

3/24/2005

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP
Dept. of Township Services
3191 Hartland Road
Hartland, MI 48353
(810) 632-7498
FAX (810) 632-6950



Don Rhodes
Supervisor

Joe Colaianne
Trustee

Ann M. Ulrich
Clerk

William Fountain
Trustee

Larry Hopkins
Trustee

Kathleen Horning
Treasurer

Joe Petrucci
Trustee

**ATTENTION
HARTLAND TOWNSHIP RESIDENTS**

**THE HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WILL HOLD A SPECIAL MEETING**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2005
AT 7:30 PM**

**IN THE
HARTLAND TOWNSHIP HALL
3191 HARTLAND ROAD
HARTLAND, MI.**

**APPLICANT: M59 LLC / PREMIER PROPERTY GROUP
"CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN"
WILL BE PRESENTED**

Denise Lutz
Township Deputy Zoning

**HARTLAND TOWNSHIP
HARTLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
AT THE TOWNSHIP HALL
APRIL 7, 2005
7:30 PM**

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL
4. APPROVAL OF APRIL 7, 2005 SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF MARCH 17, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
6. CALL TO PUBLIC **PLEASE APPROACH FRONT CENTER MICROPHONE**

PUBLIC HEARING

OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

7. APPLICANT: M-59 LLC / PREMIER PROPERTY GROUP **"CONCEPTUAL" SITE PLAN #383** SECTION 26
CA (CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE)
8. CALL TO PUBLIC
9. COMMITTEE REPORT
10. ADJOURNMENT

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETINGS APRIL 14, 2005 @ 7:30 PM
APRIL 28, 2005 @ 7:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chairman Fox.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL – Members present: Chairman Fox, Vice Chairman Bickel, Commissioner Rataj, Commissioner Hopkins and Commissioner Newsom. Commissioner Germane arrived at 8:10 p.m. Also present: Amy Neary and Alexis Marcarello of McKenna Associates and Planner Barb.

4. APPROVAL OF APRIL 7, 2005 AGENDA – Move to approve the April 7, 2005 Planning Commission Special Meeting agenda as presented. Motion Newsom. Second Hopkins. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 5-0-2.

5. APPROVAL OF MARCH 17, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – Move to approve the March 17, 2005 Planning Commission minutes as amended. Motion Hopkins. Second Bickel. Voice Vote. Motion Carried. 5-0-2.

In Item #10, before the motion insert “per applicant request to table”.

Pg. 4 item #3a. Add “The removal of 19 spaces would include cutting back the asphalt not just removing the striping.”

Pg. 5 – Item #4 – Remove “or Township Board”.

Pg. 5 Item # 13 – Change date from April 4 to April 7 for the Special Meeting.

6. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Judy Giegler – Pleasant Valley Road – Requested that the Planning Commission require 2 rows of staggered pine trees to screen her property from the development being discussed at this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

7. APPLICANT: M59 LLC / PREMIER PROPERTY GROUP CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN #383 SECTION 26 CA (CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE) – Chairman Fox – The discussion will be on the parcels north and south of M59 on the west side of Pleasant Valley for M59 LLC. The parcel to the west is held by Premier Properties and will be discussion at a later time.

Terry Nosan and Mike Horowitz of M59 LLC were present. Also present: Deb Cooper and Katie Davidson of Becket Rader. There have been long term discussions of this plan.

Ms. Davidson reviewed the wording in the Comprehensive Plan concerning the special planning area and the ordinance wording on planned developments. The surrounding uses were described. Ms. Cooper reviewed the features of the property including wetlands, wooded wetlands and scrub wetlands. Soil borings have been done and construction can be done on the site. There are no dominant drainage patterns and no dominant swales. The density has been calculated with the bonus density included. There will be a mix of various residential styles such as two level town homes, single family homes and 12 unit buildings . They are seeking a gas kiosk near the corner

site of the proposed grocery store. On street parking is planned to minimize the size of the parking lots. MDOT has reviewed the traffic study. Sidewalks are planned throughout.

Ms. Davidson described possible trail access to the Township Park on M59 and even a trail to the Hartland Settlement Area.

Ms. Cooper reviewed the various street cross sections and architectural styles.

M59 LLC discussed their response to a review from McKenna Associates including a second exit on to Pleasant Valley, bringing the Main Street businesses further back into the site, moving the gas kiosk away from the corner, review corner lot sizes, varying the building heights, clustering on the north parcel and buffering.

Ms. Davidson noted their efforts to bring the fronts of the buildings to a pleasant view such as parks and open areas.

The McKenna review of March 17, 2005 suggested more mix in the use. Place the town homes throughout the development and have less segregation of residential styles. The placement is also very linear.

Ms. Neary suggested combining the parcels of M59 LLC and Premier Properties for the purposes of the Planned Development. The sites reviewed as individuals may have difficulty meeting the standards for an outstanding planned development. A special planning area needs to have an outstanding, quality development plan that includes benefits for the Township as a whole. Off site benefits could be considered. A pattern book will be developed. The Planning Commission can request a model at some point to help with visualizing the plan. The M59 parking could be removed or at the least heavily screened. The park is a good feature and the streetscapes are good. The plan should consider square style street endings rather than round cul-de-sacs. The Planning Commission should be very specific in their comments to give detailed direction to the applicant. Stubs could be considered for future connection to the southern property.

Commissioner Bickel – Are water features planned for the M59 corners? Plantings are shown but Mr. Nosan stated that water features could be considered.

Commissioner Newsom – Would like more mix in the uses. 3 entrances to the south of M59 in about a half mile seemed to be a lot. Consider improvements to the M59 boulevard crossovers to access the north parcel entrance.

Commissioner Bickel – Heavy residential to the rear of the south parcel could justify a second Pleasant Valley access point. Mr. Horowitz agreed to consider another Pleasant Valley access point.

The tree preservation is mostly along the edges since there are few trees on the interior of the site.

Mr. Horowitz – An effort was made to hide or screen most of the parking but there must be evidence of activity on the site to bring in more customers for the retail / office business.

Commissioner Rataj would like to see a model that would also be available to the public when the characteristics of the plan are more settled.

Commissioner Hopkins – Could roads have more curves rather than a straight grid pattern? Mr.

Nosan – Went for a more urban character to the streets. Upon a question from Commissioner Hopkins concerning the condition of Pleasant Valley as a dirt road and the additional traffic this development would place on that road, Mr. Horowitz stated that they would not shoulder the cost of improving Pleasant Valley but they would be willing to share in the cost of improvements if others on the road participated.

Chairman Fox – There have been past discussions on a parcel donation for a fire station. Mr.

Horowitz – It was mentioned but not really discussed and is therefore open for discussion. It is planned to do as little grading on the site as possible. On the north parcel, the buildings can be

stepped to accommodate the topography on this site. All units are for sale, rent is not being considered at this time. Commercial is the umbrella term being used for office, retail and neighborhood services. The roads will be private.

Ms. Neary noted that the alleyways should not become roads. Ms. Davidson responded that the alley shown is 16 ft. of pavement while the roads are 31 ft.

Chairman Fox – The M59 boulevard is shown on the plan with plantings. While it looks very nice, if it is not going to happen, it should be removed from the plan. Commissioners Hopkins and Fox were not in favor of the gas kiosk.

Ms Neary calculated the residential density as 5.19 units per acre overall, 9.49 units per acre on the north parcel and 4.48 units per acre on the south parcel.

Commissioner Germane – It would appear that building is being planned for everywhere possible. More open space in the interior of the plan would be good in places other than wetlands. Mr. Horowitz felt that more open space would inhibit pedestrian use.

Ms. Cooper – If the pond shown on the north does not hold water, a clay lining could be considered. Forebays will collect water runoff. It will go forebay to detention to wetlands.

Usable open space on a previous plan was 11% or 9.44 acres. It has not been calculated on the new plan.

Mr. Nosan stated he was aware that any bonus density would have to be earned by the quality of the development and hoped they would be considered.

Commissioner Newsom saw this as an opportunity for additional park space.

Commissioner Bickel would also like to see more of a mix of uses on the site. Ms. Marcarello was not able to get an answer for Commissioner Bickel's question on setbacks from a regulated wetland. They are not sure there is a setback requirement from the DEQ on wetlands. This could be part of the PD discussion. Mr. Nosan suggested preservation easements.

The next steps in the process include the applicant incorporating Commission and consultant comments into the plan, presenting the concept to the Township Board then developing a preliminary site plan.

M59 LLC and Premier Properties have been working together on the design of the development but have remained separate entities. Mr. Giovanetti of Premier stated there would be a seamless connection of the two properties. "Unified ownership" as stated in the PD ordinance has been discussed.

Ms. Neary – A blanket PD with separate owners but the same PD agreement could be a way to go.

Mr. Giovanetti – The pattern books will be the same, the streetscapes will be the same so the PD agreement should be the same. Phasing will be part of the plan for both owners. Mr. Giovanetti is ready to come in for his conceptual meeting portion of the plan.

Commissioner consensus was that this is a much improved version of the plan.

Ms. Neary summarized the discussion items for consideration as:

More open space

Preserve trees and topography as much as possible

Pleasant Valley Road improvements

Public facilities improvement

Gas station removed

M59 landscape improvements

Curved streets

M59 crossover lane improvements

Traffic Study

Add road connection to Pleasant Valley and stubs to the south property
Superior architecture and design
Water feature – keep pond full
Cross sections on M59
Density calculations with additional park space
Evaluate Pleasant Valley and the impact of additional traffic

8. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Mares Hirschert – Share the density between the north and south parcels.

Jan Vogel – The Fenton Road entrance shown is just past the crest of the road. There can be a substantial back up of vehicles waiting to go out on M59 beginning around 5:30 A.M. Also, there are gas stations in both directions on M59 so another one is not needed here.

John Cipolla – Traffic on surrounding roads will be a concern. Is a traffic light being considered? Mr. Nosan responded that their traffic study suggested a light at the intersection will probably be necessary. It was also stated that the single family homes would have basements.

Kim Porath – The Giegler property to the south has large machinery and animals. Requesting a screening buffer to keep people, especially children away from the property. Mr. Nosan and Mr. Horowitz will work with them on this.

9. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Bickel – Natural features committee met. A survey will be available for the community on woodlands, trees and other issues. It will be available at various locations and will be written up in the newspaper and Community Life. Information will be on the web site.

Hopkins – The new date for the Board / Commission joint meeting is Thursday, May 5 at 7:00 p.m.

Fox – Use the agenda in the packet for the next meeting.

By-laws will discussed next week.

The sign ordinance has been distributed. Planner Barb has received no comments on it from the Commission. Waiting for the review comments from the attorney.

Commissioner Hopkins – The format used for changes in the Road Ordinance was much more user friendly than trying to compare two separate documents.

The Private Road Ordinance review letters are back from McKenna and Williams and Works. They will be distributed for Commission review.

10. ADJOURNMENT – Move to adjourn. Motion Hopkins.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

These minutes are a preliminary draft until final approval.

HARTLAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 7, 2005 – TOWNSHIP HALL – 7:30 P.M.

5

Submitted by,

Matt Germane
Planning Commission Secretary

Next meetings – April 14, 2005 @ 7:30 p.m.
April 28, 2005 @ 7:30 p.m.