact her home. There is going to be an alley on the north side of her house and asked how close the alley is going to be to her house. She is also concerned with dirt in the air entering her home during construction of the Newberry project.

13. PLANNER'S REPORT - None.

14. COMMITTEE REPORT- None.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Move to adjourn meeting at 9:56 p.m.

Motion Newsom. Second Voight. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 6-0-1.

This is a Draft until Final Approval.

Submitted by,

Leslie M. Sauerbrey
Recording Secretary


Laura J. Hill
Planning Commission Secretary