

**HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**December 3, 2024**

Chairman Randy Kortering called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm, welcomed our new member Gretchen Molotky and asked for a roll call of members present.

**Present:** Chairman Randy Kortering, Members, Evan Sharp, Jack VanderMeulen, and Gretchen Molotky. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

**Absent:** Leo Barajas, Doug Becker and Angela Huesman.

**Public Comment:** None.

**Minutes:**

\*\* It was moved by Molotky and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 12, 2024. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**Public Hearings:**

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing** for consideration of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Map of Holland Charter Township submitted by Thomas Kraal to rezone the property located at 10135 Riley Street, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-12-300-015, from AG Agriculture to R-1 Low Density Residential.

Present for this request was Thomas Kraal of 10135 Riley Street, Zeeland, 49464.

Mr. Kraal explained he would like to rezone his property from AG Agriculture to R-1 Low Density Residential so that they are able to split the parcel into two (2) parcels, one with the current house and one with the vacant land.

Mr. VanderMeulen expressed concern with the stub on Crabapple Lane. He asked Mr. Kraal if he knows if the intention is to expand the subdivision onto Mr. Kraal's open land and the open land on the parcel to the west. Mr. Kraal said he does not know their intentions.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one in the audience to speak to the request.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by VanderMeulen to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

The Commission went through the Criteria for Map Amendments

1. **Whether or not the proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals, policies and future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan; or, if conditions have changed significantly since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, whether the map change would be consistent with recent development trends in the area.**

The request matches the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **Whether the proposed district and the uses allowed are compatible with the physical, geological, hydrological and other environmental features of the site.**

For the most part, it does.

3. **The potential uses allowed in the proposed zoning district shall also be compatible with surrounding uses in terms of land suitability, impacts on the community, density, potential influence on property values, and traffic impacts.**

There is a residential subdivision nearby so it is compatible with surrounding uses.

4. **Whether, if rezoned, the site is capable of accommodating the uses allowed, considering existing or planned infrastructure including streets, sanitary sewers, storm sewer, water, sidewalks, and street lighting.**

There are no issues.

5. **Other factors deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission or Township Board.**

No other factors.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by VanderMeulen to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees to change the subject land from AG Agriculture to R-1 Low Density Residential. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing** for consideration of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Map of Holland Charter Township submitted Darlene Huckabay on behalf of VanHoven Family Legacy Trust to rezone the subject property 3385 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-09-400-014, from AG Agriculture to R-3 High Density Residential.

Present for this request was Tom Witteveen of Baumann Building, 2763 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Holland, 49424.

Mr. Witteveen stated they are acquiring this parcel and would like to rezone it from AG Agriculture to R-3 High Density Residential. He noted that the existing home is well kept and in excellent condition, therefore, they would like to see the home stay there and be able to offer an affordable home in the area. Mr. Witteveen understands that if the parcel was rezoned to R-3 that would make the current home legal nonconforming. He asked that the entire property be rezoned to R-3 with the condition that home be split based on the R-2A size and setback requirements since there are not those specifications in the R-3 district, or after the property is rezoned they would split the land and rezone the portion of the land with the existing home on it to R-2A. Mr. Witteveen

explain that if they rezone the vacant land on the property to R-3 that would be consistent with the Master Plan.

Mr. Kortering noted that the parcel to the south was recently rezoned to R-2A.

Mr. Witteveen stated they are looking to develop townhomes that would be owner occupied. They are looking to offer more affordable housing in the area.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff if townhomes are required to be in the R-3 zoning district. Staff said they can be in either R-3 or R-2A. Mr. Kortering followed up by asking Staff what the difference would be between the zoning districts. Staff noted that in R-3 the density would be greater, the allowed building heights would be higher, and single-family dwellings are not permitted in the R-3 District.

Mr. VanderMeulen pointed out that rezoning to R-3 would make the existing home nonconforming. Staff indicated that they would not recommend creating a nonconforming situation.

Mr. Witteveen asked if there is a way to get the house in R-2A and the remainder of the property in R-3? Staff indicated that they could request a dual rezoning. Mr. Sharp asked if the applicant were to request a dual rezoning, would it be recommended that they do a split at that point as well? Staff stated that it could be a conditional zoning with the future purpose of a split.

Ms. Molotky asked for clarification if these are going to be townhouses. Mr. Kortering stated that they are saying the plan is for townhouses but with an R-3 classification, they could come back with apartments.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked what would happen to the pond that is currently on the property. Mr. Witteveen indicated they are not sure about that yet as they would need to see what the storm water requirements are on the land.

Staff reminded the Commissioners that any conditions to the rezoning need to be done in writing by the applicant.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

The Commissioners stated they are in favor of tabling the request to see if the applicant would want to change their application. Staff suggested asking the applicant if they would like to table or withdraw the request. The applicant said they would like to table the request at this point.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to table the request. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing** for consideration of a Special Land Use request submitted Logan Dykgraaf of James Street Storage, LLC on behalf of Myra Keuning of Jacob Essenburg Co. The proposed Special Land Use permit is for Contractors' Facilities. Said lands are located at 0 (vacant) James Street, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-126-058. The subject property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial.

Present for this request were John Tenpas of Driesenga & Associates, 12330 James Street, Suite H80, Holland, 49424 and Logan Dykgraaf of James Street Storage LLC., 280 E. 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Holland, 49423.

Mr. Tenpas indicated that the land consists of 4 acres, located to the west of Holland Bowl Mill with residential to the south. They are proposing 5 buildings containing small warehouse spaces that would be owner occupied spaces. The units would vary in size from 1,500 sq. ft. to 2,400 sq. ft. with a total of 40 parking spaces. Mr. Tenpas explained they calculated the required parking based on warehousing with a small office space in each unit. They plan to have one parking space by each unit and 6 additional spaces on the property. He also stated that the signage would be wall mounted signs consisting of one per building and then the option for each unit to also have a sign for their individual business. They do not anticipate the tenants to have onsite customers. Mr. Tenpas said they plan to have retention basins onsite; they are currently working with the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission on a plan. He noted they would prefer to work with Staff for both landscaping and lighting later to be in compliance. He pointed out they have no intention of allowing hazardous waste, outdoor storage or overnight habitation.

Mr. Tenpas said that the Ottawa County Road Commission standards indicate one (1) driveway versus two (2) driveways. They are requesting two (2) driveways for safety of internal operation of vehicles as well as for emergency vehicle access. He noted that they do not have Ottawa County Road Commission approval yet but spacing follows their minimums.

Staff stated that they contacted the Ottawa County Road Commission and said they would prefer one (1) driveway lined up with Sunny June Dr. instead of the proposed two (2) driveways. Mr. Tenpas said they are willing to have a conversation with the Ottawa County Road Commission but could consolidate to one (1) driveway if necessary. He noted that in order to create a circular internal drive isle on the property they would need to add a drive isle in front of the center building taking away some of the green space in front of that building. That also would eliminate a retention basin; however, they do have options for storm water.

Mr. Tenpas indicated they will not be providing dumpsters onsite; therefore, the owners of the units would need to facilitate obtaining their own individual trash cans. He noted that this use is harmonious with surrounding uses, to the east there is an I-2 General Industrial zoning, to the north and south there is R-2 Moderate Density Residential zoning, and to the west is OS Office Services. They are planning separate water and sewer connections for each building, which will require one more connection in the road.

Staff said that the Special Use is based on the standards and that the Commission can put stipulations on driveways, outdoor storage, etc. at this point.

Mr. VanderMeulen is still concerned about potential parking issues if any of the businesses grow and they gain employees. Ms. Molotky clarified that they are proposing 34 units with 40 parking spaces with each pair of units having two (2) parking spaces by the building and six (6) extra parking spaces located on the parcel. The applicant confirmed this is correct.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Molotky to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Sharp asked if we say no to manufacturing in an industrial district, is that too restrictive? The Commissioners asked what is allowed by right in the I-1 district. Mr. Kortering indicated that in I-1 light manufacturing is allowed by right. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that some small businesses that do light assembly will potentially have semi-trucks come to deliver lumber and other supplies.

Staff said that with a prior applicant, they narrowed down the number of warehousing units versus contractors facilities, which helps identify the number of parking spaces required, restroom requirements, and trash receptacle options.

Ms. Molotky asked if they plan to have a master deed. Mr. Dykgraaf stated they will have a Master Deed. Their experience has been when they offer units such as these with limited parking available, no trash dumpsters, etc. the potential owners take those things into account when determining if they should purchase a unit. He also noted that the price tag deters those that do not fit the amenities offered. For example, a car detailing company would not want this location because of the number of parking spaces. The strength of limiting parking spaces is that it limits the type owners as well, so you are not attracting businesses that need multiple parking spaces.

Staff pointed out that there is a small piece of the property located in the northwest corner of the lot that is currently a parking lot for the neighboring business and does not have an easement. As well, Holland Bowl Mill's truck dock is directly to the east of the property and it looks like there may be access to the proposed drive aisle on this parcel. Mr. Tenpas said that the small parking area on the northwest corner will be demolished and removed. He also said that they do not plan to have an easement for the neighboring truck dock to the east.

Mr. VanderMeulen suggested that a motion should address parking and that the usage doesn't require more parking spaces closer to the unit. At this point, we do not know what the bylaws say because we are not able to read them at this time.

Staff indicated that at this time they strongly recommend not approving the site plan with the concerns the Commissioners have raised.

The Commissioners went through the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

- 1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.**

The Commissioners feels this is harmonious with the general vicinity.

- 2. The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

They should be fine.

- 3. The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

Will include in the motion no hazardous waste, no manufacturing other than what is allowed in I-1, no outdoor storage and no overnight habitation.

**4. The use will be consistent with the intent and purposes of this ordinance and the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.**

There was no objection to the use considering the property's recent re-zoning.

**5. The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

There was no objection to the use's impact based on the concept plan presented.

**6. The use will not result in traffic congestion, have an adverse impact on roads, nor cause hazards.**

Minimal traffic.

**7. There is need for the proposed use within the township.**

The Planning Commission believes if the developer is willing to build them, they have determined a need.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the Special Land Use permit for Contractors Facilities with the conditions that there is no hazardous material storage, no outdoor storage, and no overnight habitation. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**Other Business**

**0 (vacant) James Street, - Parcel Number 70-16-20-126-058 – Site Plan Review** – Submitted by Logan Dykgraaf of James Street Storage, LLC on behalf of Myra Keuning of Jacob Essenburg Co. for Contractors Facilities and Warehousing. The subject property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial.

Present for this request were John Tenpas of Driesenga & Associates, 12330 James Steet, Suite H80, Holland, 49424 and Logan Dykgraaf of James Street Storage LLC., 280 E. 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Holland, 49423.

Mr. Tenpas indicated that they need to talk to the Ottawa County Road Commission regarding driveways, as well as work with Staff on both lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Kortering said that knowing the uses in the building helps us to know if the amenities provided, like parking, are adequate. Mr. Tenpas noted that because these will be owner-occupied units, there is no way to control who buys the units.

Mr. VanderMeulen wants to verify that there is a proper turning radius for fire trucks, has the Fire Chief reviewed the plans? He also expressed concern that their units will be ugly to the thousands of vehicles that will drive by every day.

Mr. Sharp is concerned about the number of parking spaces, if semi-trucks will be allowed to drive in the property and if there is enough room for them to maneuver, as well as garbage.

Mr. Dykgraaf addressed the concerns the Commissioners raised. He said that the small number of parking spaces will deter certain businesses from purchasing a unit, like auto detailing and auto mechanics because there is not room to have customer vehicles on site. He also said that they put in their bylaws that semi-trucks are not allowed on the property.

Mr. Kortering asked how to best handle the parking concern. Mr. Dykgraaf suggested that if they restrict the number of offices that would limit the need for parking on the property.

Mr. Kortering then asked how they could improve the aesthetic of the buildings. Mr. Dykgraaf said they could add windows to them and noted that they already have brick on the bottom portion of the building which adds visual interest to the buildings.

Mr. Sharp asked if they would be able to see a site plan without the neighboring property's parking and access points shown when they come back? Mr. Tenpas indicated those would be removed.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Sharp to table the request. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**Adams Ridge, south of Adams Street and west of 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Amendment to Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan** – Submitted by Gabriel Schneider of Village Green on behalf of West End Properties for a minor amendment to the Adams Ridge PUD consisting of an architectural and locational adjustment to a storage shed.

Present for this request was Gabriel Schneider of Village Green 10502 Adams Street, Holland 49423.

Mr. Schneider indicated they are asking for approval of the location and roof style of a shed on the property. He stated the vendor didn't follow the approved plans.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if the vendor didn't deliver the product as designed, why did they accept it? Mr. Schneider said that he was not part of that process, he inherited this problem. He said that the person that ordered the shed took delivery and paid for the shed even though it was not correct. He is just here trying to make it right with the Township.

Staff indicated the building inspector has reviewed the application including the fact that the shed and its slab foundation is over a gas line

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if it has heat? Mr. Schneider said it does not. Mr. Schneider also said that it is currently movable, and they have plans to anchor it. He also noted that the gas company will redirect the gas line upon approval.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to authorize staff to proceed with authorizing an "Other Minor Amendment" with any expected changes. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

### **Tabled Items**

**410 & 414 E 8<sup>th</sup> Street – Parcel Numbers 70-16-28-328-002 & -003 – Preliminary P.U.D.** – Submitted by Paul DeBoer of MONDAY Impact Development of behalf of David DeKruyter to approve a proposed preliminary development plan for de Anker Planned Unit Development. The subject properties are zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled Sept. 5, 2023)

Item to remain tabled at this time. Staff noted that the developer is looking at different options for development.

**0 (vac) Perry Street – Parcel Number 70-16-24-300-038 – Preliminary Planned Unit Development** – Submitted by Brad VanderZwaag of Bauvan Land Co. LLC. A request for a proposed preliminary development plan for Eagle Meadows Condominium Planned Unit Development. The proposed residential development consists of two (2) single-family units and 15 two-family units served by a public street and utilities. The subject property is zoned R-2 Moderate Density Residential. (Tabled July 9, 2024)

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Sharp to remove this item from the table. Motion carried by voice vote.

Present for this request were Bill Sikkel of Sikkel & Associates, 320 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Holland, 49424, Tom Witteveen of Baumann Building, 2763 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Holland, 49424 and Jeff VanLaar of Exxcel Engineering Inc., 5252 Clyde Park Avenue SW, Grand Rapids, MI 49509.

Mr. Sikkel stated they are requesting preliminary PUD approval for 32 units consisting of 15 two-family units and two (2) single-family units on Perry Street. He noted that straight zoning would allow for 36 units. The surrounding uses consist of Walter's Gardens to the northwest, Dutch Treat Campground to the north, Windemere Condominiums to the west, industrial to the east and residential to the south. Mr. Sikkel indicated that with this variety of uses it makes this parcel unique for transitional zoning.

Mr. Sikkel explained the proposed units exceed the minimum for the property's conditional R-2 zoning. They are proposing units of 1,500 sq. ft. on the main floor. He noted that they will offer some slab zero-grade entry units, some units with daylight window basements and some with walk-out basements, creating a good mix of options for buyers depending on their needs. Mr. Sikkel said they are asking for deviations from the minimum requirements in regards to front yard setback requirements. The normal setback would be 35' and they are asking for 25' front yard setbacks to allow for larger back yards.

Mr. Sikkel said they feel they meet three (3) of the 10 purposes of a PUD where one (1) is required. He stated they are offering a variety of types of structures (#1), efficient use of the land (#2), and they are building under the maximum allowed units on the parcel (#9).

Mr. Sikkel also addressed the qualifying conditions for a PUD and indicated they feel they meet six (6) of the conditions where meeting four (4) is required. He listed a variety of housing types (#1), high quality architecture design including two (2) stall garages with extra storage along the back and a larger main floor that R-2 zoning requires (#3), landscaping beyond requirements as they are proposing a significant buffer to the east, landscaping along Perry St. and landscaping by the entrance (#4), preservation of the trees along the east property line which provides screening from the industrial use (#5), transition between uses (#9), and vehicular and pedestrian access with a public street and sidewalks on the west side of the street (#10).

The Commissioners questioned Staff as to the requirement of a buffer between residential and industrial. Staff clarified that if the industrial is already there and residential chooses to go in next to it, the residential is not required to put up a buffer.

Mr. VanLaar addressed how they are working with the Water Resource Commission. He said that the storm sewer will become a drain route with a 425 Agreement. It is currently an orphan drain so this will dictate that the drain be maintained properly. He stated they also will have a 2-tier detention pond for storm water along the west side that will divert to the new drain to allow water to flow to the Perry Street drain.

Mr. Kortering asked about green space and community space. Mr. Sikkel said that he talked to Mr. Witteveen about this and in their experience with this same type of development in Hudsonville the buyers don't use that type of space and it just requires maintenance and higher HOA fees. Mr. Sikkel stated they may be able to provide some green space for kids to play with balls or throw a frisbee. Mr. Witteveen said they are not opposed to putting a green space or community space in if required. He also noted that their demographic would be empty nesters, the development in Hudsonville is already 75% full and not one of the units has children living in it, they expect the same demographic here.

Mr. VanderMeulen said he thought the variety of units was to attract varying demographics. Mr. Witteveen said it is not necessarily to attract different demographics but to cater to varying needs that empty nesters have. Some need zero-entry due to physical limitations, some want daylight windows in a basement for natural light and others want the walk-out basements to be able to be outdoors more. The variety also allows for varying price points. Ms. Molotky asked what their price points would be. Mr. Witteveen said they have not determined that for this development yet but the development in Hudsonville ranges from \$375,000 to \$450,000.

Staff noted that the building footprints with small decks off the back could pose a problem in the future if residents would like larger decks or add a three-season room. Staff would like the applicant to consider the limitations of a building footprint versus the building envelopes. With a 10' x 10' deck they would be locked into that size.

Ms. Molotky asked how many units would be built on slabs. Mr. VanLaar said they are planning around 3-4 buildings on slabs with one of the buildings being a single-family unit. Mr. Witteveen mentioned that even some of the units with basements have zero-entry in the garages.

Mr. VanderMeulen said he is more concerned with green space than community spaces. Mr. Kortering said a gazebo isn't necessary and would be hard to fit into the design.

Mr. Sikkel noted that this will be a single lot of record, however, as a traditional condominium development, the units will each have separate parcel numbers.

Staff expressed concern over the 10' maintenance strips along the road toward the north end. Staff questioned if the drive should come to a "T" to provide a possible connection to the campground to the north. Mr. VanLaar stated that the 10' strips are deeded to the Ottawa County Road Commission as property.

The Commissioners agreed that under the Preliminary PUD Planning and Zoning Analysis they meet the following:

2 – Efficient use of land to facilitate a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use, and utilities.

The Commissioners agree that under the qualifying conditions for a PUD, they meet the following:

- 3 – High quality architectural design beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance;
- 4 – Extensive landscaping beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance;

- 9 – Effective transition between higher and lower density uses, and/or between non-residential and residential uses; or allowing incompatible adjacent land uses to be developed in a manner that is not possible using a conventional approach; and
- 10 – Shared vehicular and pedestrian access between properties or uses.

Staff noted the deviations would include the front setbacks deviating from 35' to 25' and to allow multiple principal buildings on a single lot.

The Commissioners agreed that this application complies with each of the standards for approval of a PUD.

The Commissioners then discussed conditions of approval. They stated they would like to see some green space, no size specified. Mr. Sikkel is concerned if we pull the road down to allow for green space that would get rid of the possible connectivity to the parcel to the north if they ever wanted to connect. Mr. VanLaar indicated that the Road Commission would have to weigh in on any road changes as well.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Molotky to approve the preliminary PUD based on the discussion with the condition that more greenspace be provided. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

**12429 Ransom Street – Parcel Number 70-16-04-100-008 – Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment** – Submitted by Sam Nichols of RDV Corporation of behalf of MSA Lakeshore Center, LLC to rezone the subject property from AG Agriculture to C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled November 12, 2024)

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Sharp to remove this item from the table. Motion passed with a voice vote.

Present for this request was John Whitten, Spark 43 Architects, 924 Fulton West, Grand Rapids, 49504.

Mr. Whitten indicated they are back requesting a rezoning from AG Agriculture to C-2 Community Commercial with the condition that they be restricted to the uses of Recreational Facility, Commercial, Indoor and Recreation Facility, Commercial, Outdoor.

Mr. Whitten also noted that they are aware improvements need to be made on 124<sup>th</sup> with their new main entrance moving to the 124<sup>th</sup> Ave. side of the building.

Staff clarified for the Commissioners that the applicant voluntarily submitted these conditions.

The Commission went through the Criteria for Map Amendments

- 1. Whether or not the proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals, policies and future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan; or, if conditions have changed significantly since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, whether the map change would be consistent with recent development trends in the area.**

It was noted that when the building was originally approved, which was under a different comprehensive plan, it was approved with a caveat that the building would be expanded.

- 2. Whether the proposed district and the uses allowed are compatible with the physical, geological, hydrological and other environmental features of the site.**

There was no objection given the voluntary conditions provided.

- 3. The potential uses allowed in the proposed zoning district shall also be compatible with surrounding uses in terms of land suitability, impacts on the community, density, potential influence on property values, and traffic impacts.**

The use is compatible with the skating facility to the west.

- 4. Whether, if rezoned, the site is capable of accommodating the uses allowed, considering existing or planned infrastructure including streets, sanitary sewers, storm sewer, water, sidewalks, and street lighting.**

Road improvements will likely be needed within the existing public right-of-way by the developer.

- 5. Other factors deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission or Township Board.**

No other factors.

Staff noted that they would need to draft an acceptable contract of conditions that would be recorded at the County Registrar of Deeds once the rezoning is formally approved prior to the rezoning petition proceeding to the Board if there is a recommendation of approval being considered. Mr. Whitten asked if that is something the applicant needs to do or if that is something the Township does? Staff answered that will be a joint effort with the applicant, the Township and the attorneys.

\*\* It was moved by Sharp and supported by VanderMeulen to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees to conditionally rezone the subject land from AG Agriculture to C-2 Community Commercial with the condition that the allowable use of the property be limited to "Recreation Facility, Commercial, Indoor" and "Recreation Facility, Commercial, Outdoor", provided an acceptable contract of conditions is approved by the Township and can be recorded with the Ottawa County Registrar of Deeds in conjunction with the any Board approval. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

### **Planning Commission Discussion:**

#### **Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments**

Staff indicated that the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments have been given to the Township attorney.

#### **2024 Planning Commission Annual Report**

Staff presented the report to the Commissioners asking for any questions or changes that should be made before presenting the report to the Township Board of Trustees. There were no changes requested.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Sharp to accept the report and submit it to the Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 3. Motion carried.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld  
Recording Secretary