

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
August 11, 2020

Chairman Hoeve called the meeting to order via ZOOM due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic at 7:00 pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

Present: Chairman Marion Hoeve, Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Dennis Gebben, Randy Kortering, Norm Nykamp, Miska Rynsburger 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: None

** Motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of July 7, 2020, with one correction, was made by Mr. Zylstra and supported by Ms. Rynsburger. All in favor. Motion carried.

Public Hearings

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for a Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) submitted by Douglas Becker for property located at 11069 Mason Street, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-35-100-064. The applicant is requesting an amendment from AG Agricultural to R-1 Low Density Residential.

Mr. Becker was not present to speak to this request. Staff presented a summary of the request.

Staff stated that the property is located on Mason Street between Country Club Road and 104th Ave on the North side of the road. It is currently a single-family home located on 0.69 acres. The requested rezoning will not produce any non-conformity, in fact, Staff pointed out that it will eliminate a non-conformity due to the township's minimum requirement of 5 acres for an Agricultural parcel. Staff noted that this parcel is bordered by single family parcels to the north and south and AG parcels to the east and west.

Mr. Hoeve went through the standards and found that this request meets all of the standards.

- 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 proposed rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including both the current Plan and the proposed Plan. The subject site is shown with a Low Density Residential designation.

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

Staff has identified no conflicts with this provision.

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 property has already been developed with a detached single-family home, which is consistent with the proposed zoning and surrounding areas.

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 site is capable of accommodating the allowed uses as it has already been developed with a single-family home.

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

Staff noted that the Planning Commission may wish to identify specific issues as part of consideration for this property.

Mr. VanderMeulen questioned, if at this time, they should also rezone the parcel that is to the west of this property because this will leave one AG zoned parcel surrounded by all R-1 parcels. Staff indicated that they cannot do that at this time because the owner would need to bring that request to the Commission themselves in order for that to be changed.

Mr. Kortering asked why the Mr. Becker is requesting the rezoning? Staff answered that Mr. Becker would like to put in a pool and a deck. With the current AG setbacks, he does not have space but if it is zoned R-1 he would have plenty of room, due to the smaller setback requirements.

There was no one from the public present to comment on this request.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Ms. Rynsburger to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

There was no further discussion.

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

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for a Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) submitted by William Sikkel on behalf of Select Genetics LLC for property located at 300 N. Franklin, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-13-300-029. The applicant is requesting an amendment from AG Agricultural to R-2 Moderate Density Residential.

Mr. Bill Sikkel, attorney, and Mr. Brad VanderZwaag of Baumann Building, were present to speak to this request. Mr. Sikkel noted that they are requesting a rezoning from AG to R-2 for a single-family home subdivision. The concept presented shows 48 single family homes, along with 2 larger outlots with access from Felch. Mr. Sikkel stated the parcel is 17.985 acres and they are proposing a density of 2.67 homes per acre. A typical lot width in the proposed concept is 64' wide. Mr. Sikkel pointed out that the surrounding residential developments are also zoned R-2. He also noted that the Master Plan shows the future use of this land as low density residential which would be either R-1 or R-2 as stated in the Master

Plan. Mr. Sikkel noted that Staff has concerns that some of the building types allowed in R-2 would not conform to low density residential. He stated that the owner is offering, as a condition of rezoning, that there would not be any duplexes built on this site. The owner is also voluntarily offering a density cap of 2.75 homes per acre as a condition of rezoning. Mr. Sikkel pointed out that the Master Plan requires 1-4 homes per acre.

Mr. Hoeve is concerned about the land to the south that is owned by Mr. John Jansen. He would like to see the hatchery building taken down, as he feels it could become an eyesore in that neighborhood. Mr. Hoeve asked if the Commission can look at the entire area at one time and not leave out that one parcel. Mr. VanderZwaag answered that they have a very good working relationship with Mr. Jansen. He said they are looking at adding a stub street to connect to Mr. Jansen's parcel for potential future development and to make sure that Mr. Jansen isn't landlocked.

Mr. VanderZwaag also pointed out that the two outlots coming off from Felch would have a single shared driveway that would run on the property line. Staff responded to say that would not be allowed as they would not comply with the required low width to lot depth ratio and would need a common access easement not located on either of the lots. Mr. Hoeve suggested that the developers could possibly gain access to those outlots by removing one or two of the residential lots and creating an easement from the development.

Staff also noted that duplexes would not be allowed on this property, regardless of zoning, due to the fact that in R-2, duplexes have to be built on a primary road and neither Franklin nor Felch are primary roads. Mr. Sikkel pointed out that they are planning to build a very nice development of \$300,000-\$500,000 single-family homes.

Ms. Rynsburger asked why Staff would be hesitant to rezone to R-2? Staff responded that the size requirements between R-1 and R-2 vary quite a bit. They stated that the minimum road frontage requirement for R-1 is 70' and for R-2 it is 64'. They also pointed out that the total square footage of a parcel in R-1 is 10,500 sq. ft. and R-2 is 8,400 sq. ft. Staff noted that setbacks are very much the same in both. Staff is concerned about lot sizes and lot widths being too small compared to the surrounding area as the subdivisions to the east and west have wider lot widths. They also noted that the Fairfield subdivision, although zoned R-2, was built to exceed R-1 minimum standards. Staff's main concern is with the consistencies within the surrounding area.

Mr. Sikkel stated that the client is very happy to offer the conditions of density. Staff also pointed out that the application was for a straight rezoning and there are not typically conditions added. Staff asked how the density was calculated on the conceptual drawing? Mr. Sikkel and Mr. VanderZwaag stated that it is based on gross density not net density.

Mr. VanderMeulen said that it looks like the lots would then be about 9,000 sq. ft. He is concerned with the size homes they are proposing there would not be much grassy areas on these parcels.

Mr. Hoeve then opened the hearing up for public comments.

Mr. Jason Leeuw from 10042 Felch Street. Mr. Leeuw is concerned about the density of the proposed development. He stated that Fairfield's density is 1.85 homes per acre and with these subdivisions being connected via Strawberry Lane he feels like the density should be the same. He also questioned the definition of R-1. He was under the understanding that R-1 was low density and that R-2 was moderate density. He is concerned about this being zoned R-2 and not R-1.

Ms. Patti Dixon from 2738 Fairfield Drive. Ms. Dixon is concerned about the potential traffic issues. She said that Felch and 100th already get very busy with school traffic in the mornings and afternoons and adding a whole new subdivision will only add to the congestion. She is concerned about traffic that will

try to avoid the 4-way stop and instead take Strawberry Lane through their subdivision and the danger that poses to the children in the Fairfield subdivision. Ms. Dixon also pointed out that in the paperwork Mr. Sikkel submitted he states this subdivision would be moderate density. She is concerned because she will butt right up to this new development and she would like to see the density stay the same as the Fairfield subdivision. She also doesn't believe that those homes could possibly sell for \$300,000-\$500,000 on lots that are smaller than Fairfield. Ms. Dixon stated she would like to see Strawberry Lane blocked off so traffic cannot go down that road as a cut through to avoid the 4-way stop. Ms. Dixon said that the drawing shows 9 lots in the same size space that Fairfield has 6 lots and that concerns her about the density.

Mr. Mike Lyon of 10255 Strawberry Lane. Mr. Lyon stated that the Fairfield development is R-1 and he would like to see the same characteristics in this new development. Mr. Lyon believes this new development needs to be R-1. Mr. Lyon pointed out that the Knollwood development is R-2 and that is not what he would like to see next to Fairfield.

Ms. Sherri Dickman of 348 North Franklin. Ms. Dickman agrees with the concerns already brought up. She pointed out that in the letter Mr. Sikkel submitted to the township he stated there will not be any negative impacts and she believes there will be several negative impacts especially on traffic.

Mr. Neil Ruffner of 10268 Church Hill Court. Mr. Ruffner stated that Felch Street is a mess. He believes that rezoning to R-1 would be the only way to go. Mr. Ruffner pointed out that 800 sq. ft. is a very small house and not fitting for the area. Mr. Ruffner asked how they would fit a 1,400 sq. ft. home on a 65' wide lot? Mr. Ruffner would like to see the Commission approve this with conditions.

Mr. VanderZwaag pointed out that the homes they are planning would be 1,400 sq. ft. ranch homes and 1,800 sq. ft. 2-story homes minimum. Mr. VanderZwaag also stated that these are the size lots they work with all the time and they work just fine.

Mr. Hoeve asked what the minimum size of a R-2 home is. Staff answered that the minimum is 864 sq. ft. and with a 2-story home the first floor has a minimum of 645 sq. ft. leaving around 200 sq. ft. for the 2nd story. The R-1 District has a minimum square footage of 1,200 and with a 2-story home the first floor has a minimum of 900 sq. ft. leaving around 300 sq. ft. for the 2nd story.

Mr. VanderZwaag stated that they are willing to do a condition of a larger square footage of 1,400 sq. ft. minimum.

Mr. Todd Carpenter of 10243 Strawberry Lane. Mr. Carpenter stated that he believes this development should mimic how Fairfield Farms is laid out.

Mr. David Centers of 2648 Fairfield Drive. Mr. Centers believes this development would be unsightly if it did not match Fairfield with the same size lots. He stated that the proposal would have homes right on top of each other and that would not be compatible with the density in the Fairfield development. He is also concerned about traffic and the effects this would have on infrastructure.

Mr. Ken Stults 2622 Fairfield Drive. Mr. Stults is concerned about traffic and congestion that may end up on Strawberry Lane due to people trying to avoid the 4-way. He is also concerned about the road surface handling that increase of traffic.

Mr. Hoeve pointed out that the township required that stub on Strawberry Lane to be put in there to help with potential future development and traffic flow.

Ms. Sheri LaFrance at 10154 Felch Street. Ms. LaFrance asked if the minimum acreage for AG is 20 acres will the 3 existing parcels zoned AG be forced to change their zoning? Staff answered that the minimum acreage for AG is 5 acres and no those parcels will not be forced to change. Ms. La France asked if there

was a chance to put a driveway in between the current homes that have a 30' space? Staff answered that based on zoning requirements it is not possible for a driveway that narrow to connect the any more than 1 lot at a time.

Ms. Valarie Lyon of 10255 Strawberry Lane. Ms. Lyon is concerned about safety and maintaining the look of the Fairfield development into this new development.

Mr. Kevin Hoeksema of 10251 Deerfield Drive. Mr. Hoeksema stated that his kids wait for the bus at Felch and Fairfield. They walk to the bus stop to wait but with this new subdivision he is not sure he will feel comfortable having them wait on an even busier road with the additional traffic. Mr. Hoeksema also stated that Fairfield may be zoned R-2 but it is a very nice-looking subdivision and the proposed subdivision looks very congested. He is concerned that the added traffic will cause traffic to back up on Franklin.

Mr. Carpenter pointed out that if this were zoned R-2 there could be the equivalent of 2 houses on his size lot. Mr. Carpenter feels these are very small lots and that there will not be enough space for a yard for the kids to play. He asked others to take a look at other Baumann Building projects as they do not have much green space.

Ms. Dixon asked if this is rezoned and Baumann decides not to build and they sell to someone else can the new developers then develop something even more congested like duplexes under the R-2 zoning? Staff answered that no one would be able to build duplexes on this property because the existing roads are not classified as primary roads.

Mr. Michael Quick of 2770 Fairfield Drive. Mr. Quick stated that the sizes of the lots are significantly smaller than those of Fairfield. Mr. Quick is confused why Appendix A says R-1 is low density and R-2 is moderate density but here today it is being said that R-2 is also qualified as low density.

Mr. Centers doesn't think the builder is being honest about what they can get for these homes when they are on a smaller lot than Fairfield. He believes this development will lower Fairfield's property values.

Staff submitted a letter for the record from the Fairfield subdivision signed by 45 people representing 27 different households. They are asking the Planning Commission to vote no on this request. The letter notes that they as residents are concerned about lot sizes, home sizes, connection to the Fairfield Farms Subdivision and have questions about duplexes.

** Motion to close the public hearing by Mr. Kortering, supported by Mr. Zylstra. All in favor. Motion carried.

Ms. Rynsburger stated that since the Fairfield developer really developed that subdivision under R-1 criteria on R-2 zoned land she feels that zoning this land R-2 would be too aggressive for that area and that it would not fit well with the Fairfield Subdivision across the road.

Mr. Kortering agrees with Ms. Rynsburger.

Mr. Nykamp agrees with Ms. Rynsburger as well. He also stated that this would make a big impact on the area if it was developed R-2.

Mr. Zylstra agreed. He is concerned that there would not be any lawns on the lots.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that it is expensive to build right now so the house prices quoted are accurate. Building new is a costly venture and the developer is trying to keep costs down by putting as many houses on the land as possible.

The Commission then reviewed the standards for rezoning

Standards

- 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 proposed rezoning is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including both the current Plan and the proposed Plan. The subject site is shown with a Low-Density Residential designation, although the proposed zoning would allow for denser residential development, which is not supported by the Plan.

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

Staff has identified the physical incompatibilities between disparate uses as described above. Staff is unaware of any other issues concerning this site.

- 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 potential uses of the proposed zoning district would not be compatible with surrounding uses in terms of suitability, impacts, density, and traffic due to the potential for a denser development allowed in the R-2 District.

- 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 infrastructure in the area would be better suited with a less-dense development consistent with the R-1 requirements, to help manage demand and usage.

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

Staff noted that the Planning Commission may wish to identify specific issues as part of consideration for this property.

** Motion to recommend denial of the zoning map amendment (rezoning) to the Township Board of Trustees by Mr. Kortering, supported by Mr. Gebben.

A vote was taken with 6 members Hoeve, Gebben, Kortering, Nykamp, Rynsburger, and Zylstra voting in favor and member VanderMeulen voting in opposition. Motion carried 6-1.

Chairman Hoeve next opened a public hearing for a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to allow accessory use farm stands as Special Uses in the C-2 Community Commercial District, submitted by William Sikkel on behalf of Visser Farms LLC.

Mr. William Sikkel and Mr. Phil Visser were present to speak to this request. Mr. Sikkel stated that they are proposing a text amendment to allow a farm stand on a C-2 zoned property. They feel it is an important use on a C-2 parcel. Currently farm stands are only allowed on AG zoned property. Mr. Sikkel

pointed out that due to COVID-19 there has arisen a new need for fresh produce to be available in a more convenient location. For most people having to go to a farm stand out in the country is quite a bit out of their way and this would allow farm stands to be closer to where people live and drive.

Mr. Sikkel pointed out that this very different from selling fireworks or blankets on the corner. This is a very specific request for just produce. Mr. Sikkel stated that the amendment could include a definition of what a farm stand would be. If this gets approved then they would come back before the Commission to obtain a special use permit which would further specify what can and cannot be sold at the farm stand and any other guidelines the Commission would require. They are just looking to find a way to allow produce to be sold in a close proximity to where people shop and live.

Mr. Visser stated that in March when restaurants closed down, they lost many of their regular customers and since then they have an overabundance of crop that they need to sell. And they know that there are people that would like to buy the produce they are just looking for ways to provide that opportunity to people as conveniently as possible.

Mr. VanderMeulen added that he was very glad to see the stand on Chicago Drive. He feels it is a very good idea but not sure if this text amendment is the answer. Mr. VanderMeulen is not sure about the wording proposed. He does like that it would take a Special Use.

Mr. Nykamp stated that maybe this is something we need to tweak. Mr. Nykamp asked if Mr. Visser would have rented the building and had some inside and some outside would that have been in compliance? Staff answered that still would not have been in compliance. Staff explained that the current ordinance states that temporary stands are only allowed up to 14 days 2 times a year. Mr. Hoeve asked what if they were totally indoors? Staff answered that yes then they would be ok because they would be like a grocery store.

Mr. Gebben agreed with Mr. VanderMeulen that we need a farmer's market that is open more often than the one in Holland City twice a week. Mr. Gebben applauds what Visser Farms is trying to do. Can we do something to make this happen quickly?

Ms. Rynsburger asked if a Special Use would allow the Commission to set up definitions. Mr. Hoeve and Mr. Gebben stated that they would need a very tight definition. Mr. VanderMeulen added they would need restroom facilities and ample parking.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff if the township allows mobile restaurants? Staff responded that yes, they do but only in conjunction with special events. Mr. VanderMeulen asked about when Beechwood Restaurant would be set up by Quality Car Wash, we gave them certain conditions to allow the BBQ wagon on certain days, hours, etc. Staff responded that we no longer allow that per the new Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Visser stated that he is willing to do whatever the township wants him to do in order to open up the produce stand. He added that things need to move very quickly thought because crops are ready. Mr. Visser said that when he was open for a little while this spring, he did have restrooms, ample parking, and good driveway access points. He is asking the township to please work with them.

Mr. Hoeve asked if he could set up a stand by the community garden by the mall? Staff responded that a farm stand would not be allowed their because it again is not an AG zoned property.

Mr. Hoeve asked Staff for suggestions on how the Commission can help them out quickly. Staff stated that they understand the concerns with Mr. Visser but pointed out that the Commission had discussions and then put into place that they only wanted sales of goods to happen in a brick and mortar building. This change would bring about enforcement issues and there are a number of other concerns as outlined in the Staff Report. They also understand that this is not easily resolved in one night.

Mr. Gebben acknowledged that what Mr. Visser wants is going to take too long to save this year's crop. He suggested that Mr. Visser go in front of the Township Board and ask if he could use a part of a park to set up a stand.

Mr. Hoeve asked if due to the pandemic is there something we can do just for this growing season. He asked if we can go to the legal team and see if there is something, we can do to allow them to sell. Staff answered that it would need to be brought to the Township attorney and the Township Board. Staff stated that this is a timing issue. Staff has been in conversation with Mr. Visser for 2-3 months now and other options have been out there for some time. A couple of Board meetings have to happen to get a first reading and a second reading. Then the Special Use application would be another meeting. So, it would be 2-3 months for a final approval.

Mr. Hoeve stated that he feels Staff missed his point. He is asking if there is something the Township Board can do quickly for a temporary ordinance for like 3 months or so. Staff responded that this is a good point, this could be a special situation due to the pandemic.

Mr. Kortering said that the Planning Commission is supportive of this change but it's not executable tonight.

Mr. Hoeve asked if someone would want to make a motion to ask Staff, the legal department, and the Township Board what can be done to expedite approval of this type of use for the balance of this year?

Mr. VanderMeulen would like the township planning department to work on some wording permitting farm stands in a C-2 district.

Ms. Rynsburger asked if there is any way that a temporary permit can be given to allow them to open until all of this get resolved. Mr. Sikkel stated that there is language in the Michigan Right to Farm Act that could apply here and he would be happy to talk to the Township Supervisor and or the Township's Legal counsel to see if there is an avenue they can take to allow this to open more quickly. Mr. Sikkel also asked if Mr. Visser could reopen if the Township would hold off on any enforcement until this is resolved.

Mr. Hoeve opened the hearing for public comment.

Rev. Tyler Wagenmaker of 5166 64th Ave. spoke in support of Mr. Visser. He stated that he feels that the township shouldn't let legalities stop us from doing what is right.

Ms. Jessica Eberly from 4632 112th Ave stated that her mom lives close to where Mr. Visser had his stand and her mom felt it was a huge blessing as she lives right across the street and the neighbors around her felt the same way.

Staff submitted 3 letters that had been received in regards to the farm stand. The first letter is from Alverne and Arlene Hop from Olive Township stating that they are in support of the stand, the second is from Ottawa County Board of Commissioners stating they are in support of the stand and offering the

option of going to the Township Board with an allowance and the third letter is from Babs Ailes from 593 Howard Ave also expressing support of the stand.

** Motion to close the public hearing by Mr. Kortering, supported by Mr. Zylstra. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Motion was made by Ms. Rynsburger and supported by Mr. Kortering to request that the Township Board, with Township attorney approval, consider a temporary ordinance to allow Visser Farms to open a produce stand on a temporary basis. All in favor. Motion carried.

** Motion to direct the township planners to draft language to allow farm stands in C-2 Districts including language regarding restrooms, signage, and the like by Mr. VanderMeulen, supported by Mr. Kortering. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Motion to table the request for the zoning ordinance text amendment was made by Mr. Gebben, supported by Mr. Kortering. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve next opened a public hearing for a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to allow overhead doors on the primary street side (front) of principal buildings, submitted by William Sikkel on behalf of Advantage Marine, Inc.

Mr. William Sikkel was present to speak to this request on behalf of Advantage Marine. Also present to speak to this request is Mike Obbink from Obbink Builders.

Mr. Sikkel stated that this is not a specific request for Advantage Marine as he has had at least 4 clients come to him with this same issue. Mr. Sikkel pointed out the wording in the ordinance that they are proposing to change. "Section 10.7 Off Street Loading B. 3. Location. Loading docks, overhead doors, and other service entries shall not be located on the primary street side of principal buildings."

Mr. Sikkel stated that Advantage Marine is looking to have a show room in the front of the building and would like to have glass garage doors to be able to get the boats in and out of the showroom. This would not be a service entry door or for receiving goods and services. This would strictly be for show. Other clients that have come to him have been restaurants that want to install garage doors to open up their restaurants for outdoor seating.

Mr. Sikkel stated that they are looking for approval of the text amendment that would then allow a business to come to the Commission for a Special Use approval and at that point the Commission could make sure they meet the criteria.

Mr. Kortering asked what is the definition of an overhead door. Staff replied that an overhead door is not defined in the ordinance, however it would be defined as a roll up style door. Staff also noted that their concern is that in the future, if this property changes hands, a new owner could change the doors to something not as attractive like for instance for an automotive repair shop.

The Commission questioned why they would not put in the large sliding glass doors instead since they are permitted? Mr. Obbink answered that they are cost prohibitive and depending on the structure of the building could stick out further than the width of the building.

Mr. Sikkel questioned if in the ordinance section 10.7 c where it talks about modifications if this would qualify under that? Staff indicated that is strictly for the lines around the loading area.

Mr. Kortering asked if the Commission can define a unique glass overhead door for specific uses in the ordinance? Staff answered they feel that use comes into play. Mr. Kortering then asked if they state “glass overhead door is allowed per Planning Commission approval?”

Staff reminded the Commission that this would be a text amendment that would apply to any use not just this specific user. Mr. Sikkel asked why do we need a restriction on upward acting doors? Staff feels that in the future it could cause a lot of problems that would be hard to enforce. Mr. VanderMeulen agrees with Staff. He feels there are other solutions that could work and they should look into those options.

Mr. Hoeve opened the hearing up for public comment.

Mr. Eric Lamer of 604 Wedgewood Drive. Mr. Lamer stated that Elhart has glass garage doors and 1 of every 5 buildings along Chicago Drive have garage doors on the front of the building. It was noted that the old fire station on Felch has a glass garage door now. Mr. Lamer stated that not fixing a door if it gets broken seems like a moot point because if something breaks on my property, I need to get it fixed and the fix needs to follow code.

** Motion to close the public hearing by Mr. Kortering, supported by Ms. Rynsburger. All in favor. Motion carried.

Ms. Rynsburger stated that the language proposed seems reasonable. If we allow retractable side to side doors why not overhead doors. Mr. Kortering agrees with Ms. Rynsburger.

**Motion was made to approve proposed language by Mr. Kortering, supported by Mr. Gebben. A roll call vote was taken with members Hoeve, Gebben, Kortering, Rynsburger, and Zylstra voting in favor and members VanderMeulen and Nykamp voting in opposition. Motion carried 5-2.

Chairman Hoeve next opened a public hearing for a Special Use seeking permission for a solar array, submitted by Kavi Kulkarni/Harvest Energy Solutions on behalf of Jessica Eberly for land located at 4632 112th Ave., described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-02-100-013. The property is zoned AG Agricultural.

Mr. Jake Schuster was present to answer Commission questions about this request.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked why it is 12’ off the ground. Mr. Schuster stated that that would be the highest point the lowest point will be 2’ off the ground.

Mr. Hoeve asked is that is a lot of wire to run? Mr. Schuster stated that this would be a normal amount of wires for this type of project.

Ms. Rynsburger pointed out that it feels like a green light when looking at the special use standards.

Mr. Hoeve opened the hearing up for public comment.

Ms. Jessica Eberly spoke in support of this project.

Mr. Schuster asked if this will have to go to the Township Board for final approval. Staff informed him that the Commission gives the final approval or denial tonight.

** Motion to close the public hearing by Mr. Nykamp, supported by Mr. Gebben. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Motion was made to approve proposed language by Mr. Zylstra and supported by Mr. Kortering. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve next opened a public hearing for a Special Use seeking permission for an expanded outdoor storage area for a boat repair and storage facility, submitted by William Sikkel on behalf of Advantage Marine, Inc. for land located at 483 Douglas, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-19-300-095.

The applicant has asked to have this request tabled.

There was no one from the public present to comment on this request.

** Motion to close the public hearing by Mr. VanderMeulen, supported by Mr. Zylstra. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Motion was made to table the request by Ms. Rynsburger and supported by Mr. VanderMeulen. All in favor. Motion carried.

Other Business

275 E. Lakewood PUD (Planned Unit Development) – Update. The applicant wishes to provide an update to the Planning Commission concerning the current status of the 275 E. Lakewood PUD project. Because of the extensive changes being proposed to the project, Staff has concluded that preliminary review of the PUD will again be required. This will allow for an appropriate new review of this proposal based on the applicable criteria and conditions for PUD approval as specified in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Mike Corby of Integrated Architecture and Kevin Kammeraad presented an update on their PUD located at 275 E. Lakewood Blvd. Mr. Corby explained that with the changes they made 80% of the units now meet the minimum storage requirement where before only 50% met the minimum. He also pointed out that the units are also a bit larger than originally proposed. Mr. Kammeraad stated that they are still looking to provide workforce housing. They have changed the layout of the buildings to have the shorter buildings along the perimeter and the taller buildings toward the center. Mr. Corby stated that they feel they have a much more unified project now with housing on all of the parcels. Mr. Kammeraad talked about the mixed use and that they are looking to have things like the management office, work out facilities, a coffee shop, etc. on the main level with the residential units on the upper levels of the mixed-use buildings. The goal at first would be to serve the residents at the development but as the project grows, they would like to see those mixed-use spaces attracting the surrounding community as well.

Ms. Rynsburger stated that she loves all of the green spaces. She is wondering what the look-out is? Mr. Kammeraad explained that there will be 2 look-outs and they are elevated areas overlooking a natural area. Mr. Kammeraad also pointed out that they added more walk ways to the project. Mr. VanderMeulen asked if the project still includes a bridge over the creek and Mr. Kammeraad stated that it does and is closer to Lakewood Blvd. Mr. VanderMeulen also stated that he would like to see a bus shelter. Mr. Kammeraad said that Building C has very large overhangs that they are planning to utilize for things like a bus shelter.

Staff pointed out to the Commission that the public hearing for this project will be September 1 and at that point they will get more extensive details. Mr. Corby pointed out that since this is their second time coming to the Commission their public hearing drawings will look more like a final since they are further along in a project than you would normally be at this stage.

Staff noted that an email was sent out to the Commissioners regarding the Comprehensive Plan and if they have any questions to please get in touch with him.

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary