

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
November 5, 2019

Present: Chairman Marion Hoeve, Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Dennis Gebben, Randy Kortering, Norm Nykamp, Ken Bosma and Ed Zylstra. Also present were Community Development Director John Said, Assistant Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

Absent: None

Public Comment: The following individuals were in attendance to present their opinions on the safety of the new 5G technology coming into the West Michigan area.

Lisa Bomers RN, Safe Technology Educator with Michiganders of Safe Technology. Ms. Bomers presented information in regards to new 5G technology that is being rolled out in communities across the country without safety studies regarding short- and long-term safety effects. Her concern is with the potential health risks this technology possesses. She believes that this technology emits microwave radio frequency radiation. The towers are expected to be placed every 3-10 homes in neighborhoods and every 500' in public areas. This is going to increase the rise in RF exposure. Studies have shown that RF exposure through our wireless devices has been linked to severe health problems. She is asking the Township to support a moratorium to stop the roll out of 5G in our Township until more research can be done on this topic. She provided more information for the Commission to review.

Maija Hahn, Director of Michiganders of Safe Technology. Ms. Haan is available for the Township to come to her to obtain resources and education material for additional information on these potential health risks and get information on studies that have been done. Municipal Attorney Michael J Watz is available to assist municipalities develop strong ordinances and resolutions. She is asking that the Township pass a resolution of a moratorium for small cell installation in Michigan's public rights of way until safe levels are established for long term exposure.

Lisa Treet, East Grand Rapids, works in the field of Building Biology. Ms. Treet tests for environment issues like RF, mold and electrical fields in home offices, schools and public places. Significant increases in the exposure to radio radiation in our daily lives has been noted in the recent years. There have been numerous health complications in our everyday health. The installation of the new 5G technology will significantly increase the exposure to this radiation. Due to the health concerns she is asking that the Township create a protective ordinance to provide appropriate setbacks for schools, sleeping spaces within homes, and parks.

Amy Caspian, Member of the Safe Technology Group. Ms. Caspian shared an article regarding the 5G technology and its health effects. She believes that there is clear evidence and studies that this technology has caused cancer and breaks down DNA. Due to the installation of these towers in such close proximity to homes the amount of radiation exposure is increase significantly. She is asking that the Township enact a Commission to study the effects of 5G.

Mr. Hoeve thanked the presenters and stated that they would pass along information to the Township Board.

** Motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of October 1, 2019, was made by Mr. Kortering, supported by Mr. Zylstra. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a special use request submitted by Rose Park Christian Elementary School, to allow farm animals on school properties with a minimum of five (5) acres. These amendments, which would include changes to several areas of the Zoning Ordinance include Sec. 9.14 (Keeping of Farm Animals, Chickens and Bees), would allow operating schools to have a maximum of five (5) farm animals on their properties.

Miska Rynsburger, Holland Christian Schools – Rose Park Christian Elementary School, was present to speak to this request. She had two students read essays as to why pygmy goats should be allowed on school property. The first student was Persephone Beebe (6th grade). She stated that there are three (3) reasons pygmy goats should be allowed on school property. First, they like to be around people, they are domesticated animals and adapt well to a variety of climates and are easy to take care of. Second, she said that having the goats is a good way to teach the students responsibility. Third, goats have been proven to help students with disabilities or with high anxiety. The goats help to relieve stress and nervousness. The second student was Paisley VanDenBeldt (1st grade). She asked the Commission to grant an amendment to allow their school to have 3 pygmy goats.

Ms. Rynsburger stated that the property is currently zoned commercial and residential and that under the current zoning farm animals would not be allowed. They are asking for an amendment to allow schools to have up to five (5) adult animals on school property.

It was asked if the animals, because of being in close contact with small children, would need any special inoculations. Ms. Rynsburger stated that they would not. The Commission also inquired how the animals would be cared for during longer school breaks when no one was at the school. Ms. Rynsburger stated that they have families at the school with hobby farms that have already stated they would take the animals during these breaks to care for them. At this time, they are looking to obtain 3 pygmy goats but, in the future, could possibly add 2 chickens.

** It was moved by Mr. Bosma and supported by Mr. Zylstra to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Kortering asked if the applicant had read the staff report. Ms. Rynsburger stated that they had.

Mr. Hoeve stated that Corpus Christi Catholic school also has animals; however, they are zoned Agricultural so that was not a problem.

Mr. Gebben asked how the Commission is to move forward with this request. Staff responded that the Township attorney advised that if this amendment was approved that then the school should apply for a Special Use and that the neighbors in a 300' radius be informed of the use. Mr. Gebben also asked if the staff report limited the number of animals. Staff responded that it was suggested to limit the number to five (5) adult animals. This would mean that they should look into possible husbandry issues as well. They also stated there is no regard to types of animals stated. Mr. Gebben also questioned the hatching of chicks in many classrooms, is that going against the ordinance? Staff stated that it is not because they are not adult animals, and because baby chicks are primarily kept inside.

Mr. Nykamp inquired if they would be able to limit the types of animals once the special use is before them. Staff indicated that they would be able to specify types of animals, along with rules regarding the types of structures, fencing, cleanliness, care taking over night, inclement weather, etc., requirements.

Mr. Hoeve stated that all criteria have been met.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Nykamp to approve the request with the recommendations by staff in the staff report. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened the Public Hearing for a proposed special use request submitted by Roberto Arrendondo, Beto's Garage for land addressed at 198 Manufacturers Drive, Suite 10, described more specifically as parcel number 70-16-17-310-001. The applicant is seeking permission for vehicle repair and outdoor storage. The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial District.

The request is for vehicle repair and associated outdoor storage of vehicles awaiting service. This particular business has been in operation for several years, but never obtained approval for a Special Use and now wishes to establish compliance through obtaining approval for this request.

Beto's Garage occupies the approximate north half of the garage building, within which are three repair bays. There is one overhead door leading into the space from the north parking/driveway area. The space also includes miscellaneous ancillary uses associated with a repair facility; storage, waiting room, and office. There are approximately 5 parking stalls to the north of the building used by Beto's.

David Macias was present to speak on behalf of Mr. Arrendondo. He asked if there were any questions from the Commission. Mr. Hoeve asked about landscaping. He indicated that Mr. Arrendondo is a tenant and not the owner of the property but that the landlord is more than willing to add any required landscaping the Commission would like.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired about parking. Mr. Macias stated that they can have 4-6 vehicles parked waiting to be serviced. Mr. Arrendondo is the only mechanic and he can have up to 3 vehicles in the bays at one time.

Mr. Bosma asked if there have been any formal complaints or issues during the time frame Beto's Garage has been in this location. Staff answered that there has not been any issue other than a sign that did not meet code and that situation was easily remedied.

Mr. Hoeve mentioned that this special use is being submitted to bring Mr. Arrendondo up to code, not for a new business.

Mr. Nykamp ask if outdoor storage is allowed as currently zoned. Staff indicated that it is allowed in Industrial areas as a special use. Mr. Hoeve followed up by asking if a vehicle parked outside is considered storage or parking? Staff answered that it depends if the car has a license plate, whom the vehicle is registered to and if the vehicle is operable. If it is not registered to the property owner or does not have a plate or is not operable then it would be storage.

Scott Steggerda, Owner, Quality Machine & Automation raised concerns with the number of vehicles that are regularly parked on the property. He stated that there can be up to 15 cars at a time parked in the lot. Some of them are there for months at a time. He says it looks like a junk yard and would like to see

it cleaned up and a limit to the number of vehicles that are allowed to be parked there. Mr. Steggerda also submitted pictures that he has taken of the business and the parking issues.

** It was moved by Mr. VanderMeulen and supported by Mr. Bosma to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Hoeve asked how we are able to enforce the concerns over the vehicles. Staff said that complaints can be called in and the Township will send a code enforcement officer out. The Commission can make a limit to the number of vehicles parked outside at a time and that would make it enforceable. Mr. Nykamp stated that the Commission has done this in the past.

Mr. Nykamp asked if it is possible to put a time limit on how long a vehicle is allowed to be on the property. Staff said that would be difficult to enforce.

Mr. Gebben stated that he would like to see a plan as to how the outside property is to be managed as is applied to parked cars, dumpsters/garbage, automotive parts that are removed from vehicles, etc. Mr. Macias stated that any automotive parts are stored in the building. Mr. Arrendondo will work with any requests the Commission would like him to comply with.

Mr. Zylstra inquired how many parking spaces does Beto's Garage currently have. It appears that they have eight (8) spaces, including four (4) spaces behind the building.

Mr. VanderMeulen is concerned if the business grows that Mr. Arrendondo could add more mechanics. Is there a way we can limit the number of employees? Staff indicated that is not enforceable.

Mr. Macias indicated that the back half of the building has been vacant for some time and that they currently are using those parking spaces.

Mr. Gebben stated that if 2-4 businesses can be in the building is it possible to specify how many spaces each of the units has and how those spaces are to be used?

** It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Bosma to table the hearing until a plan can be submitted to define how the outside area and parking spaces are to be used, to have the applicant get the owner's approval of parking designated for Beto's, and to have the applicant complete a landscape plan with the owners approval, and to get the landscape plan approved by Staff. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened the Public Hearing for a special use at 11344 E Lakewood Blvd by Mike Winkler of Building Safety Consultants o.b.o. Mark's Detailing for an amendment to the previously approved (2005) vehicle wash/ vehicle repair facility (the 2005 approval also included vehicle sales but the applicant has indicated they do not engage in the activity. Staff Note: The applicant confirmed in writing via email that they have withdrawn that previous approval.) The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

The expansion consists of adding a row of seven (7) parking spaces along the southern edge of the property, fronting the Chicago Drive access road.

Mr. Winkler gave some back history on this property. Stating that the owner's believed, through working with former Zoning Administrator, Jon Mersman, years ago that they were in compliance with the Township on their parking and drainage. Mr. Winkler stated that the owners are coming to the

Commission instead of going through an attorney hoping to be able to get this taken care of without any legal means.

In the staff report it talks about the need for an access isle. Mr. Winkler stated that this not needed in this situation due to the nature of the business. They regularly have small fleets of vehicles dropped off from dealerships to be detailed and they stack these vehicles while they are working on them. The staff report also mentions drainage being an issue. Mr. Winkler said that these issues were addressed years ago and had been taken care of then through the zoning administrator not through the Ottawa County Water Resource Commission. The owner is willing to do what the Commission recommends. The other point made in the staff report is landscaping. It was stated that there just isn't room on the property to add any trees.

Mr. Hoeve asked Mr. Winkler if the owners had anything in writing from Mr. Mersman. Mr. Winkler stated they did not but there are witnesses that this all happened. Mr. Gebben inquired if Mr. Mersman would be willing to submit something in writing that he approved this?

Staff also stated that tandem parking is specifically noted in the Zoning Ordinance as not allowed. If the Commission would allow tandem parking for this business then it would stay with that property for future owners to also be able to use tandem parking. This is not something we can take back again after a new tenant moves in. Staff is suggesting using some creativity and coming up with a way to create a drive aisle and still get the additional parking they are looking for. If there is a disagreement on this it can be referred to the Zoning Board of Appeals for them to deal with this. Also, an appeal to a staff decision can be made to the Zoning Board to make a determination.

Mr. Winkler suggested that the Commission make a motion only allowing detailing cars to be allowed to be tandemly parked. That way it would not follow to future tenants on the property.

Staff stated that no outdoor storage is allowed in C-2 zoned parcels. Therefore, the vehicles that are there without license plates are considered storage which is not in compliance with code.

Mr. Winkler stated that this is a very unique situation and that car dealerships in the Township also have this same situation of cars without license plates and that they also stack vehicles. Can Commission put in a stipulation that this stacked parking is for this particular type of business only?

Mr. Zylstra asked if the business owner owns the space. Mr. Winkler stated they own the condo units 7, 8 & 9. Mr. Zylstra also questioned what is currently designated as parking. It was determined the 12 spaces in front of the business along with the angled parking to the north. Mr. Winkler pointed out that they have been very sensitive to making sure they keep all vehicles in spaces directly surrounding their business and not encroaching on the other business / tenants in the building.

Tim Lubbers from Busscher's Septic & Excavating, spoke in support of Mark's Detailing. He stated they are very good neighbors; the parking spots are not always full (only when they get a large job from a dealership) and they do a very good business. He feels that the drainage that was done when the gravel was put in was appropriate as he is in that line of work.

Mr. Hoeve inquired if 3-4 more parking spaces would be enough instead of the 7 asked for. Staff responded that they are more than willing to work with the applicant on a design to get the most spaces possible and maintain an access isle.

** It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Zylstra to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

** It was moved by Mr. Bosma and supported by Mr. VanderMeulen to table the hearing to allow the applicant time to work with Staff on a new design. All in favor. Motion carried.

Other Business

13341 Quincy Street, John Shaw/GNS America – Tabled at October 1, 2019 Meeting – Craig Gengler from Driesenga & Associates was present to speak to this special use request for outdoor storage. The property is zoned I-2 General Industrial District.

The request is for outdoor storage along the north and east sides of the building and parking lot. Items stored outside primarily consist of pallets, bins, containers, and other materials related to the operation of this facility. Based on areal imagery, GNS began extensive outdoor storage over the last several years without first seeking special use approval from the Township, and is now seeking to obtain approval for that outside storage.

The applicant proposes to install berms, landscaping, and fencing along the site edges to sufficiently screen the outside storage from adjacent views. Since the last meeting, the applicant has submitted plans indicating screening, and Staff will confirm conformance to applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Engler stated that they are working with Staff on screening and landscaping design. The screening would hide the storage areas from the neighbors. There is already natural screening along the east of the property by the way of a line of trees on the adjacent parcel. They are proposing a windscreen which is a mesh product that attaches to the existing fencing. They are also looking to add some extra parking and paving on-site. This would allow them to move employee parking away from semi-truck maneuvering. Staff is suggesting that the new landscaping be planted in the spring when they are sure it will take hold well.

Mr. Bosma questioned drainage with the berm that is in the plans. Mr. Engler stated that they have taken out the berm from the initial drawing to allow for drainage and to allow future access to the road. Mr. Bosma questioned if they could keep the berm with designed low points to maintain necessary drainage. Mr. Engler stated they really don't want the berm but would rather plant large mature evergreen trees as a visual block.

Mr. Hoeve is concerned about complaints from neighbors seeing the storage above the fence line. Mr. Engler stated that they are working to make sure storage does not go above the 8' fence line.

An Operation Manager from GNS was present to respond to a question regarding what is being stored on site. He responded that they store many empty storage containers, bins and pallets on the property. Mr. VanderMeulen asked how they handle rodents in the empty storage containers. It was answered they use Rose Pest Control to keep the rodents out.

** It was moved by Mr. Bosma and supported by Mr. VanderMeulen to approve the special use subject to Water Resource Commission approval and that the height of the storage does not exceed the height of the fence. All in favor. Motion carried.

Quincy Street and 136th, Northwest Corner – Dan Larabel / Westview Capital LLC – Tabled at October 1, 2019 Meeting – The applicant is seeking Preliminary Site Condominium approval for a 213-lot detached

single-family home development, to be called Silverwater. In its entirety, the subject property contains approximately 83.76 acres.

The applicant (Westview Capital/Allen Edwin Homes) obtained approval for rezoning of the subject site to R-1 Low Density Residential and R-2 Moderate Density Residential. The rezoning was heard by the Planning Commission at their August 6, 2019 meeting, and the Township Board provided final approval (second read) at their meeting on September 5, 2019.

Todd Stuve from Excel Engineering spoke on this request. He stated that they are planning on 3 ponds/lakes ranging from 3.5 – 4.9 acres. The whole development being proposed is 213 units. The plan consists of 6 phases total. Phase 1 consists of 40 lots in the western portion of the property. The revised plans show 2 entry points on Quincy St. with 3 internal roadway systems. They have increased the right-of-way along 136th from 50' to 60' with a 10' open space strip along the right-of-way and a 30' landscaping easement beyond that. They also adjusted the right-of-way along Quincy from 33' to 50' with a 10' buffer strip and a 10' landscaping easement beyond that. Landscaping buffering plans have been provided.

Staff recommends that the layout be slightly redesigned to accommodate a new street entrance off 136th. Mr. Stuve stated that the Ottawa County Road Commission is not requiring the entrance but is not opposed to it if the Commission requires it. The goal of the developers is to keep residential traffic away from the industrial traffic along 136th Street and create a significant buffer for the residents from the industrial properties across the street. They would like to maintain the residential character at each of the entry points and that would be difficult with the industrial facilities directly across the street.

In regards to the 5-acre parcel located at 13803 Quincy, the developers have been in contact with the owner and they are not interested in selling that property at this time. They also talked to the Road Commission about putting a stub going to that 5-acre parcel and the County is not in favor of a stub leading to such a small parcel that could potentially end up being used for a private road extension. In that case, the stub would have to be torn out to avoid a cult-de-sac and a new road put in.

The staff report also listed pedestrian access as a concern. The developer is proposing a path between 2 of the ponds and a second path at the west end of the property going to Quincy Park. A 5' sidewalk, 10' open space strip and 10' buffer easements on either side are being proposed. To maintain the integrity of the path they are suggesting restricting sheds/accessory buildings within those 10' easement so that neighbors are not able encroach on the public area. Staff is recommending 20' wide open space areas without easements encumbering adjacent lots. Mr. Larabel stated that they are at 10' with 10' easements which is essentially the same. Mr. Dan Larabel suggested they could do a split rail fence with landscaping to provide a border to the public path and a visual boundary for neighbors to prevent encroachment. Mr. Hoeve stated he would like to see the fencing and landscaping as close to the border as possible. Mr. Larabel stated that putting sporadic fencing and landscaping would prevent owners from encroaching. Mr. Nykamp likes that the landscaping would be a visible reminder to the homeowners where the line is. Staff expressed concerns that over the long term, homeowner installations (such as fences and sheds) may tend to creep over the lines into easements. They also have seen HOA's change their minds and become more lax with the rules. Staff would like to see both paths on separate parcels, not involving an easement, to make the neighborhood open space as wide as possible. Mr. Larabel said they were not interested in doing that, the most they will do is a 20' easement. That if it came down to that they would then take the path out altogether. They felt putting the path in was a nice gesture for the residents by providing them an easier access to the neighboring park. Staff also indicated that the easement may need

to be wider for drainage. This will be determined by the Water Resource Commission after approval of the Preliminary Plan by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hoeve and Mr. Bosma both are concerned about not having an access point to 136th. Their concern is ease of access for residents coming in and out of the development as well as any potential road closures in the future along Quincy. If there was an additional access point along 136th that would give residents another way out. They suggested putting the access point around lots 184 & 185 which is at the very north end of the development. Mr. Larabel stated that it would depend how that lines up with the industrial driveways across the street. He will continue talks with the Road Commission to determine the best location of a driveway along 136th.

The question was raised when will the sidewalks/paths go in. Mr. Larabel indicated they would go when the home adjacent to it goes in. Mr. VanderMeulen would like to see them in by the time half of the lots are in so that those living there can use them. Mr. Stuive stated they can be installed as the phase is developed.

What about the width of the walkway between the ponds? Mr. Larabel stated they have more room there to make it wider if needed.

Mr. Bosma is still concerned with access to the small parcel that sits along Quincy in the middle of this development. He would like to see at least the space left open and setbacks put in place for an access stub to be built there in the future. Mr. Bosma suggested taking Lot 35 and holding it for a future public right of way and write it in the plan that it could be a private road rather than a public road.

Mr. Larabel is concerned with the maintenance of the vacant lot in the future after Westview is no longer involved in the development. Staff and the Commission directed Mr. Larabel to put something in the approval documents as to who is to maintain that area.

Mr. Stuive stated that there is still the unresolved issue of Staff's comment about building envelopes adjacent to drain easements. They are not interested in having the same building envelope for every lot and feel the building envelopes that may be reduced by such easements are still very buildable.

** It was moved by Mr. VanderMeulen and supported by Mr. Zylstra to grant preliminary approval with the following conditions: 1) address 136th Street access 2) address the easement width for the pathway (drainage requirements may affect the western path width, after preliminary approval the developers will then be able to go to the Drain Commission with plans and then get back to Commission with the requirements) 3) access to the 5-acre piece that is currently not owned and 4) clarify the type and placement of fencing along the path on the west part of the property. All in favor. Motion carried.

PUD - Quincy Street West of 120th, Robert McCaigue, Continental 512 Fund LLC – Proposed “Quincy Street Apartments” - The applicant is seeking Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for a 264-unit multi-family rental residential project, to be called Quincy Street Apartments, on the south side of Quincy Street, west of 120th Avenue. The subject property was recently rezoned to R-2A Medium Density Residential from the previous AG Agricultural District; the Future Land Use Plan for this site designates it as Medium Density Residential. The rezoning was heard by the Planning Commission at their June 4, 2019 meeting, and the Township Board provided final approval (second read) at their meeting on July 18, 2019.

The applicant's current plan proposes to develop the western portion of the property containing about 25 acres; the total property contains approximately 43.3 acres. The Zoning Ordinance specifies a maximum density of 10.89 dwelling units per acre (multi-family) in the R-2A District; the proposed development contains approximately 10.66 dwelling units per acre. Current plans show 11 two-story buildings, each containing 24 dwelling units.

The current proposal does not include the eastern portion of the property, which contains about 18 acres. The applicant's plans show potential future development consisting of additional multi-family and a possible senior living facility. However, these are not part of the proposed PUD, and the applicant would need to return to the Township for review and consideration of any development in the eastern portion.

Robert McCaigue from Continental 512 Fund LLC was present to talk about this project. They have been working with staff over the past month. They have submitted a new site plan with additional access for emergency vehicles.

They are looking forward to being the first in the area to provide the new studio apartment style. Looking for preliminary PUD approval to address two (2) sections in the ordinance. One for a reduction in the size of a studio and one-bedroom apartments. The second would be for a reduction to the storage area requirements.

They are looking for approval on the preliminary PUD so they can move forward with the Drainage Commission and continue to work with staff on the specific details. They are proposing the stated reductions based on market research and analysis and found this is what renters are looking for in today's market place.

Mr. VanderMeulen brought up how he would still like to see an access road going to Beeline Road. Mr. McCaigue stated they too would like to have a road going to Beeline Road; however, they do not own the land to Beeline Road. If the Commission requires a road then they will pursue that option further.

Mr. Hoeve asked about water and sewer utilities. Mr. McCaigue is proposing a 2000 linear foot sanitary extension to this site at their expense. It will also allow others along that line to tap into it and use it as well. This is through an easement that is already set. The water and storm water are already in place.

Mr. VanderMeulen is questioning on-site outdoor storage. Mr. McCaigue stated they are proposing on-site storage, either gravel or enclosed, for larger recreational items to be stored so that they are not scattered throughout the site. If they need to do a special use permit, they are willing to do that as well.

Mr. Hoeve is still concerned with the limited amount of indoor storage and the size of the studio and one-bedroom apartment. The studio apartments range from 527 to 618 sq. ft. (minimum 550 sq. ft.) and the smallest one-bedroom is 637 sq. ft. (minimum 727 sq. ft.). The three-bedrooms meet the requirements.

It was questioned if they could fill the small studio and one-bedroom apartments. Mr. McCaigue feels they are going to be overwhelmed with the number of people wanting these size apartments. Mr. Kortering knows someone in this situation who could not find a one-bedroom apartment to rent and had to go with a much more expensive two-bedroom, but would prefer a less expensive apartment. He sees the need for this type of apartment in the area.

Mr. Hoeve again asked about the lack of storage. Mr. McCaigue is stating that self-storage is becoming a big business. It is more cost effective for people to store their items in those rather than pay for a larger square footage apartment to store their items in.

Mr. VanderMeulen is not bothered so much with the indoor storage, understanding the market has changed for storage requirements. He is more concerned with the outdoor recreational vehicle storage. He sees the need for these smaller apartments as well. He recently spoke with an older single woman that would love a small apartment like this. He brought up the possible need for electric vehicle car chargers. Mr. McCaigue said that they are not currently planning on installing them; however, putting those chargers in is an easy thing to install if they find the need for them. They have done so in their other developments as residents have asked for them.

Mr. Hoeve is concerned with the proposed parking on the roadways. With parking on both sides of the road it causes traffic congestion. Mr. McCaigue indicated that this is a private road and he believes a 24' drive isle is wide enough. (Staff Note: drive aisle widths are subject to approval by the Fire Chief, who typically requires 26 feet in width for drives adjacent to buildings.) They are looking to keep parking in close proximity to their club house. They will comply with what the Commission requires but they would prefer to maintain parking along the road close to the club house.

The Commission went through the PUD Standards.

** It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Bosma to accept preliminary approval with the following conditions: 1) pursue access easement and connection to Beeline Road; 2) the on-site outdoor storage shall not be allowed; and 3) remove parking along the main access drive adjacent to the clubhouse and Building 1B. The Commission is approving the square footage submitted for all apartment layouts, as well as the tiered storage sizes. Yes – 6, No - 1. Motion carried.

12199 Felch Street – Planned Unit Development (PUD) Pre-Application Review Conceptual Residential Project - The applicants seek Planning Commission input for a conceptual proposed residential project on the subject property at 12199 Felch, which in total contains approximately 7.99 acres. The property consists of a single (now unified) parcel. The concept includes three multi-family residential buildings containing three stories each, with a total of 115 units (Note: the number of units will need to be adjusted slightly to 114, which is the maximum allowed if a 20% density bonus is granted for an approved PUD based on Sec. 16.3.D. of the Zoning Ordinance).

Vishal Arora, Magnus Capital Partners was present to present the proposed PUD containing affordable/workforce housing. They are coming tonight looking for feedback and to discuss the discretionary 20% zoning density bonus.

Mr. Arora stated that the proposed development is on approximately 8 acres of land currently zoned Commercial and Agricultural with the future land use designated as High Density Residential. The original plan consisted of 3 buildings with 114 units (including the 20% bonus) with one- two- and three-bedroom units. All units meet all ordinance requirements for square footage and storage.

Their revised plan indicates 2 buildings as to not overdevelop the property and be able to provide more amenities, which is what is currently attracting renters. The amenities they are proposing include a dog park, playground, open space, fitness center, community rooms, class rooms, packaging room (for picking

up delivery packages) and bike storage. They emphasize keeping all amenities centralized as to create community.

Mr. Gebben said it looks like the plan is on track. Mr. VanderMeulen asked what kind of construction they are presenting? Mr. Arora stated they are planning wood frame constructed buildings due to the flexibility allowed with that type of construction over block and plank buildings. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that block and plank is better for noise control. Mr. Arora said they would lose efficiencies on floor to ceiling height with a block and plank building. Staff commented that the limitation is 60' per 2018 zoning ordinance amendments and they are well within those standards. They will continue to work with Staff as they move forward.

Commission had a discussion with staff regarding when do we know when the market is saturated with apartments because it seems like there have been a large number of new apartments proposed in the last year. Staff commented that they are correct, the township has taken a chunk out of the housing shortage in the area over the past year. But we do need to be careful not to let it get from a shortage to a glut. It was requested that staff inform the Commission as to how many new units have been approved in 2019.

The proposed 2020 Planning Commission meeting schedule and submittal dates were reviewed and approved by Commission.

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 3, 2019 at 7:00 pm.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary