

**HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**March 5, 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 Becker and supported by Sharp to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 6, 2024. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

**Public Hearings:** None.

**Other Business**

**470, 471 & 475 Howard Ave – Parcel Numbers 70-16-30-150-035, 70-16-30-150-036 & 70-16-30-126-056)** - Amendment to a P.U.D. Final Development Plan – Consideration of a request for an Other Minor Change to the 470 & 471 Howard Ave PUD consisting of a revised landscaping plan, submitted by Mike Evenhouse/ME Yacht Restoration of MTJ Holdings, LLC.

Present for this request was Mike Evenhouse, ME Yacht Restoration of MTJ Holdings, LLC., of 848 W Lakewood Blvd., Holland, 49424 and Andy Slagh, Evergreen Landscaping of 14430 New Holland St., Holland, 49424.

Mr. Evenhouse said that they hired Evergreen Landscaping because they wanted to have high quality work done and for the project to look the best in the Township. Mr. Evenhouse thought they were meeting the landscaping requirements but have since been informed they do not meet the PUD requirements. He said they are requesting to change the PUD to follow the landscaping work that has been installed.

Mr. Kortering pointed out to the Commissioners that the landscaping installed does not meet the PUD requirements nor the newly revised landscaping standards that were recently approved by the Township.

Staff stated that the issue is the landscaping plan is part of a PUD agreement and Staff cannot allow alterations to a PUD agreement without Commission approval. Mr. Kortering asked for clarification from Staff as to what the Commission's options are. He asked if they can approve

the changes that were made to the landscaping plan in the PUD or if can they give Staff authorization to work with the applicant as they best see fit? Staff stated that if the Commission believes the proposal is an Other Minor Change, they can either approve what was done, or give Staff direction on how the Commissioners would like Staff to proceed with a PUD Amendment.

Staff noted that the original plan stated that along Douglas Ave was to be a wrought iron fence with a berm and landscaping to match the neighboring lot to the west (500 Douglas Ave) and along the west property line was to be more canopy trees and shrubs to create a buffer. Staff also stated that there was a driveway removed along Howard Ave; Staff agrees this was a good change as it creates a safer traffic flow. Staff showed that along Douglas Ave now is a fence and a natural contouring berm with trees. Shrubs have been placed between the fence and the berm, rather than planted on the berm, which make the shrubs lower/more hidden, taking away from screening of the large buildings on the property. Staff also noted that along the west lot line, they planted a few trees and no shrubs.

Mr. VanderMeulen went over the chart and the changes that were made to the original plan along with what is now required under the new ordinance. He stated that he is surprised that they went ahead with a plan that was different from the landscaping plan in the PUD without coming before the Commission for approval first.

Mr. Evenhouse stated that the new landscaping looks great and he gets compliments on it frequently.

Mr. TeSlaa said that the landscaping looks great, and wouldn't say no to approving it as it is but does want to bring them into compliance with minimum zoning requirements so that we are consistent for future applicants.

Mr. Evenhouse said that they do not want to look like their neighbor as their landscaping looks bad and overgrown and he didn't want his property to look like that so he spent more money to make it look really good.

Mr. Kortering went through where they meet standards and where they are falling short. He noted that they exceed standards along Douglas Ave and are comfortable with the front yard landscaping installed along Howard Ave but fall short along the buffer abutting 449 Douglas, the buffer along 500 Douglas, and the parking lot.

Mr. Slagh said that the majority of changes were made to get more color and more aesthetically pleasing landscaping. He stated they used different species to make it look awesome. Mr. Slagh also noted that they planted the trees behind the berm because that was more suitable for that species so that they will thrive.

Mr. Kortering asked the Commissioners if they would like to direct Staff to handle it from here by determining that it is an Other Minor Change to the PUD? Mr. Becker said he thinks it looks nice, but in thinking ahead to future applicants, we may want to enforce the current revised standards for this one so we don't set a precedence. Mr. Sharp said he wants to be fair but yet consistent. Mr. Barajas said that it looks great, but worries that the next applicant will fall short and will not try to look this good. Mr. TeSlaa feels that the applicant can work with Staff to cover the tree shortages. Mr. VanderMeulen said that because this would be an amendment to a PUD, the Commission can fall back on the PUD as all PUDs are project specific. He did say that he feels

a few extra trees would be nice though. Mr. Kortering noted that having lots of shrubs in one area doesn't make up for the lack of shrubs in another area.

Staff clarified that the Commissioners are directing Staff to work with Mr. Evenhouse to follow the minimum requirements for the trees in the buffers where they are needed.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by VanderMeulen to authorize Staff to proceed with authorizing an "Other Minor Amendment" to bring the landscaping up to the current minimum landscaping requirements for trees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

**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.

Randy Koetje, applicant, was in the audience and noted that he did not have any additional comments at this time for his request. If the Planning Commissioners had any questions though, he would be happy to answer them.

Staff explained the Future Land Use Map Amendment procedure. Mr. Broersma then stated that the current designation in the Future Land Use Map is Agricultural Preservation for the subject property and the applicant is asking to change it to Medium Density Residential with a section in the southeast corner being Neighborhood Commercial. Staff explained that Medium Density Residential can be single family attached/detached homes or multi-family units.

The Commissioners looked at a housing study that was done in 2020 along with other data Staff compiled which shows how much land in the Township is currently designated in the Future Land Use Map, for Medium Density and High Density residential development. The conclusion from this data is that there is still significant capacity left for housing construction within appropriately designated areas of the Township.

The Commissioners then looked at the surrounding parcels and their Future Land Use Map designations and zoning. It was noted that to the north and west, parcels are designated for Light Industrial, however, the majority of that land is still being farmed and currently zoned AG Agriculture. To the south, parcels are designated for residential including a large apartment complex, Authentix.

Mr. Barajas stated that the Master Plan changes over time and not every property fits exactly into what was determined at the time the Master Plan was revised. He also noted that being in the real-estate industry, he is always supportive of home ownership and against more rental development. Mr. Barajas noted that providing condominiums for the baby boomers to move into frees up more homes for new, younger buyers to purchase and get them into homeownership. He noted that there is a need to free up more land for development as the land that is open for development is either not for sale or is not being developed.

Mr. Kortering asked why there is such a high demand for rental units. Mr. Barajas stated it is because there are not enough homes for sale so people are forced to rent in order to find a place to live.

Mr. VanderMeulen agrees that this is a problem. We are attracting people to live and work here but there is a lack the homes for them to purchase. He said he is not sure how to solve that problem.

Mr. Becker stated that he is nervous to open the door for other developers to try to change the zoning of land designated to Agricultural Preservation if we were to approve this one.

Ms. Huesman said that she drove by the property today to get a good feel for its location and the surrounding area. She said that the data provided by Staff was very helpful. Ms. Huesman agrees that home ownership, and not more apartments, is the direction she would like to see the Township move in but feels that this parcel should remain Agricultural Preservation.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if Staff could clarify why this parcel was deemed Agricultural Preservation in the Master Plan. Staff stated that they look at the size of the parcel, the surrounding land uses, as well as setting boundary lines and it was determined that Quincy St. should be a boundary line between residential and agricultural.

Mr. Kortering said that the studies done show that the Township is good with developable land until 2040.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Sharp to recommend denial to the Township Board. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 2. Motion carried.

The Commissioners had a discussion on promoting home ownership and how to encourage that in the Township. Mr. Randy Koetje of 547 Baldwin was present and, as a developer, he noted that the developers that are looking to develop large multi-family complexes are looking at the big rent numbers and they are paying too much for land causing them to need to make more money to compensate for the high cost. He also noted that vacancies in rental are edging up again.

### **Tabled Items**

**410 & 414 E 8<sup>th</sup> 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. 16<sup>th</sup> St., 595 E. 16<sup>th</sup> St., 367 Hoover Blvd., 582 E 15<sup>th</sup> 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.

**0 (vac) 140<sup>th</sup> 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. (Tabled February 6, 2024)

Item to remain tabled at this time.

**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. (Tabled February 6, 2024)

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 set minimum storage requirements based on unit size. They looked at current requirements, versus MSHDA standards, versus 8%, 9% and 10% storage areas, as well as looked at a real-life nonuse variance request for apartment storage areas which is currently tabled at the ZBA. The Commissioners concluded that a laundry room should not be fully counted in the storage calculation due to appliances and the space need for a door not being considered open floor area. It was determined that the Commissioners would like to see a definition of what storage is and how it is calculated. The Commissioners would like to see columns added in the chart for 6% and 7% for the next meeting.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 9, 2024, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld  
Recording Secretary