

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
February 6, 2024

Chairman Randy Kortering called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

Present: Chairman Randy Kortering, Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members, Leo Barajas, Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Evan Sharp and Russ TeSlaa. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

Absent: None.

Public Comment: None.

Minutes:

** It was moved by TeSlaa and supported by Becker to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of January 2, 2024. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Abstain – 1. Motion carried.

Public Hearings:

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Preliminary Plan for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) request by Jean Ramirez of The Shops at Westshore on behalf of Greg Erne of Westshore Mall Investors, LLC. Said lands are located at 12331 James St. & 0 (vacant) James St., described more specifically as Parcel Numbers 70-16-16-451-001, 70-16-16-400-051 & -70-16-16-400-052. The proposed development consists of a mix of commercial and residential uses including 186 total residential units (multi-family, townhome attached single-family, and live-work units), open space areas, and Eco-Park.

Present for this request was Greg Erne of Westshore Mall Investors, LLC. of 12331 James St., Holland, 49424 along with Har Ye Kan of HYK Consulting LLC. of 36 W. 8th St., Suite 213, Holland, 49423 and Nick Rolinski of Broad Street Studio, Inc. of 11150 James St, Zeeland, 49464.

Mr. Erne said that he purchased the property in 2012 and since that time has converted it to mixed use with an outdoor focus, added new tenants and is now expanding onto adjacent vacant land. He noted that in 2021 a previous Preliminary PUD was approved by the Commission. Since then, some things have changed; they sold a piece of the land to be developed into a nursing home facility, the building next to Hobby Lobby is now being developed for the Ottawa area intermediate school district (OAISD), they added Grand Rapids Community College (GRCC) as a tenant, and the new Holland Charter Township Community Center is currently underway in the old Younkers suite. Mr. Erne stated that because of these changes, as well as the unit count changing, they have submitted a new PUD request.

Ms. Kan explained the commercial and residential plans that are included in this PUD plan. She said the commercial changes would include two (2) new drive thru commercial buildings. One

would be located near the south-west end of the property (closest to Mattress Firm and On the Border) and the second would be located at the north west side of property (across the parking lot from Burlington Coat Factory). In the first building, they are looking to open a coffee shop with a drive thru that can accommodate at least 10 stacking spaces. They feel that this would be a good addition to the GRCC campus located at that end of the property. The second drive thru at the north end would have 11 stacking spaces. The addition of these buildings would help to direct the flow of traffic around the property. Ms. Kan also noted one other commercial building that would be built to the north of the new Community Center. She noted that there are several ideas for this space such as a day care, meeting space(s), offices, dining, etc.

Ms. Kan then provided details regarding the residential developments on the property. She said that this new plan is similar to the 2021 PUD. They did add a third bank of townhomes on the southern portion along the Eco-Park. Ms. Kan noted that they also added 19 townhomes south of the OAISD building to the plan. These townhomes would front the streets with a central green space in the middle. She stated that they are proposing 44 parking spaces. Ms. Kan noted that this plan utilized suburban redevelopment strategies for infill. She also noted that the longer "L" shaped building was lengthened. Ms. Kan said that the proposed total number of housing units has been decreased from 280 to 186.

Ms. Kan talked about the aesthetic of the property. She said that the Eco-Park area will beautify the area as a whole. Ms. Kan stated that they envision some buildings using the maximum height of 60 feet, similar to what the R-3 zoning district would allow. The majority of the housing will be along the Eco-Park for privacy and a calm atmosphere. She noted that the townhomes by the OAISD will be 3-stories.

Ms. Kan talked about how they are trying to create a truly walkable environment. She said to get to the live-work buildings it is a 2-minute walk from the main parking lot.

Mr. Kortering asked if they are considering installing EV charging stations. Ms. Kan said that they are in conversations with EV charging companies.

Ms. Huesman asked for clarification on what a live-work building is. Ms. Kan explained that this would be a building that would be split with a store/office front on the first level with the owner then living in the space above.

Mr. Kortering noted that they are requesting that they follow the R-2A zoning requirements for minimum dwelling unit sizes, but he is wondering if it would be better for them to ask to follow the R-3 zoning requirements. He stated that doing this would mean less deviations from code.

Mr. Sharp asked if they have considered the impacts on the residents living in the midst of a busy common space. Ms. Kan said that they are looking to create a community similar to a down town area where there are activities day and night with residential mixed in.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked how many units will be owner occupied versus rental units. Mr. Erne answered that they are proposing 186 total units with the potential for 25-45 units being for-sale units. He did note that this would be dependent on demand but that they will be set up to be sold. Mr. Erne said he is not sure at this time if the townhomes by the OAISD will be owner occupied or rentals. Mr. Kortering stated that he would like to see that number stay closer to 45 units.

Mr. Kortering clarified that the applicant is asking for a height exemption, and an exemption in the mixed use for stand alone residential. Ms. Kan noted that they would not technically be stand along residential buildings as they will have common rooms that would be available for event space rentals. Mr. Erne noted that the 19 townhomes are all residential with some of the units having parking underneath.

Ms. Kan said that they would like the Commission to have a broader vision of what mixed use looks like. She said that looking at mixed use strictly as multilevel is very restrictive.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if they will be connecting to 120th via Union Street. Ms. Kan said that they need to be very sensitive to the Children's Advocacy Center. Mr. Erne also noted that they do not own the property where the road would connect so they do not have control over connecting to Union Street. He did say that they too would like to see it connected and, therefore, will leave that area of the property open for possible future connectivity.

Mr. Kortering asked if they are asking for the PUD to cover all 3 phases. Mr. Erne answered that they are asking for the full PUD covering all 3 phases. He noted that Phase 1 is already mostly completed. Phase 2 would be the development of the townhomes by OAISD which is planned to move forward quickly. Mr. Erne noted that Phase 3 could take a bit longer since there is quite a bit more development and planning that will need to go into that part of the PUD.

Staff told the applicant that they did a wonderful job with the presentation of the project. Staff also clarified for the Commissioners what the applicant is asking for. They are asking for a 60' height on buildings and agree that changing to R-3 specifications for multi-family floor areas would be a very good change. The Commissioners will want to consider the first-floor residential possibility as this is a deviation from the C-2 zoning.

Ms. Kan addressed lot requirements and whether this will be a single lot is yet to be determined but they appreciate Staff's suggestion as this would eliminate lots without proper frontage, reduce non-conformities and would eliminate conflicts. They will take that into account moving forward. She also stated that she likes the idea of changing from R-2A to R-3 zoning requirements for dwelling unit sizes. She noted that for building height they would like to use a step-back approach verses a set-back approach to reduce massing and provide vertical relief for natural widening and increase views.

Ms. Kan addressed storage requirements for the dwelling units. She said they plan to exceed Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) minimums. Ms. Kan next talked about private streets/driveways. She stated that they will maintain the 26' wide roadways and remove all speed bumps per the Fire Chiefs request. She also stated that they plan to convert the 3-lane road from a 2-lane one direction and 1-lane the other to 1-lane in each direction with a center turn lane. Ms. Kan noted that they will provide building plans, elevation plans, landscaping plans, a survey, utility plans, lighting plan, and signage plan at the final PUD application.

Ms. Kan next addressed parking. She said that there was a question as to why the 75-spaces located at On the Border were not included in the parking calculations. Ms. Kan stated that this parcel was sold so they can no longer count those spaces in their calculations. Staff noted that the parking calculations for residential spaces are below the requirements, and wondered how they plan to remedy this.

Staff stated that the requested uses of Bed & Breakfasts and Housing – Independent, Assisted, Convalescent and Nursing are not permitted uses in the underlying C-2 Zoning District and, therefore, could not be permitted uses for this PUD. Ms. Kan agreed to remove Bed & Breakfasts but requested that they keep senior housing. She clarified that they would like to offer housing for 55+ but they are not looking to provide convalescent, nursing, or assisted living care. She referenced what Rest Haven has built in the City of Holland on the corner of 9th and River Ave. Ms. Kan also pointed out that with the walkability and Eco-Park this provides aging-in-place and active living for the 55+ community.

Mr. Kortering asked if they have plans for a daycare. Mr. Erne said they would love to have a daycare facility and are in talks with organizations to put one there.

Mr. Kortering asked if they have an architectural plan for cohesiveness in the development. Ms. Kan said they do have an architectural plan that makes the whole PUD look cohesive.

Chairman Kortering opened the meeting up for public comments.

There was no one present to speak to this request.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. VanderMeulen said that he likes the idea of adding things that are geared toward the aging population. He likes the addition of the Community Center and the walkability of the development as a whole but is concerned about parking being so far away from the dwelling units along the east side of the development with older residents.

Mr. Sharp said that he has no problem with the height exemption and he is also comfortable with stand-alone dwelling units.

Mr. Barajas said he too is good with the height exemption and likes the step-backs. He also is good with the dwelling units being on the first floor in the mixed-use area.

Mr. TeSlaa stated that he is good with the plan as presented. He said the size of the development is huge and understands that we will need to make accommodations to make it work.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if they plan to make this into one parcel. He noted that there are advantages and disadvantages to doing so. Mr. VanderMeulen is not in favor of deferred parking being so far way from the residential area.

Mr. Becker stated that he loves the turn-around the property has made in the last 10 years and is looking forward to seeing what happens in the next 10 years. He noted that he is good with the height deviation with the step-backs.

Ms. Huesman said that she likes all of it with the interesting mix of different uses. Ms. Huesman said that she likes how she can see her mother-in-law living here as well as her young adult child living there.

Staff went over a few items needing further discussion.

1. 60' height deviation.
2. Changing from R-2A standards on dwelling unit sizes to R-3 is a good idea but will need clarification on storage.
3. The nursing home issue, which is not allowed with a commercial use in this PUD.
4. 120th Ave. access easement – is there a plan for this?
5. Lot combining – will they be combining any of the lots? There may be an option to leave the Eco-Park as its own parcel.
6. Main floor and upper floor setbacks due to the lack of a survey.
7. Parking on the southern property line needs to be resolved.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff if they can approve with the notation that deviations of setbacks need to be clarified at final as well as any combination of lots. Staff indicated that would be fine.

Ms. Kan clarified that they are asking for a setback of 0'. She noted that this is because of the townhomes that front the Eco-Park and the pedestrian promenade that are designed to be right on the promenade. Ms. Kan did say that the other residential buildings would have larger setbacks. Mr. Kortering said it is hard to approve that without a professional survey. Ms. Kan clarified that the maps show setbacks, etc. She stated that this could be a condition of approval to include those calculations/distances in the final PUD packet.

Mr. Rolinski pointed out that the townhomes and the mixed-use buildings are behaving as if they are a front yard to the Promenade.

Ms. Kan noted that they are not planning a skilled nursing facility but rather would like to offer senior housing (55+). Staff indicated zoning will not control age, but reiterated the Housing – Independent, Assisted, Convalescent and Nursing use would not be permitted.

Staff clarified that setbacks and easements do not need to be nailed down today as they are a work in progress. Staff did note that they will need to see a survey before committing to setback deviations. Staff also noted that the Fire Chief will want to see an easement from James Street to Felch Street. Mr. Sharp asked Staff if they can do different setbacks for different buildings? Staff answered that they can propose them.

Mr. Kortering went through Section 16.1.C to determine whether the proposed PUD meets the intent and purpose of Article 16. The purpose of the PUD process is to provide a design option to allow for one (1) or more of the following.

1. Innovative land development in terms of variety, design, layout, and type of structures constructed;
2. Efficient use of land to facilitate a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use, and utilities;
3. Adaptive re-use of significant or historic buildings;
4. Mixed use development projects and/or mixed-use buildings;
5. Preservation and protection of significant natural features, open space, and cultural/historic resources;
6. Promote efficient provision of public services and utilities;
7. Minimal adverse traffic impacts and accommodate safe and efficient pedestrian access and circulation;

8. Convenient recreational facilities;
9. Use and improvement of land where site conditions make development under conventional zoning difficult or less desirable; and
10. Open Space Development option, per Section 16.3 E.

The Commissioners agreed that this proposal meets many of the items listed.

Mr. Kortering next went through the following PUD – Preliminary Qualifying Conditions (Section 16.2):

The applicant shall demonstrate that the PUD provides at least four (4) of the following site design elements, which could not be attained under conventional zoning:

1. Mixed-use development with residential and non-residential uses or a variety of housing types;
2. Pedestrian/transit-oriented design with buildings oriented to the sidewalk and parking to the side or rear;
3. High quality architectural design beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance;
4. Extensive landscaping beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance;
5. Preservation, enhancement, or restoration of natural resources (trees, slopes, wetlands, water views, etc.);
6. Preservation or restoration of significant or historic resources;
7. Provision of open space or public plazas or features;
8. Efficient consolidation of poorly dimensioned lots or property with difficult site conditions (e.g. topography);
9. Effective transition between higher and lower density uses, and/or allowing incompatible adjacent land uses to be developed in a manner that is not possible using a conventional approach;
10. Shared vehicular and pedestrian access between properties or uses;
11. Mitigation to offset impacts on public facilities (such as street improvements); or
12. Significant use of sustainable building and site design features such as: water use reduction, innovative wastewater technologies, low impact stormwater management, on-site renewable energy, reuse/recycled/renewable materials or other elements identified as sustainable by established groups such as the US Green Building Council (LEED) or ANSI National Green Building Standards.

The Commissioners agreed that this proposal meets more than four (4) of the items listed.

The Commissioners reviewed the PUD – Preliminary Approval Standards (Section 16.8).

A preliminary PUD development plan shall only be approved if it complies with each of the following standards and applicable standards established elsewhere in Article 16.

- A. Intent and Qualification. The proposed PUD complies with the intent and the applicable qualifying conditions of Sections 16.1 C and 16.2 C of this article, respectively.
- B. Uses. The uses conducted within the proposed PUD, the PUD's impact on the community, and other aspects of the PUD are consistent with the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.
- C. Design. The proposed PUD shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in a manner harmonious with the character of adjacent property, the surrounding uses

of land, the natural environment, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the development.

- D. Character. The PUD shall not change the essential character of the surrounding area.
- E. Impact. The PUD shall not be hazardous to adjacent property or involve uses, activities, materials, or equipment that will be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, or glare.
- F. Public Service Capacity. The PUD shall not place demands on public services and facilities more than current or anticipated future capacity.
- G. Utilities. Underground utilities, including telephone and electrical systems, are required within the limits of all PUDs. Appurtenances to these systems, which can be effectively screened, may be exempt from this requirement if the Planning Commission finds that such exemption will not violate the intent or character of the proposed planned unit development.

The Commissioners reviewed the above and found the application to meet the standards.

The Commissioners had a discussion on the conditions for the PUD. They discussed easements, parking, lot combinations, time line, setback clarity, storage, nursing home versus a 55+ housing community, easement locations and deferred parking.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Huesman to grant approval of the preliminary PUD with the following conditions: the PUD will be based on the use of R-3 standards for dwelling unit sizes, a maximum building height of 60' and setbacks to be reviewed at final PUD, include an easement to connect to 120th Ave., and will not include the 23 deferred parking spaces off site as shown. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Other Business

0 (vac) Quincy St. – Parcel Number 70-16-04-400-026 – Future Land Use Map Amendment
– Consideration of a Future Land Use Map Amendment to designate the subject land from Agriculture to Neighborhood Commercial and Medium Density Residential.

Present for this request was Todd Stuive of Exxel Engineering of 5252 Clyde Park Ave SW, Grand Rapids, 49509 and Randy Koetje of Vanburen – Quincy, LLC.

Mr. Stuive said that the parcel they are requesting be changed is located off 120th and Quincy. He said it is currently zoned Agriculture and is vacant land. Mr. Stuive noted that the surrounding land is zoned as follows:

North – 2 parcels of Agricultural land, and 2 parcels of Industrial land

West – Agricultural land

East – Agricultural land

South – PUD (Authentix), R-2A (Quincy Place Senior Living), Agricultural, and R-2A (Church)
Kiddy corner is a residential PUD.

Mr. Stuive then showed the map indicating the Master Plan Future Land Use Map which has the designations surrounding the subject property as follows:

North – Industrial
West – Industrial
East – Agricultural
South – High Density and Medium Density Residential

Mr. Stuive noted that there is water and sewer on 120th and that all utilities are along Quincy. They are asking for Medium Density Residential and eventually they would like the 6-acre parcel to the SE to be rezoned to C-1 Neighborhood Community Commercial.

Mr. Stuive stated that the western part of the property is below flood plain, therefore, they would like to create a pond there for storm water and use the land they dig out of the pond to help build the building sites up higher.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff what is allowed in Neighborhood Community Commercial. Staff stated that things like day care centers, government offices, medical, meeting spaces, offices & services, etc. Mr. Stuive clarified that they are not looking to put anything like a service station there; they are thinking along the lines of a day care, offices, etc.

Mr. Kortering asked Mr. Koetje what is driving the desire to develop this land. Mr. Koetje said that the land is for sale, and it looks like a good piece of land to create a transition for what is in the Master Plan. Mr. Barajas asked what price range of housing they plan to develop here. Mr. Koetje said they build homes that range from \$450,000 to \$600,000. He said they are not sure at this point if they will want to build all single-family stand-alone homes or have some duplex condominiums and single-family homes. They will see what the market is demanding at the time. Mr. Stuive noted that a few of the buildings may need to be townhomes that are built on a slab because of the high-water table near the flood plain.

Staff indicated that the Commissioners need to decide if they want to move forward with considering the Future Land Use Map Amendment at this time. If so, they would need to direct Staff to draft an intent to Plan letter to send to all surrounding municipalities, utilities, etc.

Ms. Huesman stated that she is curious about the light industrial land adjacent to this parcel and if it is developed and what is there.

Mr. Becker said that he would deny the request based on the Master Plan.

Mr. Sharp also said that he would deny the request based on the Master Plan.

Mr. Barajas stated that he feels there is a huge need for residential development in the Holland area and he is for this development in this location.

Mr. TeSlaa feels like it is in the middle of development and is leaning toward seeking additional information.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that we do need land preservation but looking at the map feels like this location is not a bad location for development.

Mr. Kortering said he feels like we need to stick with the Master Plan.

Mr. Sharp noted that it feels like an odd border but that we should still stick with what the Master Plan says.

Mr. Barajas noted that the Township ran water and sewer past the property so it seems like it should be developed to utilize the cost of the utilities that were put in there.

Mr. TeSlaa stated that this one is in a much better location for development than the last one that came before the Commission; this one feels like it should be developed.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Sharp to deny the request. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 3, No – 4. Motion failed.

** It was moved by TeSlaa and supported by Barajas to direct Staff to draft and send the intent to plan letter to the appropriate agencies. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 3. Motion carried.

0 (vac) 140th Ave. – Parcel Number 70-16-07-200-022 – Site Plan Review – Consideration of a site plan review submitted by Brad VanderZwaag of BauVan Land Co, LLC for site plan approval of a 120-unit multi-family apartment complex, consisting of 5 three-story apartment buildings with 24 units each and 5 one-story garage buildings. The subject property is zoned R-3 High Density Residential.

Present for this request was Chuck Hoyt of Nederveld Engineering, of 347 Hoover Blvd., Suite C, Holland, 49423 and Brad VanderZwaag of BauVan Land Co. LLC. of 2763 120th Ave., Holland, 49424.

Mr. Hoyt said the parcel they are presenting a site plan for tonight is located between 140th Ave. and Westwood Ln. The parcel is 10-acres and they are proposing a density of 12 units per acre. This land is currently zoned R-3 which has a Master Plan density of 10-15 units per acre. Staff explained maximum density for the site based on the Zoning Ordinance is 12 units per acre.

Mr. Hoyt noted that there will be two access points. The first, and main access point, will be off 140th Ave., and the second access point will be to the north to Westwood Ln. This access point may feel a bit different from the main access off from 140th but there will not be a speed bump or a gate or anything like that.

Mr. Hoyt noted that they are planning to have a storm water detention pond and have talked with Ottawa County Water Resources Commission and they are supportive of the design. They understand that they will need final approval from the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission to move forward. Mr. Hoyt also said that all the utilities are all ready there.

Mr. Hoyt then addressed parking. He stated that there are 304 proposed parking spaces, which is four (4) more than what is required. They would like to use these 4 spaces for their next agenda item consisting of 9 townhomes located on Westwood Ln. They did change the parking to include parking garages to help them meet the minimum storage requirement.

Mr. Hoyt stated that these buildings would be 3 stories tall with a height of 43' where the maximum height allowed is 60'. He stated that there will not be any onsite management. He noted that this is an experienced owner, and they will have a local management company that is available 24 hours a day.

Mr. Hoyt indicated the natural walking path along the west side of the parcel. This would give a space for residents to take walks, for dog walking, etc. He noted that this is a heavily wooded parcel which makes it a nice place to take a walk.

Mr. Kortering asked what their target market would be. Mr. Hoyt stated that they would be open to anyone. Mr. Kortering then asked if they would be providing a place for the kids to play.

Mr. Kortering voiced his concern for safety of the garages that face the northside of the property. Mr. Hoyt responded that they would add more lighting to that area in the photometric plan. He realizes that is not the best answer to reduce crime.

Mr. Hoyt responded to the Staff report that indicated that West Ottawa Public Schools was concerned with possible cut through traffic on their property if they do not have two driveways. He stated that they are planning on two driveways.

Mr. Hoyt stated that they will provide the access easement language to Staff.

Mr. Hoyt stated that they are not asking for any variances as they have a "by right" plan.

Mr. Hoyt then talked about the landscaping. He noted that the Township requires a tree survey to determine tree credits. Mr. Hoyt is wondering if this is necessary because the parcel is so heavily wooded. He noted that in the Staff Report there was a question of protection of landscaped areas with raised curbs, parking blocks or other similar methods. It was also noted that there is no protection for the perimeter for the parking area peninsulas or corners. Mr. Hoyt stated that they do have curb stops in some of the locations but they will make adjustments for the other areas. Mr. Hoyt stated that there is a heavy tree canopy to the north so he is wondering if they need the additional hedge screening there.

Staff stated that we have to go by the ordinance. If the applicant would like to get a variance, they would need to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Hoyt stated that they will resubmit an updated photometric plan. He also stated that they will not be using any ground/monument signs.

Mr. Hoyt said they meet all dimensional standards and will address the items discussed.

Mr. Barajas said that to him not having a green space for children to play is a big deal.

Mr. TeSlaa would like to see outdoor space for kids and for adults.

Mr. VanderMeulen is concerned with where they are going to put the snow in the winter as there is no open area connected to the parking lot to push the snow off the parking lot. Mr. Hoyt said they could haul the snow away or take a couple parking spaces to create a pile. Mr. VanderMeulen is also concerned about a play area for smaller kids, not just a green space for older kids to throw

a ball or frisbee around. Mr. VanderMeulen is also concerned about 140th. He said it seems like West Ottawa Public Schools could potentially close the road off for liability issues. Due to this, he is not sure that 140th will really be the main entrance, he feels that Westwood will be the main entrance and that the developer should be prepared for that.

Staff stated that they fulfill the storage requirement by adding the garages. Staff questions if the layout of the garages is the best layout and wonders if they could create spaces between some of the garage units so that the garages line up better with the apartments, in doing so this could create space for snow storage. Staff would like to see the non-motorized pathway connect to the sidewalk along the main roads.

Staff asked the applicant if they have any plans to combine the parcels as this would resolve some of the deficiencies noted in the Staff report for both the apartment and townhomes project. Mr. Hoyt stated that they prefer to keep them separate. Mr. VanderZwaag said they will take the play area into advisement.

Staff indicated that there is a "Crime Free Multi-Housing Program" in conjunction with the Ottawa County Sheriff's Department. The program requires tenants sign an agreement that they will follow the rules of the program. This also allows the owners to immediately evict tenants that do not follow the rules such as drugs, violence, etc. Mr. Kortering said that this is a good option but we have never required this before and would not want to place this requirement on this complex but this could be something that the owners can look into. Mr. Hoyt said that he is not familiar with the program.

Mr. Sharp indicated that he is leaning toward tabling the request based on snow storage and greenspace/play areas.

Mr. VanderMeulen would like the applicant to revise the site plan and come back.

** It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by TeSlaa to table the request so the applicant can consider snow storage options, provide a tree survey and revised landscape plan, provide a response to including a play area, provide a response to the sidewalk connection to 140th Ave and provide an updated lighting plan. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

13928 Westwood Lane – Parcel Number 70-16-07-231-007 – Site Plan Review – Consideration of a site plan review submitted by Brad VanderZwaag of BauVan Land Co, LLC on behalf of Neal Kelley of NFK Properties LLC one multi-family building, consisting of 9 townhome style units measuring two stories in height. The subject property is zoned R-3 High Density Residential.

Present for this request was Chuck Hoyt of Nederveld Engineering, of 347 Hoover Blvd., Suite C, Holland, 49423 and Brad VanderZwaag of BauVan Land Co. LLC. of 2763 120th Ave., Holland, 49424 and Mr. Bill Sikkel, 42 E. Lakewood Blvd., Holland, 49424.

Mr. Hoyt said that they are proposing 9 townhomes with stormwater, parking, entrance from Westwood Ln, garages, compliant landscaping buffer plan, and R-3 zoning, all on a 1-acre parcel, with a density of less than 10 units per acre. He stated that the front yard will be considered the arc of the Westwood Ln public right of way and the rear yard will be the Southernmost property line. Mr. Hoyt stated that the rear yard setback is 25'. He stated that they were considering that

a side yard. Mr. Hoyt said they would like to consider the front yard to the east and rear yard to the west with the south being a side yard.

Staff responded by saying that we have to follow the ordinance which states that the front yard has to face a public or private road. If they would like to challenge this determination, they would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Staff noted that if they would like to make the access road a private or public road that would change the yard determination.

Mr. Hoyt stated that the mail kiosk placement will be in the final design plans. He noted that they need Ottawa County Water Resources Commission review and approval yet. Once they have the final utilities drawings, they will submit those for the Township Director of Public Works to review.

Mr. Hoyt noted that the sidewalk goes right through the driveways to the garages. Mr. VanderMeulen suggested that they indicate where the sidewalk is by texturizing the sidewalk differently from the driveways or scoring them differently.

Mr. Hoyt indicated that they are leaving 4 parking spaces from their apartment development to the west for these townhomes. He also noted that they will not have a garbage dumpster; each townhome will have its own garbage can.

Mr. Kortering asked if they can approve contingent on ZBA approval. Staff stated that the private access drive is not a concern; it just causes problem with the front yard designation. Mr. VanderMeulen would like to make going to ZBA a condition of approval as well.

Staff asked Mr. Hoyt how they address the driveway that is on another property as well as the mailbox?

Mr. Sikkel stated that they could combine the 2 properties and that would solve this problem, however, if they ever wanted to sell just the townhouse building that would cause a problem. Mr. Sikkel then suggested changing the project to a condominium which simplifies a lot of the issues. Staff agreed that this would be a good idea. Mr. Sikkel stated that they will come back before the Commission as one property.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Barajas to table the Site Plan Review for one multi-family building, consisting of 9 townhome style units measuring two stories in height. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Macatawa Legends - South of New Holland Street and East of 144th Ave. – Amendment to a PUD Final Development Plan – Review of Resolution and Report

Present for this request was Michael McGraw, 3918 Egypt Valley NE, Ada, MI 49301.

Mr. McGraw stated that he is concerned with the verbiage on page one, the last paragraph, limiting the number of third stall garages. It was determined to remove the verbiage “up to four (4)” and “up to six (6)” in relation to the number of third stall garages.

** It was moved by TeSlaa and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the Resolution and Report, with the proposed changes, recommending approval of the Amendment to the Macatawa Legends Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan and direct Staff to distribute the document to the Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Tabled Items

410 & 414 E 8th St. – Parcel Number 70-16-28-328-002 & -003 – Preliminary PUD – This item was tabled at the September 5, 2023, Planning Commission meeting.

Item to remain tabled at this time.

575 E. 16th St., 595 E. 16th St., 367 Hoover Blvd., 582 E 15th St. – Parcel Numbers 70-16-28-482-005, -006, -001 & -007 – Site Plan Review – Consideration of a site plan review submitted by Chris McGuire of McCon Building Corporation of behalf of TRT Partners LLC of a restaurant with a double drive-through. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Item to remain tabled at this time.

Zoning Text Amendments

The Commissioners then had a discussion about possible Zoning Text Amendments, including minimum floor areas for dwellings in C-1 and C-2 and minimum storage areas for multi-family and single-family attached dwellings. It was determined the Planning Commission felt comfortable with applying R-3 minimum floor areas for dwellings in C-1 and C-2. In regards to minimum storage areas, the Township currently has a minimum of 120 sq. ft. The Commissioners determined that they would like to see a tiered system for minimum storage requirements as the unit size increase the storage requirements also increase. Staff will work on a new chart to present to the Commissioners as the next meeting.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 2024, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary