

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
April 14, 2026

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, Angela Huesman, Gretchen Molotky, and Evan Sharp. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White, and Recording Secretary Sheila Webb

Absent: Doug Becker and Jack VanderMeulen

Public Comment: Chairman Kortering stated that an email was received from Patrick Vawter of Capstone Communities on behalf of K & J Legacy LLC requesting to withdraw their submittal for the Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan for “The Cottages at Holland.”

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Barajas to accept the withdrawal request received from Patrick Vawter of Capstone Communities on behalf of K & J Legacy LLC requesting to withdraw their submittal for the Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan for “The Cottages at Holland.” All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Dale Voetberg, 3565 Beeline Road, Holland, MI 49424 stated that the Capstone property would be directly north of his property. Mr. Voetberg stated that he wants to know what their proposal is for traffic. Mr. Voetberg noted concern about when they put the street through which will be close to his house and wondered if they would create a buffer zone. Chairman Kortering stated if the request is reintroduced, these items will be discussed in a future public hearing and that Mr. Voetberg will receive notification of that meeting.

Chairman Kortering closed the public comment.

Minutes:

** It was moved by Barajas and supported by Sharp to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 3, 2026. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. Motion carried.

** It was moved by Barajas and supported by Huesman to approve the minutes of the special meeting of March 18, 2026. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. 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 My House Ministry to rezone the property located at 352 Beeline Road, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-200-016, from R-2 Moderate Density Residential to R-2A Medium Density Residential.

Present for this request was Dave Greydanus of My House Ministry, 3915 62nd Street, Holland, MI 49423.

Mr. Greydanus stated that he is on the board of My House Ministry and that last year they purchased the property located at 352 Beeline Road. Mr. Greydanus noted that they help women in transition get back on their feet by offering transitional housing. Mr. Greydanus stated that they own a house in Holland City and had a rental house that sold and that's why they are looking at 352 Beeline Road. Mr. Greydanus noted that currently there are 3-4 mothers and their children living in one home. Mr. Greydanus stated that they are requesting the change to R-2A Medium Density Residential with preliminary plans to have townhouses and single-family homes.

Chairman Kortering asked if it would be rental housing. Mr. Greydanus stated that they would pay a fee. Chairman Kortering asked Staff what the ramifications are of this zoning requirement. Staff noted that they worked with My House Ministry to look at a R2A district which allows for single family homes and town homes or multi-family units. Staff stated that one concept is to have a central meeting space and smaller homes around it which would require a PUD. Having the R-2A zoning base allows for flexibility and creativity. Chairman Kortering confirmed that this is a zoning amendment change and not an approval of a plan.

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.

Ms. Molotky asked how many buildings the property allows for. Staff stated that based on square footage of the lot, it would be one unit per 4,000 square feet which means a maximum of 21 units would be allowed. If they request a PUD, there could be a potential of a 20% bonus density. The Commission discussed that this is a good fit for the area.

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 Commissioners agreed that the rezoning is consistent with 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.**

The applicant is constructing a development that aligns with the surrounding area.

- 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 Commissioners agreed that the proposed zoning district is compatible with the surrounding area.

- 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.**

The Commissioners concluded that this criteria would be met.

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

The Commissioners stated there were no other factors.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees to change 352 Beeline Road from R-2 Moderate Density Residential to R-2A Medium Density Residential. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent – 2. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to change and add certain sections to the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township. The section under consideration is an amendment to Article 9 – Specific Use Requirements, Section 9.20 – Outdoor Display, Sales, Temporary of the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township. The petition is submitted by Emily Johnson. The proposed text would add “Seasonal Outdoor Display and Sales” (occurring between April 1 and October 31) as a use requiring Special Land Use permit approval from the Township Planning Commission in the C-1 Zoning District.

Present for this request was Natalie Ustick of Rivers Ace Hardware, 463 1st Street, New Era, MI 49446.

Ms. Ustick stated that she is here to talk about the Rivers Ace Hardware in Holland at 645 Douglas Avenue. Ms. Ustick noted that they are requesting a text amendment to Section 9.20 to permit seasonal outdoor displays and sales in the C-1 Zoning District. Ms. Ustick stated that they would like to have outdoor seasonal displays, but they are not allowed to since they are zoned C-1 which doesn't allow for any outdoor displays or signs outside of the retail space. Ms. Ustick noted that they are requesting a zoning text amendment so that they can have a temporary outdoor structure (greenhouse) and outdoor displays between April 1st and October 31st with a special land use permit.

Chairman Kortering noted that their request is not just for their property but for all C-1 property. Ms. Ustick confirmed that was correct. Ms. Ustick noted that the current 14-day limitation appears intended for short-term promotional events and residential yard sales and because they are a commercial property within a mostly residential area, it limits what they can do with the current zoning. Ms. Ustick said that they are asking to be considered a commercial property even within a mostly residential area. Ms. Ustick stated that Holland Charter Township has a strong agricultural historical root in seasonal outdoor retail and their products reflect the established commercial character of the community.

Mr. Sharp asked if this was adopted, would that satisfy the need for their business? Ms. Ustick confirmed it would. Chairman Kortering asked how long it would take for the Township to change the text amendment. Staff noted that the earliest it could get on the Township Board agenda would be May. Chairman Kortering asked if there was a faster way. Staff noted that there is not,

but there are other avenues such as going to the Zoning Board of Appeals and requesting more days instead of the current 14 days.

Chairman Kortering asked what the ramifications would be if all C-1 zoned properties have this. Staff stated that the C-1 district was intended to be a more walkable development and not big box stores or drive-through restaurants and that's why the Board allowed different setbacks. Staff noted that within the C-1 setbacks, the building can be within 10 feet of the property line and have different side setbacks to adjacent resident housing. Staff stated that with this zoning amendment request there are no parameters in terms of setbacks, size, and percentage of area allowed. The C-2 district with outdoor sales capped at 20% of the principal building. Chairman Kortering asked if they could exceed those guard rails in this proposal. Staff confirmed that those guard rails are not included in this proposal. Chairman Kortering stated that setbacks could be ignored in this proposal as it is currently stated. Ms. Ustick noted that was why they specifically included that a special use land permit must be acquired so that each C-1 property is reviewed, and it wasn't intended to be a free for all. Chairman Kortering asked if the intention was for the next person to have to ask for a special land use permit. Staff noted that this request would require a special land use permit approval from the Planning Commission, but it becomes difficult in some cases for the Planning Commission to not have a starting point in terms of a guardrail.

Ms. Ustick stated that they would abide by the required setback in regards to the temporary greenhouse. Ms. Molotky asked if the previous owners had a greenhouse on the property. Ms. Ustick noted that for the last 30 years there was a greenhouse, but it was not a safe structure so they took it down. Staff noted that the greenhouse was originally on a residential lot adjacent to the store which was rental property owned by the previous owner and was not on store property.

Ms. Ustick noted that in 2025 they were told to remove the greenhouse from the parking lot. Ms. Molotky asked if they owned that adjacent rental property. Ms. Ustick stated that the sale of the property went to Fab Leasing, and the owner is Emily Johnson, and she does not own that property at this time.

Mr. Sharp asked if they would be listing specific items and quantities for outdoor sales or just scope out an area. Ms. Ustick noted that the biggest concern is the greenhouse which would stay up from April 1st through October 31st and that they would also want designated areas underneath the store's awning and in the parking lot for palletized outdoor displays. Staff noted that for safety reasons the Fire Chief would be involved regarding products under the eaves.

Ms. Molotky asked why the wording needs to be structured in a way that changes it for everyone and not be considered case by case. Staff stated that it could have been an option to do a conditional rezoning of the site to put conditions on a C-1 regarding potential setbacks. Ms. Molotky asked if that was an easier way for them to achieve this. Staff stated that it could be or a similar variance might be slightly quicker.

The Commissioners agreed that they are all in favor but apprehensive that it's for all C-1 districts rather than just this site. Ms. Ustick stated that they chose this route due to an email they received from Staff that had four options to choose from. Ms. Ustick noted that they were told to take the text amendment for the C-1 neighborhood commercial zoning district route. Ms. Ustick handed a paper copy of the email to Chairman Kortering. After reading the email, Chairman Kortering stated that he doesn't see a recommendation, just the four options. Staff noted that the email was originally sent last year and was resent in February when they asked for different options regarding outdoor sales and displays. Chairman Kortering pointed out the four choices contained

in the email: hold a maximum of two temporary outdoor sales events for a maximum of 14 days which is within the guidelines; seek a zoning ordinance text amendment to alter the total number of days; seek a zoning ordinance text amendment for "Outdoor Display and Sales" to be an allowed use in the C-1 neighborhood commercial zoning district; and seek to rezone the property from C-2 community commercial and then seek a special land use permit. Ms. Ustick noted that the last 2 options were their best options because they are not the owners of the property.

Mr. Barajas asked why they were doing a rezoning for all of C-1 districts. Ms. Molotky asked how many C-1 districts they have. Staff noted that there are 23 parcels either fully zoned or partially zoned C-1.

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

Mr. Sharp noted that he is not concerned regarding the number of C-1 districts this could affect but is concerned about maintaining consistency and setting expectations. The Commissioners agreed that they want to find a way to help them but still need to consider what's best for the Planning Commission going forward. Mr. Sharp asked if it would be okay to vote on this as written and then potentially propose the amendment by adding guardrails. Staff stated that they could do that but suggested completing it one time instead of twice.

Staff noted that one of the biggest concerns in the way this is structured is that under the current section, merchandise displayed outdoors shall be limited to items customarily sold within the principal retail building and that has not changed. Staff noted that many items that they currently have outdoors are not necessarily indoor items that would be allowed outdoors which means some items of this proposal may not be achieved. Ms. Ustick noted that all of the outdoor items can be found inside of the store. Ms. Huesman voiced concern over this regarding the next request because this is the amendment going forward.

The Commissioners discussed whether or not this amendment was good for the Township. Mr. Sharp stated that a concern is consistency and making sure applicants understand the expectations. Chairman Kortering confirmed that they need to be transparent and consistent. The Commissioners discussed that part of the reason for the amendment change is due to the greenhouse being on a different piece of property, and they were told to take it down.

Staff stated that an intent of the ordinance and state law is that nonconformities go away and things are brought back into compliance. Staff noted that they are now taking the next steps and doesn't believe the proposal tonight is the appropriate way forward. Staff stated that they would suggest putting guardrails in place.

The Commission then reviewed the Zoning Text Amendment Criteria from Section 21.4B of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. The proposed text amendment would clarify the intent of the ordinance.

The Commission found this criterion applies.

2. The proposed text amendment would correct an error or oversight in the ordinance.

The Commission found this criterion not applicable.

3. The proposed text amendment would address changes to the State legislation, recent case law or opinions from the Attorney General of the State of Michigan.

The Commission found this criterion does not apply.

4. The proposed text amendment would promote compliance with changes in other County, State or Federal regulations.

The Commission found this criterion does not apply.

5. In the event the amendment will add a use to a district, that use shall be fully consistent with the intent of the district and the character of the range of uses provided for within the district.

The Commission found this criterion to be consistent regarding intent.

6. The amendment will not create incompatible land uses within a zoning district, or between adjacent districts.

The Commission found this criterion applies.

7. The proposed text amendment is supported by the findings of reports, studies, or other documentation on functional requirements, contemporary building practices, environmental requirements and similar technical items.

The Commission found this criterion applies.

8. As applicable, the proposed change shall be consistent with the township's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services.

The Commission found this criterion applies.

9. The proposed change shall be consistent with the township's desire to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

The Commission found this criterion applies.

The Commissioners stated that they generally agree on most of the criteria. Mr. Sharp asked what the timeline would be if the Planning Commission drafted it themselves. Chairman Kortering said that the earliest would be at the June meeting. Staff confirmed that this is a motion to recommend that the Township Board approve it. Mr. Barajas asked if the Township Board could add additional guidelines. Staff stated that the Township Board could deny it, send it back to the Planning Commission for more consideration, or approve it. Mr. Sharp asked if they could attach to the recommendation that they are comfortable with the intent of the amendment but understand they might share some of their concerns. Staff stated that the Township Board receives the application and tonight's minutes.

** It was moved by Molotky and supported by Barajas to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Article 9 – Specific Use Requirements, Section 9.20 – Outdoor Display, Sales, Temporary of the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township to the Township Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 1, Absent – 2. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Crossings Court Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan, submitted by William Sikkel of Sikkel & Krommendyk, PLC on behalf of 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 were Bill Sikkel of Sikkel & Krommendyk PLC, 320 N 120th Avenue, Suite 150, Holland, MI 49424 and Tom Vroon of T2 Properties LLC, 611 136th Street, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Sikkel stated that they were here back in December 2025 on a different application but with the same project seeking a modification to an existing PUD. Mr. Sikkel noted that the last application in December had two components including changing the existing site plan and approval of the contractor use on the new building going up. Mr. Sikkel stated that it came up that contractor facility means contractor facility and not personal storage because it doesn't generate job growth and there's a lot of this use already in the Township. Chairman Kortering agreed and said they are being consistent. Mr. Sikkel stated they had to come back with some changes to the plan and that there was no problem with the contractor use but no boat and RV storage. Mr. Sikkel noted that boat and RV storage is very important to his client. Chairman Kortering asked if the boat and RV storage was for the new building or the old one. Mr. Sikkel stated that it was for both and was already allowed in the existing building. Chairman Kortering stated that they specifically said no to boat and RV storage for the new building.

Mr. Sikkel stated that he went back to look at what was and wasn't approved in 2016 for the original Crossings Court PUD. Mr. Sikkel noted that they aren't coming here to do something brand new and that boat and RV storage was originally approved for this site. Mr. Sikkel stated that in 2016 when this project was presented, it had two components to it: the west building (lots 2 and 3) which is the existing building and the east side which is lot 4. Chairman Kortering asked if it was completed within the time frame of the PUD. Mr. Sikkel stated that he didn't think so. Mr. Sikkel noted that the east side has not been developed and that's what they are seeking approval for. Mr. Sikkel stated the idea was that the east lot was to be used for things in addition to what the west lot was.

Mr. Sikkel noted that there's a comment in the April 12, 2016, meeting minutes that says Mr. Hoeve next introduced the final resolution and report for the Crossings Court PUD indicating what was allowed on the west two lots which was designed for C-1 and C-2 uses plus the boat, RV, and car storage and that lot 4 would be permitted the same uses and exceptions as lots 2 and 3 with the addition of I-1 permitted uses. Mr. Sikkel reiterated that the meeting minutes stated that the east lot was allowed for everything on the west side plus I-1 uses plus contractor yard. Mr. Sikkel stated that the original resolution and report didn't state that as precisely as what it said in the meeting minutes, and it was always the intent for the east side to be used for the same things as the west side. Chairman Kortering confirmed that he is basing that on the meeting minutes not the resolution and report for the PUD. Mr. Sikkel stated that's what the request was and that's what the discussion was in the meeting minutes and that it was an oversight in the final resolution and report. Mr. Sikkel noted that the original intent was always to have the east side like the west side.

Mr. Sikkel stated that the original approval included everything in the I-1 uses which includes warehousing and noted that the definition of warehousing is storage of household goods or commercial goods. Chairman Kortering asked Staff to clarify the definition of warehousing. Staff noted that was correct, but it's important to point out that warehousing and cartage business was the term used at the time. Mr. Sikkel noted that in 2016 there was a category called warehouse and cartage business but that today it's defined as storage of household goods and commercial goods. Staff noted that the word businesses was included in the 2016 use. Mr. Sikkel noted that it said warehouse and cartage business and not warehouse business and cartage business.

Mr. Sikkel stated that the east lot was approved for I-1 uses. Staff confirmed it is zoned commercial and underlying C-2 for the PUD. Mr. Sikkel noted that the east lot was allowed C-1, C-2 and I-1 uses and stated that the 2025 approval was not finalized yet. Staff stated that the final approval was subject to receiving a new site plan to address items like outdoor storage setbacks. Mr. Sikkel noted that the original 2016 approval included I-1 uses which today includes warehousing defined as facilities for the storage of furniture and household goods or commercial goods. Chairman Kortering asked where boat storage fit in that definition. Mr. Sikkel stated that he believed it would be household personal property.

Chairman Kortering asked about the timeframe of the PUD. Staff noted that the 2016 PUD should have been completed in 2019. Chairman Kortering stated that they understand his points, but the 2016 PUD should have been completed in 2019 so it's hard to cite something from 2019 for 2025. Mr. Sikkel noted that this is not a new project and the Township ordinance states the use harmonious and fits in. Mr. Sikkel stated there will be 6 units and some of them will be used for contractor facilities and there are potential buyers interested in purchasing the units for boat and storage purposes.

Chairman Kortering noted that the Township has too many storage units and want to use the land for taxable uses. Mr. Sikkel noted that there is still a demand for storage units. Ms. Molotky asked why the PUD wasn't completed by 2019. Mr. Sikkel stated that the economy was the reason. Mr. Sikkel noted that they couldn't get any commercial uses back there because nobody wanted to buy by the train tracks and they have no visibility from the road so they couldn't put any more restaurants or store fronts. Mr. Sikkel stated that's why the owner of the property wanted to build storage units. Mr. Sikkel confirmed that the west building has a blend of contractor facility units and boat and storage units. Mr. Sikkel stated they wanted to have the same as the west side, which can include a contractor company, but the owner also uses it for personal storage.

Ms. Huesman asked if the units were for sale. Mr. Sikkel confirmed that the units would be owner occupied. Ms. Huesman noted that this PUD is different especially within the surrounding area. Ms. Huesman stated that at the December 2025 meeting, they were not aware of the original 2016 PUD. Staff stated that the original PUD approval anticipated one user on this property, one contractor facility with an outdoor storage yard. What has changed is that currently this site might be too big for one user so now instead it could be six smaller businesses not intended for storage per the pending 2025 recommendation for approval.

The Commissioners agreed that storage would be acceptable if the land cannot be used for any other purpose. The Commissioners agreed that instead of looking at the history of the PUD, they would be more inclined to approve if the approach was that they can't find another use for the property. The Commissioners agreed that the property is too small for anything that's going to create jobs other than individual contractor facilities and lean toward what's the best use for the parcel.

Mr. Vroon stated that the idea was never to have mini storage and that their vision was to have contractor facilities and most contractors like to store their boats. Chairman Kortering asked if the aesthetics were going to be similar. Mr. Vroon stated that it would look more like a contractor facility because the ones next door were designed by the architect to look more like livable spaces. Mr. Vroon noted that he thinks that's part of the reason they didn't sell because they weren't really user friendly. Mr. Vroon stated that the new contractor facility will be what you normally see with the big overhead door but will be hidden behind everything on that road. Mr. Vroon noted that the facade will be a 4' high masonry block and then metal panels above. Staff stated that a big difference is that you will see the overhead doors. Mr. Sharp confirmed that the intention is owner occupied for-sale units.

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

The Commissioners discussed that the location of the property is not readily visible and that the contractor facility of six units is a good use of the property. Staff asked if they should reevaluate the full list of uses that this can be used for. The Commissioners discussed that typically when they approve storage units they put a limitation on no residential dwelling and no hazardous materials stored on site.

Ms. Huesman asked if they were working off the old PUD. Staff noted that the PUD expired so this amendment can be used to reestablish it, and it's appropriate at this time to review all uses and restrictions since it's been approved there's a new master plan and new zoning ordinances. Chairman Kortering asked Staff how to go about that. Staff stated that question should be put to the applicant to see what they want to use the building for and use that as a starting point. Mr. Sikkel stated what if the uses were whatever is in C-2, the underlying zoning, or whatever complies with the existing C-2 plus storage and contractor facility. Chairman Kortering asked if they were removing the I-1 overlay. Mr. Sikkel confirmed C-2 with contractor facility and toy barn storage. Staff stated that they agree with the elimination of I-1 uses and a PUD resolution report to outline the east lot approval for permitted uses in the C-2 as well as permission for the contractor facility and warehouse use consisting of personal storage.

Chairman Kortering asked what happens to the December 25 approval. Staff noted that the applicant could withdraw that request. Staff noted that this would basically be the same approval that was presented in December, same building footprint, same outdoor storage area, same landscaping relief along the western property boundary, but they are asking to include permission to have the warehouse use without the 2025 restrictions. Chairman Kortering asked what needs to go into the motion. Staff stated the motion would approve the request as presented including the warehouse use and add stipulations to include no residential dwellings and no hazardous material storage. Staff noted that the resolution and report would cover everything talked about at this meeting and would come back to the Planning Commission for review.

** It was moved by Huesman and supported by Molotky to advise Staff to prepare a Resolution and Report recommending approval of the proposed Crossings Court PUD Amendment for review at the next Planning Commission meeting with the following conditions:

- It is subject to a withdrawal of the December 2025 PUD Amendment application;
- That no residential dwellings or hazardous materials are permitted on site; and

- The approved uses are subject to the permitted uses in the underlying C-2 Community Commercial Zoning District, including permission for contractor facility, warehousing, and outdoor storage uses.

A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. Motion carried.

Mr. Sikkel stated that he is formally requesting withdrawal of the application that was considered at the December 2025 Planning Commission meeting.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Barajas to approve to accept his withdrawal. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for outdoor sales and display of firewood, bagged products, propane, bottled water and windshield washing fluid for the gas station. The petition is submitted by Craig Wheeler of Meijer, Inc. for property located at 3320-3228 West Shore Drive described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-09-300-086. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial and FP Floodplain.

Present for this request were Craig Wheeler and Luis Paredes Espinoz of Meijer, 3320 West Shore Drive, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Wheeler stated that they are requesting a special land use permit to continue to sell merchandise outside of the gas station. Mr. Wheeler noted that they received a code enforcement and weren't aware a special land use permit was needed. Mr. Espinoz noted that concern came from not having a permit and having items displayed near the pumps. Mr. Espinoz stated that they are fully willing and able to adjust whatever is needed.

Chairman Kortering asked if he read the comments from the Fire Chief which stated that he doesn't support sales areas between the gas pumps that include flammable and combustible items. Mr. Espinoz stated that he had read the staff report and noted that they had palletized firewood between the gas pumps. Staff confirmed that any approval conditions will need to reflect not allowing combustible materials including firewood, mulch, and washer fluid.

Chairman Kortering clarified that the display areas need to comply with the minimum required building setbacks for C-2 and that the display areas need to be on paved areas. Chairman Kortering noted concern that the displays looked to be wider than the cement base for the gas pumps. Staff stated they have height and width concerns possibly causing problems for drivers. Mr. Espinoz stated that they don't really have a need or desire to continue to have the palletized product by the gas pumps. Mr. Espinoz noted that they really want to keep outdoor displays by the front of the building. Mr. Espinoz confirmed that they are okay with no product at all by the gas pumps; product would be just along the front of the building.

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

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 this standard has been met.

- 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 this standard has been met.

- 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 agreed as long as the restrictions are included.

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

The Commissioners stated this standard has been met.

- 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 agreed since they are an existing business.

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

The Commissioners stated that they have no concerns since they are an established business.

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

The Commissioners agreed since they are already operating.

Mr. Sharp asked about the height of the display items by the building. Staff noted that the applicant is planning to put three storage racks to the north end of the building on the sidewalk. Staff noted that it will be potentially important for the applicant to consider some parking blocks and that it would be good to address that in the motion. Mr. Barajas asked if there were already parking blocks there. Mr. Espinoz stated that there are poles already there.

** It was moved by Molotky and supported by Sharp to approve the Special Land Use Permit for outdoor sales and display of firewood, bagged products, propane, bottled water and windshield washing fluid for the gas station for Parcel 70-16-09-300-086 with the conditions that there is no merchandise to be stored or displayed by the gas pumps, and they must have parking blocks or bollards for customer protection in front of the displays located in front of the building. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. Motion carried.

Tabled Business

2332 & 2352 North Park Dr - Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan - 70-16-21-100-046 & -045 - Request by Michael Lewis of Chick-Fil-A Inc for a dual-use development containing the existing Chick-Fil-A and existing Quality Car Wash. The proposed Planned Unit Development would allow Chick-Fil-A to expand their outdoor meal delivery operation by creating a second drive-thru lane. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled January 6, 2026)

The item is to remain tabled.

Planning Commission Discussion

Staff noted that Fillmore Township has provided a notice of intent to prepare a master plan in case anyone wanted to take a view of their master plan proposal and process.

Communication from Zoning Board of Appeals

Staff stated that ZBA has been considering oversized accessory buildings. Staff noted the most recent one was for a 3,072 square foot accessory building on an 11-acre parcel and the ZBA granted it. Staff stated that the ZBA asked that the Planning Commission consider allowing larger buildings on larger properties.

Chairman Kortering asked if ZBA wanted action through a text amendment. Staff confirmed that ZBA would like the Planning Commission to consider a text amendment. Mr. Sharp asked if there was any concern with the number of buildings on the property. Staff noted that this was not brought up by the ZBA. Ms. Huesman asked about the frequency of this request. Staff noted that this is the first one in a couple of years. Mr. Barajas stated that he deals with it a lot in the real estate world where people want bigger accessory buildings. Chairman Kortering recommended that Staff look into it as a potential text amendment change. Staff stated they would start by identifying how many properties zoned residential suitable for a single family home which would be R-1, R-2 and R2-A that are over 3 acres.

Housing Study

Chairman Kortering voiced concern with owner-occupied residential units and that the major concerns are the willingness of people that own property to sell it and the infrastructure costs. Chairman Kortering inquired about ideas to encourage more owner-occupied residential units.

Mr. Barajas noted that the moratorium a few years back affected that direction because it pushed people to a certain area and those property owners raised their price significantly. Mr. Barajas stated that this made land more expensive, so it made more sense for the developers to put in multifamily units. The Commissioners discussed the former moratorium and the master plan.

Chairman Kortering noted that the small house footprint is good for the right situation and in the right setting but does not solve the problem. The Commissioners talked about what could be done to incentivize the builders willing to build owner-occupied housing and how to lower infrastructure costs. The Commissioners discussed the affordability of housing versus income in the Township. Ms. Huesman spoke about what was going on at Lakeshore Advantage Service. The Commissioners discussed that people that rent need to be close to where they work and more like an urban center versus people commuting to work.

Preliminary Ordinance Discussion on Battery Energy Storage Systems

Staff stated that they have been refining the language and reviewing what other communities are doing. The Commissioners agreed that they should do something. Staff noted that a revised draft could be provided at the next meeting so valuable input and good discussion could begin.

Chairman Kortering confirmed that an applicant could go with the state but that would probably take longer so if we had our own restrictions and guidelines, they might follow it because it would be faster. Chairman Kortering noted that the state doesn't appear to be as focused on aesthetics.

Staff discussed PA 233 which covers utility scale projects that includes solar, wind and battery energy and that the Township could adopt a CREO (Compatible Renewable Energy Ordinance) which is basically you adopt what the state says. Staff stated that they would recommend an incompatible workable ordinance so there would be base regulations for battery energy storage, not just utility scale and that it would still be regulated by the Township. Staff discussed the setbacks the state CREO requires versus what the Planning Commission might require. The Commissioners agreed that they should move forward with Staffs' workable ordinance.

Staff discussed setbacks other communities have adopted. Mr. Sharp asked if these other communities are taking noise and voltages of power into consideration. Staff talked about the noise section of last month's draft, and they are looking at different options. The Commissioners discussed the possibility of a special meeting to discuss this in more detail.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Webb
Recording Secretary