

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
December 2, 2025

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, Members, Leo Barajas, Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Gretchen Molotky (arrived at 6:10 pm), Evan Sharp and Jack VanderMeulen. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White, and Recording Secretary Sheila Webb

Absent: None.

Public Comment: None.

Minutes:

** It was moved by Barajas and supported by Becker to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 4, 2025. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent – 1, Abstained - 1. Motion carried.

Public Hearings

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Crossings Court Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan, submitted by Tom Vroon of T2 Properties LLC for property located at 0 (vacant) Crossings Court, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-22-271-011.

Present for this request was Ryan Ysseldyke of Holland Engineering, 220 Hoover Boulevard, Holland, MI 49423; Bill Sikkel of Sikkel & Associates, 320 120th Avenue, Suite 150, Holland, MI 49424; and Tom Vroon of T2 Properties LLC, 611 136th Street, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Ysseldyke stated that there was a long history on this piece of property, and this is the last remaining parcel to be developed in the PUD. Mr. Ysseldyke said that there are a couple of changes needing approval from the original PUD relating to building location and setbacks. Mr. Ysseldyke noted that the proposed building is further away from the property line and meets the current C-2 setback requirements. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that for the most part they have no concerns with the corrections needed on the site plan with the exception of the landscaping and screening section. Mr. Ysseldyke noted that a type D buffer would be required along the west property line and that it is a shared access easement driveway. Mr. Ysseldyke said that would not be practical and would cut off the driveway and be in violation of the easement. Mr. Ysseldyke stated they are asking for relief of that requirement.

Mr. Ysseldyke asked for clarification regarding the outdoor storage in the front yard and whether the outdoor storage needed to be 50 feet from the right-of-way to be in compliance. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that the current plan has a 45-foot setback and asked if the outdoor storage needs to be moved 5 feet. Chairman Kortering asked if they would lose some of the southwest side to be

compliant to the 50-foot setback. Staff noted that the front yard is the area between the building and the right-of-way, therefore, a portion of the outdoor storage would be in violation of ordinance but relief could be sought for that with the PUD.

Chairman Kortering inquired about the intended use. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that it is a contractor facility. Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the distance from the radius of the cul-de-sac to the southwest corner of outdoor storage. Mr. Ysseldyke said that it is currently 45 feet. Mr. VanderMeulen said that this front yard is different due to the radius of the arc. Staff noted that the applicant is proposing a solid fence, and it is at the end of the cul-de-sac so it would be somewhat of a prominent view, but it's not necessarily a highly trafficked cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Molotky arrived at 6:10 pm.

Chairman Kortering noted that the last approved contractor facility had a stipulation that it had to be used for contractor facilities, not personal storage. Mr. Sikkel noted that the intent would be to allow flexibility in terms of the market. Mr. Sikkel noted there is a lot of need and desire for contractor facilities. Chairman Kortering stated that we want to make sure we are using the land wisely and to encourage job creation. Mr. Sikkel stated that the client would like to do both, contractor facilities and storage. Chairman Kortering stated that the Commissioners would decide if storage would be approved.

Mr. Sikkel asked if the current zoning would allow boat and RV storage. Staff said the underlying zoning is C-2 Community Commercial which could allow such storage by a special land use permit but stipulations could be applied. Mr. Sikkel asked if they needed to get special use approval. Staff noted that the applicant is seeking a contractor facility by right without having to go through a special land use permit. In this case, the PUD resolution and report may have a stipulation including no boat, RV, classic car, toy barn activities, etc.

Chairman Kortering confirmed that they have applied stipulations in the past and stated they wanted to use the land in the best way and start encouraging job creation for a contractor facility. Chairman Kortering said that the Township has an above average number of storage facilities. Mr. Vroon stated he understands what he is saying but is not sure what the use will be for the individual contractors. Mr. Vroon noted that the contractor may store his personal boat, RV or snowmobile. Mr. Vroon stated that the outdoor storage is an effort to attract a mason or a plumber and not necessarily towards storage but would like to be flexible.

Mr. Sikkel asked for a compromise that no more than three units could be used for storage facility. Mr. Sharp noted that he aligns with past views and does not want more storage facilities. Mr. Barajas agreed if it's going to be a contractor facility then no personal storage should be allowed. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that there is not much industrial space left and more storage space is not needed.

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 Becker and supported by Huesman to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Chairman Kortering stated that they want to be consistent and that a contractor facility is not a storage facility. Mr. Becker stated that the storage concern, the setback for outdoor storage, and the landscaping on the west side need to be addressed. The Commissioners discussed that Mr.

Sikkel's compromise would be difficult to implement and reinforce. Ms. Molotky confirmed that the outdoor storage area would only be for the contractor's storage needs and not RV storage.

The Commissioners discussed offering relief regarding the setback from the public right-of-way. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that they should keep at least the 50 feet. Staff pointed out that relief could be granted for the landscaping on the west side due to the presence of the shared access easement approved under the current PUD.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the ground cover for the outdoor storage. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that initial intent was crushed concrete if that's acceptable. Staff noted that outdoor storage areas are to be paved unless approved by the Zoning Administrator with a suitable material and depends on the type of equipment being used and the frequency. The Commissioners agreed that the default is paved unless there is a good reason not to.

The Commissioners were in agreement of the intent and purpose, qualifying conditions, and standards for approval. Mr. Becker questioned if the outdoor storage was for contractor use only. Mr. Sikkel confirmed that the outdoor storage was only for the 6 contractor units. Staff noted that the plan change of the 50-foot setback would have to be coordinated and then written into the resolution and report.

** It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Becker to approve the Major PUD Amendment and allow this parcel to be used for contractor facilities with outdoor storage with the condition that usage should be for contractors only, no storage of RVs, boats, toys, and antique cars; not to be used for sleeping facilities; no hazardous materials; there should be a 50-foot setback following the same radius of the cul-de-sac which affects where the outdoor storage is; no landscaping needs to be put on the west side of the building; the storage area should be paved and for tenant use only and they should work with Staff for the final layout placement of the outdoor storage. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0, Absent – 0. Motion carried.

Staff noted that the Township will need to receive the revised site plan prior to moving forward with writing the Resolution and Report for the Crossings Court PUD Amendment.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for major vehicle repair with associated outdoor storage area and vehicle sales and display. The petition is submitted by Angel Rios of A&J Automotive on behalf of Jeremy Fogg of Greentrust Capital Management LLC for property located at 2490 Van Ommen Drive, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-16-377-010. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was Jeremy Fogg of Greentrust Capital Management LLC, 222 S River Avenue, Holland, MI 49423.

Mr. Fogg stated that he is requesting vehicle sales to be added to the current use of automotive repair. Mr. Fogg noted that they are still working on an updated layout to where those vehicles can go along US31 based on the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting and decisions.

Chairman Kortering suggested Mr. VanderMeulen clarify what was decided at the ZBA meeting. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that the first 10 feet from the highway right-of-way to the parking lot should be landscaping, and the trees could be off to the side so the cars would still be visible. Mr. Fogg stated that he was frustrated that the landscaping would block the view of his cars.

Chairman Kortering noted that beautification is part of the master plan. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that a 30-foot setback was required for the storage area.

Staff stated that a total of 4 variances were considered by the ZBA. The vehicle display area needs to be 10 feet back to accommodate the front yard landscape buffer to extend the full width of the lot. The outdoor storage was granted a 15-foot side yard setback from the north property line resulting in a zero-foot setback. The outdoor storage could be in the US31 front yard since this is a through lot with two front yards. The outdoor storage was granted a 20-foot front yard setback from the north property line resulting in a 30-foot setback.

Chairman Kortering asked if the ZBA approved 8 parking spots for the for-sale cars. Staff noted that approval was for how close the vehicles could be to the street.

Chairman Kortering asked about the business changing from automotive repair to repair and sales. Mr. Fogg said his tenant is currently doing automotive repairs and selling cars, so he is just trying to make it legal.

Mr. Fogg shared his frustration with the 20-foot limitation and not being able to have for-sale cars or employee parking in that space. Staff pointed out that for-sale cars could also be parallel to the highway. Mr. Fogg agreed that would be helpful. Ms. Molotky asked how many cars could be put in that area. Staff noted that potentially two cars could go between the outdoor storage fence and the front yard buffer area. Staff stated that the plan was not updated for this hearing and that the applicant could revise the plan for 10 cars. Mr. Fogg stated that he probably wouldn't need 10 cars but would have them parallel to the highway by the outdoor storage and put trees within the 10-foot buffer area. Staff noted that this gives them flexibility for snow plowing and parking cars at an angle for a different look. Chairman Kortering asked if the person selling cars has a dealer's license. Mr. Fogg stated that he did not know, but he would be sure one was obtained if this is approved. Chairman Kortering stated that it would be part of the approval.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Marty DeHaan, 4279 Beeline Road, Holland, MI 49423 stated he owns Quality Brake and Auto Service, 2470 Van Ommen Drive, Holland, MI 49424, which is located next to Mr. Fogg's property. Mr. DeHaan discussed the area business' front yards versus back yards. Mr. DeHaan stated that his property does not have any green space because it's all concrete. Mr. DeHaan stated his frustration regarding vehicles not being able to stay outside longer than 24 hours.

Ms. Molotky asked about cars staying outside longer than 24 hours. Staff noted that to accommodate this, the Planning Commission made a change that repair facilities are allowed to have outdoor storage, but it needs to have a 6-foot fence. Chairman Kortering said this change helps them achieve more beautification which is part of the master plan. Staff noted that if a vehicle is outside for more than 24 hours related to major vehicle repair then it becomes outdoor storage which should be kept in a screened-in area.

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

Chairman Kortering confirmed the applicant would be limited to 8 for-sale vehicle spots. Staff noted that the applicant agreed to the 8 spots, but the spots would have flexibility along the frontage as opposed to the original drawing. Chairman Kortering asked what types of vehicles

would be for sale. Mr. Fogg stated that cars and trucks would be sold, not commercial vehicles, boats, or RVs. Mr. Fogg asked if the existing fence on the north side needed to be replaced since it is a chain link fence. Staff noted that the understanding was that it would be replaced, but they would review the ZBA minutes.

The Commission then reviewed 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 Commission agreed that it is fitting for the neighborhood.

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.

The Commissioners stated that they are already operating the business.

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.

The Commissioners noted that because the business is already in operation, the use will not be detrimental to any persons or property.

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

The Commissioners agreed the use is consistent.

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.

The Commissioners noted that there will be landscaping added to the area.

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

The Commissioners stated that this is an existing facility, and they have no concerns with this standard.

7. There is need for the proposed use within the township and the use will not be detrimental to the community.

The Commissioners noted that they are already operating so the need does exist.

Chairman Kortering asked if the 8 spaces needed to be striped. Staff noted that the parking spaces for customers and employees need to be striped, not the spaces for the for-sale cars.

Chairman Kortering asked for clarification regarding the additional landscaping in the front and or south yards. Staff stated that it wasn't a requirement but would bring it closer to conformance.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Molotky to recommend approval of the Special Land Use permit for major vehicle repair with associated outdoor storage area and vehicle sales and display for 2490 Van Ommen Drive with stipulations that the site plan should be modified per variances granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on the 18th of November; the site plan review shall be done through Staff; vehicle sales and displays shall be limited to 8 spaces along US31 and only upon receipt of an approved dealer license; sales limited to passenger vehicles only; the parking lot and approved spaces shall be striped per zoning ordinance requirements; all vehicle repairs should be done indoors. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0, Absent – 0. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for a contractor facility with outdoor storage. The petition is submitted by Brian Malone of Sonseeker Pools on behalf of Christine Gethin of CLG Holdings LLC for land located at 4412 136th Avenue, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-05-300-023. The subject property is zoned I-2 General Industrial.

Present for this request was Ryan Ysseldyke of Holland Engineering, 220 Hoover Boulevard, Holland, MI 49423.

Mr. Ysseldyke stated that this site is an existing approximately 10,000 square-foot industrial building, and the applicant is asking for outdoor storage space due to the way the business is run, for supplies and for storing business vehicles and trailers. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that they are asking for site plan approval for outdoor storage at the maximum allowed of 10,000 square feet. Mr. Ysseldyke noted that the site plan shows 20,000 square feet of outdoor storage because they didn't have time to update it from the previous ZBA meeting.

Chairman Kortering asked about the nature of the business. Mr. Ysseldyke stated that this business constructs and installs in-ground pools.

Chairman Kortering asked about the location of the outdoor storage in regards to the new site plan. Mr. Ysseldyke stated it would be a combination because they would need access to the storage space from the existing parking lot so probably more in the southern half. Mr. Ysseldyke noted that landscaping and lighting would be included in the final site plan. Chairman Kortering noted that they are seeking a use approval for a plan that is not finished. Mr. Ysseldyke stated they are very willing to work with Staff to come into compliance.

Chairman Kortering asked what kind of outdoor storage surface material would be used. Mr. Ysseldyke noted that the preference is crushed concrete but understands it's at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Chairman Kortering noted that the Fire Chief may require some paving. Staff said that due to the type of vehicles and heavy daily use, the outdoor storage area would need to be paved.

Ms. Molotky asked if the storage area would be covered. Mr. Ysseldyke said it would be an open-air storage and would store vehicles and materials.

Chairman Kortering asked about landscaping and fencing. Staff said the fencing would have to be at least 6 feet but could be up to 8 feet. Staff noted that landscaping would be needed in the areas adjacent to the new improvements and do not anticipate any additional lighting needs.

Mr. VanderMuelen asked if the applicant should come back with a new plan. Staff stated that they are comfortable with moving forward. Chairman Kortering noted that they would let the applicant decide how the 10,000 square feet would be allocated.

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 Barajas to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Chairman Kortering noted that outdoor storage would be limited to 10,000 square feet per the ZBA and that lighting was not an issue. Chairman Kortering asked if the Commissioners wanted to see a new site plan. The Commissioners agreed that a new site plan could be handled by Staff. Chairman Kortering stated that the outdoor storage area would need to be paved. Chairman Kortering asked about the need for a change of use permit for the building. Staff said that this is for informational purposes for the applicant in case the use of the building changes.

The Commission then reviewed 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 agreed that it is appropriate for the neighborhood.

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.

The Commissioners noted that they have no concerns with this standard.

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.

The Commissioners stated that there is no change in the operation of the site. The Commission noted they discussed the types of materials and equipment to be stored outdoors and had no concerns with hazards.

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

The Commissioners stated the use is consistent.

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.

The Commissioners noted that this standard is met due to the limit of 10,000 square feet.

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

The Commissioners stated that since they do not have customers, the use will not negatively impact traffic.

7. There is need for the proposed use within the township, and the use will not be detrimental to the community.

The Commissioners agreed that there is a need.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to approve the Special Land Use Permit for a contractor facility with outdoor storage for 4412 136th Avenue with consideration that the site plan is updated to show the intended space and that the applicant works with Staff on all outstanding requirements. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0, Absent – 0. Motion carried.

Other Business

Lakewood Place, 279 Paramount Ave & 0 (vac) Lakewood Blvd (70-16-21-100-084, 70-16-21-169-001, -002 & -003) – Amendment to P.U.D Final Development Plan – Submitted by Scott Geerlings for an Other Minor Amendment to the Lakewood Place PUD consisting of modifying the use of the designated green space, including removal of the proposed bridge and addition of a new trailhead and looping pathways.

Present for this request was Scott Geerlings of Midwest Construction/Geerlings Development, 16 S Elm Street, Zeeland, MI 49464.

Mr. Geerlings stated that he was there to discuss the bridge. Staff stated that the request can be considered as an Other Minor Amendment or be considered a Major Amendment by the Planning Commission. Staff pointed out that the request is to eliminate the bridge connection between the east and west side of the existing drain on-site.

Chairman Kortering asked why they wanted to remove the bridge. Mr. Geerlings stated that they've had some push back from FEMA. Mr. Geerlings noted that Outdoor Discovery Center and the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner thought there would be a better way to widen the drain so there's more storage, more habitat and more of a filter before it drains into Lake Macatawa which would enhance Project Clarity. Mr. Geerlings stated that the bridge would be nice but not necessary. Mr. Geerlings noted that you could just walk to the road where there is a bike path, and it would be available to the general public. Mr. Geerlings said he's not sure who would ultimately own the land, whether that would be Outdoor Discovery Center or the Township but that the park area is for the general public. Mr. Geerlings said the bridge design was ready to go, but it was suggested that they use their funds for better amenities.

Chairman Kortering stated that the bridge was not a promise made to the people that are renting, and it was not included in the brochures. Ms. Molotky asked if the bridge was part of the approved design. Chairman Kortering affirmed that it was. Chairman Kortering stated that Joe Bush, Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner, wrote a letter reinforcing what Mr. Geerlings is saying.

Staff stated that the understanding is that the channel is not widening, but the property will be creating overflow capacity. Ms. Molotky noted that in the past there was a problem with an orphan drain and that this could help prevent possible flooding. Mr. VanderMeulen asked if it made a

difference if the bridge was there or not. Chairman Kortering noted that the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner implied that he'd like to not have the bridge there.

Mr. Geerlings noted that they do not want to limit this area to just the immediate tenants, that it should be available to the public. Mr. Becker asked about the length of the bridge. Mr. Geerlings stated that he thought it was close to 80 feet. Mr. Geerlings stated that they tried to put the bridge on the narrowest part of the drain. Mr. Becker stated he had a concern with people still trying to cross the drain without the availability of a bridge. The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of having a bridge within the apartment complex.

Mr. Geerlings noted that the proposal is actually more expensive than just putting the bridge in. Mr. Geerlings stated that without the bridge it is still accessible via a bike path and a concrete path. Ms. Molotky stated she feels that an accommodation needs to be made to widen the drain for flood prevention purposes. Mr. Geerlings stated that if the bridge is put in as designed that's not anticipating widening the drain. Ms. Molotky stated that they need to show the reason for changing their original approval. Mr. Geerlings noted that there is some wetland area, and that's why they came up with the idea of a park. Mr. Barajas asked if there was any public parking. Mr. Geerlings stated there isn't any public parking, but there is parking available behind building H.

Mr. Sharp stated that if everyone says this makes sense then we should go in this direction and that it seems reasonable. Ms. Molotky noted that to prevent what's happened in the past, she is in favor. Mr. Barajas said that he would not go against FEMA. Mr. VanderMeulen stated he would like to see the bridge but is not opposed to the amendment. Ms. Molotky asked if there was anything else that could be done.

Staff asked the applicant to clarify whether FEMA is saying that they can't have the bridge. Mr. Geerlings stated that the bridge could get in the way of creating volume for a heavy rain. Staff noted that they do not have enough data to know what FEMA is saying or that it shouldn't happen.

Mr. Becker noted that he'd like to see the bridge but doesn't want to see flooding. Ms. Huesman stated that we are just making a decision if this a minor or a major amendment and thinks Staff should move forward with authorizing a minor amendment.

Chairman Kortering stated that Outdoor Discovery Center has shared notes of support for this plan. Mr. VanderMeulen asked who would be maintaining the property long term. Mr. Geerlings stated that has not been determined yet, probably either the Township or Outdoor Discovery Center. Staff noted that if it becomes a separate parcel, it may require another PUD amendment. Mr. Geerlings noted that the property would be donated, and the drain would always be taken care of by the drain commission.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Molotky to direct Staff to proceed with authorizing an "Other Minor Amendment" with any expected changes. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0, Absent – 0. Motion carried.

Tabled Business

11483 Lakewood Blvd – Special Land Use Permit – 70-16-22-271-005 - Consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for "Vehicles, Recreational equipment, manufactured homes, heavy equipment sales and rental" and "Vehicle Repair, including outdoor storage of vehicles

awaiting repair”. Petition is submitted by Dave Timmerman of Union Land LLC. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled August 12, 2025)

The item is to remain tabled. Staff noted that the applicant will be coming to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance for their outdoor storage location.

Planning Commission Discussion

2025 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 Huesman to accept the 2025 Planning Commission Annual Report as presented and direct Staff to submit the report to the Township Board of Trustees for their information. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0, Absent – 0. Motion carried.

Planning Commission Objectives for 2026

The Commissioners discussed several topics that they would like to review in 2026 including helping Lakeshore Advantage reach their goal for more jobs as well as re-evaluating contractor facilities and housing.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 6, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Webb
Recording Secretary