

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
July 6, 2021

Chairman Hoeve called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

Present: Chairman Marion Hoeve, Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Doug Becker, Ken Bosma, Randy Kortering, and Miska Rynsburger. Also present were Community Development Director John Said, Assistant Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Township Attorney Ron Bultje and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

Public Comment:

Mr. Bill Sikkel spoke about his desire to obtain Staff Reports prior to Planning Commission meetings.

Minutes:

** It was moved by Kortering and supported by Rynsburger to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2021, meeting. All in favor. Motion carried.

Public Hearings:

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration for a proposed special use for vehicle sales submitted by Erik Krueger of Jefferson Beach Yacht Sales o/b/o Dave Lamer of Dual Prop, LLC. Said lands are addressed as 495 Douglas Ave., described more specifically as 70-16-19-376-028. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was the applicant's attorney Mr. Bill Sikkel.

Mr. Sikkel stated that this is a 4-unit condominium building and that Jefferson Beach Yacht Sales would be occupying the 2-western units. He noted that the other 2 units are occupied by Holland Propeller. Mr. Sikkel stated that they are requesting a special use to allow recreational vehicle sales to be allowed in the western most suite (Suite 1). The east suite (Suite 2) will be a garage area used to prep the boats prior to delivery. Mr. Sikkel stated that this is an internet sales business and therefore there will not be any boats displayed outside of the building. He also pointed out that there will only be 3-5 employees on site and an occasional customer that may come in to sit down with a sales person to pick out a boat on a computer.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about parking on the property. Mr. Sikkel believes that there are 24 parking spaces which is more than adequate for this business.

Staff wanted to clarify that the special use request is only for the western suite (Suite 1), just the office, and asked if the eastern suite (Suite 2) needed to be considered in the request as well? Mr. Sikkel answered that they only need the special use to be considered for Suite 1 because Suite 2 will be used for prepping boats for delivery and will not be used as office space.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

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

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

Staff wanted to make sure that the applicant understood that the new special use would supersede the old special use. They also wanted to verify that they are asking for the correct use in the appropriate suite(s).

Mr. Kortering asked for verification of what the new request is. Staff stated the new request is for boat sales in Suite 1 (the western most suite). Mr. Sikkel stated that the previous special use was for vehicle repair for the entire building and therefore they do not want to change the use for Suite 2 as that will continue to be used for vehicle repair as they prep the boats for delivery. They only are asking for Suite 1 (the western most suite) be changed to sales.

It was discussed if the Commission should add to the motion that there be no storage of boats/vehicles outside of the building. The applicant has no problem with that as they do not store any boats on the property.

** It was moved by Kortering and supported by Becker to approve the request noting that the request meets the special land use standards and with the stipulation that there be no outdoor storage/display of vehicles/boats. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to allow Farm Markets as special uses in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning districts (where not already allowed by the Michigan Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development).

Present for this request was Mr. Ronald Bultje, Township Attorney.

Staff began by stating that this text amendment is based on a request by the Planning Commission after much discussion at several special meetings. Staff's concerns regarding the text amendment would be based on what is already allowed under MDARD. Staff stated that the Commission should always ask themselves why are they are considering a text amendment? Text amendments are not to be taken lightly as they are a serious matter. Staff also asked what issue are they are trying to solve when 67% of the Township already allows farm stands. Staff also pointed out that they have not seen a community outcry for expanding the area of allowed farm stands other than support for one farm stand at one location.

Mr. Bultje said that he does not disagree with what Staff said but that there also is nothing wrong with what the Commission is trying to do. He pointed out that he has been contacted by an attorney for the original applicant that had requested to be allowed to operate a farm stand in a C-2 area of the Township, and this attorney stated that they interpret GAAMPS as saying they could not be on platted land and that they interpret that as only being residential. Mr. Bultje explained to the attorney that the regulations do not differentiate between platted land that is residential or commercial, so there is really no merit to the attorney's arguments

Mr. Becker stated that at the Township Board level residents asked them to take a closer look at this. Mr. Becker feels like this text amendment is a good compromise as it seems simple and concise. He is in support of it and would like to see if move forward.

Mr. Kortering stated that he feels the Commission has not taken this text amendment lightly as they have been in conversation about this for over a year now. He also feels that just because only one farmer made the request doesn't mean that we shouldn't address it. Mr. Kortering pointed out that there have been others, like Mr. Roger Victory, that have spoken up in support of making a change. He asked Staff about some of the problems they see that could arise with this text amendment like tents or temporary structures. Staff responded that zoning doesn't allow for tents other than for a maximum of 14 days to allow for goods from inside a brick-and-mortar store to be sold outside that building for a limited time.

Staff also pointed out that for qualifying structures under 400 sq. ft. and under the Building Code and International Fire Code do not apply. Therefore, we have no way to control what those structures look like. They could put up four 10' x 10' tents all connected to create 400 sq. ft. area. Mr. Kortering asked if the way the text amendment is written couldn't we deal with those types of things when the application is brought before the Commission?

Mr. Bultje stated that tent rules don't apply when GAAMPS prevail. The text amendment states that the Township will allow farm markets based on the same rules as GAAMPS has. Mr. Bultje stated that the Commission wanted to be consistent and not have separate rules for the expanded area from the areas covered under GAAMPS. Mr. Becker asked if they could have four 10' x 10' tents strung together and it was answered that they could.

Mr. Kortering stated then that the risk we put ourselves in is really the same risk we run with the current land covered under GAAMPS. He then stated that if we had complaints regarding a farm stand then when they come back with a new application the next year, we could address those complaints at that time and create stipulations to the approval of the special use or deny the special use. Staff asked what happens after a year, does the applicant need to reapply and then have the Commission re-evaluate? Commission believes that is what was decided on previously.

Ms. Rynsburger said that from the stand point of the customer she sees that they would be less likely to drive 5 miles out of their way to go to a local farmer to get their fresh produce even if that produce was much better than others that are closer and more convenient. She would like to see the local farmers have the opportunity to sell their produce in a location that is convenient for customers because they are more likely to buy the produce when it is in a convenient location.

Mr. Bosma pointed out that he was not here for the initial conversations on this issue but has been listening in on the last couple of meetings and stated that, in his experience on being on the Commission for many years prior to this, he has never seen a text amendment request based on one applicant. Mr. Bosma stated that he's struggling with this.

Mr. Hoeve pointed out that at this point you cannot buy everything at one location whereas this amendment this could allow more variety at a single location and he likes that option.

Mr. Becker stated that he agrees with Ms. Rynsburger that he would like to see this option in a location that is closer to where our residents live and drive to make it more convenient for them. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he too likes the change and sees how this could make the season where fresh produce is available to residents longer.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that the Commission has gone back and forth for over a year now. We have studied the issues and have not come about this decision lightly. He feels this amendment fulfills a need in the Township. Mr. VanderMeulen also pointed out that the Township Manager

signed the application for the text amendment and questioned if that was an act of endorsement for the amendment. Staff pointed out that the Manager signing the amendment application is not a sign of support of the amendment it is rather an act to allow the Commission to fully consider the issue. Staff pointed out that the amendment needs to be considered under the applicable text amendment criteria and needs to be looked at impartially.

Mr. Hoeve asked what was done or said at the Township Board when the Commission sent the initial request to them last year. Staff stated at that point it was a request to suspend the rules for a limited time for the location on Chicago Drive to allow a farm market to operate there. At that time the Township attorney advised the Board not to approve the request because this action did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Township Board and rather should be taken up by the Zoning Board of Appeals and therefore the Board legally needed to deny the request. Staff pointed out that during that time the Commission had already decided to take a closer look at Farm Stands and scheduled several Special Meetings to do so.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

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

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

** It was moved by Kortering and supported by Becker to recommend approval of the proposed Text Amendment with a draft date of June 8, 2021. A roll call vote was taken with 4 members voting in favor and 2 members voting in opposition. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment submitted by David A. Burg of PIRHL Acquisitions LLC o/b/o Judith Nykamp of Kamp David LLC. Said lands are addressed as 0 Ottogan Street (vacant), described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-35-400-013. Petitioner is seeking to amend the land's designation from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential.

Mr. Hoeve noted that the applicant requested this item be tabled at this time.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

Mr. Roger Littlepage of 49 Brynwood Ave., President of the Knollwood Association, stated that he has lived in Knollwood for 5 years and he is concerned about property values going down with a High Density Residential development going in right next to their development. He pointed out that there are several well-established developments in the area and having this parcel re-zoned to High Density Residential doesn't seem to fit with the surrounding developments and is very concerning. Mr. Littlepage is also concerned about the impact a high density residential development would have on the traffic in the area. Mr. Littlepage pointed out that the nearby intersections have been getting increasingly busier and he is concerned that adding a high density development there would only add to the congestion at these intersections. Mr. Littlepage stated that Knollwood is a great community to raise a family and he is concerned about the safety of the families with additional traffic this will cause on Ottogan.

Mr. Robert Boersen of 61 Brynwood Ave. Mr. Boersen said that he echoes what Mr. Littlepage said and added that that he has lived in Knollwood for 13 years and when he first lived there, they seldom heard traffic on Ottogan but now it has become very busy and they hear traffic all day

long. He stated that it has also become busier with semi-truck traffic. Mr. Boersen is concerned about the property being re-zoned from AG Agricultural to R-3 High Density Residential.

** It was moved by Bosma and supported by Kortering to close the hearing noting that the Commission will take public comments after the applicant has spoken when the item is back in front of the Commission. All in favor. Motion carried.

** It was moved by Bosma and supported by Kortering to table this item per the applicant's request. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Map of Holland Charter Township submitted by David A. Burg of PIRHL Acquisitions LLC o/b/o Judith Nykamp of Kamp David LLC to change the subject property from AG Agricultural to R-2 Moderate Density Residential and R-3 High Density Residential. Said lands are addressed as 0 Ottogan Street (vacant), described more specifically as 70-16-35-400-013. The current use of the property is agricultural, and is zoned AG Agricultural.

Mr. Hoeve noted that the applicant requested this item be tabled at this time.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

Mr. Roger Littlepage of 49 Brynwood Ave., President of the Knollwood Association. Mr. Littlepage stated that he echoes what he said for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment item for this property. He then asked when this item will come back before the Commission? Staff suggested that Mr. Littlepage watch the Township website for upcoming agendas.

Mr. Robert Boersen of 61 Brynwood Ave. Mr. Boersen said that he echoes what he said for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment item for this property. He asked what the plan is for this property by the applicant? Staff answered that the applicant is looking to put up a multi-family 3-story building with 146 units. Part of the development is listed as Independent Senior Citizen Housing. The buildable area would be approximately 15 acres of the 40 total acres of the property, due to wetlands and easements.

** It was moved by Kortering and supported by Becker to close the hearing, noting that the Commission will take public comments after the applicant has spoken when the item is back in front of the Commission. All in favor. Motion carried.

** It was moved by Bosma and supported by Rynsburger to table this item per the applicant's request. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of a special use request for a proposed contractors facility submitted by David VanderSlik of Black River LLC o/b/o Josh Bauman of Holland Community Hospital. Said lands are described as 873 & 891 Black River Drive, described more specifically as 70-16-25-474-004 and -005. The property is zoned C-3 Highway Commercial.

Present for this request was Mr. Jonathan Male of Exxcel Engineering.

Mr. Male stated that DJ's Landscape Management Company has outgrown their current location on Brooks Ave. in the City of Holland. He explained that during a typical business day the employees will arrive in the morning, park their vehicles, get their assignments for the day, load

up their company trucks and head out. They will then come back after an 8–10-hour day to put the trucks away and leave in their own vehicles. There are a few office staff employees that will remain in the building throughout the day but there are no sales done in the facility. Mr. Male stated that they are submitting plans for a 10,000 sq. ft. building with employee parking in the front of the building. They will have a fenced and screened area behind the building for storing company trucks along with landscaping supplies such as mulch, stone, etc. This property is currently owned by Holland Hospital and is located in the Adams Street Commerce Park, which to date only has a couple of buildings that have been built. Mr. Male said that they would be connecting to Township water and sewer and that they will work with the Water Resource Commission on a bringing the current storm water detention area on the site up to today's standards.

Mr. Kortering asked about the salt they keep on site and how they plan to keep that contained? Mr. Male showed a picture of a Quonset hut structure that has a concrete floor, concrete going up the sides a few feet, a rounded metal roof, with an open front so the employees could drive the trucks in and load the salt. Mr. Male explained that this type of enclosure works well because they only fill it about half way. Mr. Hoeve noted that he has seen this type of structure used by others municipalities as it works very well for salt storage and loading of the trucks.

Mr. Becker asked if the salt bin is in the plan that was submitted? Mr. Male stated that it is in the plan they submitted. Staff noted that this style of building has been denied in the past and that the building code will dictate whether this type of structure will be allowed or not. Mr. Hoeve asked Staff if they could approve the request with denial of the covered salt bin? Staff responded that they are okay with reviewing a salt bin structure once more information is provided and ensuring it will meet building requirements.

Mr. Kortering inquired about the noted future expansion area. Staff noted that they would like to see the initial construction and how the business operates from this location and have them come back to the Commission for approval of any future expansion.

Mr. Bosma asked where the fence will be located? Will it be located along the original area or along the future expansion area? Mr. Male stated that it will be as indicated on the drawings, however, if they did any improvements to that area, they would need to come back and get the Township's approval.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about lighting and would like to make sure that any lights on the property do not interfere with drivers on the highway. Mr. Male stated that their light plan should not interfere with the highway but if the Commission would like to see a cut sheet of the lighting plan, they would be able to provide that to them.

Mr. VanderMeulen then asked what they do with any trimmings or yard waste? Mr. Male stated that they will take it back to the site, make a small pile (approximately 20 yards) and haul it away every day or two. He stated they will not have anything that will be there for any length of time.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

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

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

** It was moved by Bosma and supported by Becker to approve this request based on the standards and with the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any permit, the applicant shall combine the two parcels into a single lot of record.
2. Approval does not include the "Future Expansion Area."
3. Applicant shall obtain Staff approval of a salt bin structure.
4. Fencing shall be along the initial line and shall not include the "Future Expansion Area."
5. Prior to the issuance of any permit, the applicant shall obtain Staff approval of the final site plan, including landscaping, fencing, and lighting.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of a special use amendment request submitted by Timothy Kraal of Butch Properties LLC. Said lands are described as 912 N. Black River Drive, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-25-475-002. Petitioner is seeking permission for expansion of an existing contractor's facility. The property is zoned C-3 Highway Commercial.

Present for this request were Ms. Becky Paige of Holland Engineering and Mr. Steve Kraal of Butch Properties LLC.

Ms. Paige stated that they are requesting to expand the facility with a 6,000 sq. ft. addition, additional parking and a traffic circle. She also pointed out that the owners of this property also own some of the adjacent surrounding parcels. Ms. Paige stated that they have an easement for stormwater and they submitted paperwork to the County Drain Commissioner last week for approval. Ms. Paige noted that landscaping requirements may be a bit of a challenge. Staff noted that if they are asking for landscaping exceptions that would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about outside storage and if that is part of the request? Mr. Kraal stated that they do not store any of their items outside because they are all steel, wire, etc. that cannot get wet. However, occasionally they may have a long pole that needs to be outside for a time in order to be able to load it on to a truck to haul away.

Mr. Kraal asked what Staff meant when they said, "They would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals?" Staff replied that they would need to go in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals if they were looking for a reduction in landscaping requirements. Staff did note that by just looking at the landscaping plan it looks sufficient. Mr. Hoeve clarified that the landscaping plan would go to Staff first and if they deny the plans then the applicant can go in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

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

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

** It was moved by Bosma and supported by Kortering to approve this request noting that the request meets the standards of approval and sighting the outdoor storage of long poles that was previously approved for this parcel. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a public hearing for consideration of a request for a proposed preliminary site condominium plan for the Peregrine Cove Site Condominium Development, submitted by Michael West of Westview Capital LLC o/b/o Paul and Violet Riemersma Trust/Michelle Eustice Trustee. Said lands are described as 0 Perry Street (no address), described more specifically as 70-16-24-300-038. The proposed site condominium consists of 22 detached single-family residential units with public watermain and sanitary sewer, private street, and private stormwater retention facilities. The subject property is currently zoned R-2 Moderate Density Residential.

Present to for this request was Mr. Mike West of Westview Capital.

Mr. West explained that the proposed site condominium plan would consist of 22 single family homes on a 700' private road with private storm water to meet county requirements. Mr. West stated that they have a unique situation to the east with an industrial parcel bordering them. To create a visual barrier there they are proposing a 15' tree buffer and landscape easement. Mr. West stated that there are currently some trees on the property and they plan to keep as many trees as they can and then plant additional trees as needed to create the buffer.

Mr. Bosma asked why they are proposing a private street rather than a public street? Mr. West answered that they have done many private roads across the state in some of their other developments they have worked out well, but he also noted that they have done some public roads here in the Township as well. They feel that with this being a cul-de-sac road that a private road would make more sense. Mr. Bosma asked Staff if a cul-de-sac road would be approved by the Road Commission? Staff did not know if that would be approved or not. Mr. Bosma stated that he struggles with putting in private streets because later there are always complaints with snow removal and street maintenance that is directed at the Township. Mr. West said that the master deed will address that. Mr. Bosma replied that homeowners aren't looking at the master deed when they can't get out of their driveway during a snow storm and then the Township has to field the phone calls and complaints. Mr. Bosma stated that he would like to see the applicant go to the Road Commission and see if they can do a public road here with a connection point to 104th.

Mr. Hoeve asked if the Road Commission would allow a dead-end road? Mr. West answered that it is a lengthy process to get a public road approved with the Road Commission. He stated that he lives on a cul-de-sac that has been there for the past 20-30 years and still looks good. Mr. West stated that with this private road there will be plenty of money in the maintenance fund to make short- and long-term repairs as needed.

Mr. Hoeve asked if there was a way to have a connector road going through where Unit 11 is on the plan to someday connect to 104th Ave? Mr. West stated that mixing public and private roads is not a good idea. Mr. West also pointed out that the farm land they are referring to would have two potential connection points to 104th if that land is ever developed. Staff responded by stating that the Master Plan strives for connectivity and when a new development is going in that is the time to plan for future connectivity. Staff also stated that having two access points is a matter of public safety, and is the same requirement that was applied to Knollwood and other

neighborhoods around the Township. Staff would recommend setting aside the land now and constructing a stub street for connection at a future date.

Mr. Bosma suggested that Mr. West review the utility widths and how they will be affected by setbacks and building envelopes.

Mr. Becker stated that he would like to see them investigate the public road option with the Road Commission. He said that it gives him pause to not have connectivity and would like to see them leave either Unit 10 or 11 open for connectivity in the future. Mr. West stated that they feel this parcel just doesn't make sense to connect to a public road in the future. Staff stated that they would like to see the possibility of connecting a future development on the agricultural land to the northwest. Mr. VanderMeulen pointed out that they allowed a private road at Blue Jay Crossing because of odd parcels and connectivity just wouldn't work well there but he doesn't see any reason why there can't be connectivity and a public road here.

Chairman Hoeve opened the meeting up for public comments.

Mr. Ken Riemersma of 10244 Perry St. asked what kind of development are they proposing? Will this be condominiums, HUD housing, etc.? Mr. West answered that this is a site condo which will consist of single-family homes ranging in size from 1,400 – 2,200 sq. ft.

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

Mr. Hoeve stated that it looks like the items that need to be addressed here are the public verses private road and a stub street to the North West for connectivity in the future.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Bosma to table this request to give the applicant time to address comments made by Staff and the Commissioners regarding the private verse's public road and the possibility of future connectivity to the North West. All in favor. Motion carried.

Other Business

0 Black River Ct. – Kevin Miller/Mission Design – Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Highway Commercial to Light Industrial. (Originally tabled January 5, 2021)

This item should remain tabled at this time

2763 120th – Brad VanderZwaag of G2G LLC – Special Land Use – Contractor's Facility. (Originally tabled January 5, 2021)

This item should remain tabled at this time.

0 Black River Ct. – Kevin Miller/Mission Design – Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) – C-3 Highway Commercial to I-1 Light Industrial (Originally tabled January 5, 2021)

This item should remain tabled at this time.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed a few housekeeping matters.

Mr. Kortering asked if Staff could clarify what Mr. Sikkel was talking about regarding the Staff Report at the beginning of the meeting? Staff stated that they made the decision to no longer send out the Staff Report to the applicants because of all of the last-minute changes, emails, and phone calls they would get the day of the meeting or the day before. The Commissioners completely understand Staff's frustrations with the last-minute changes and questions and also feel that this should not be something Staff should be dealing with right before the meeting. Mr. Kortering asked if maybe instead of sending it out the Friday prior to the meeting maybe we could post it to the website the day before the meeting so the applicants can at least have time to read it through and be able to come prepared for the meeting. Mr. Becker and Mr. VanderMeulen both like the idea of putting it on the website. Mr. Kortering stated that they could even post it the day of the meeting to limit the chances for the applicants to bother Staff with questions prior to the meeting. Staff is trying to limit some of the planning on the fly that's been happening because of the Staff Report. Mr. Bosma suggested that we put something on the first page that states "The time for submittals of information is now closed. This information is provided only for Staff comments and no changes will be accepted prior to the meeting." Staff likes the recommendation.

Next, Staff said that they are talking with the Township Manager about hiring an independent consultant to study and review rental housing in the Township. They feel this could help to guide the Township in future decisions and also with future re-zonings.

Mr. Hoeve asked if we are allowed to put a hold on approving any more multi-family developments? Mr. Bultje answered that the Township can put a moratorium on approving multi-family units for a specific time frame. The safest way to put a moratorium on rental housing would be to change the zoning ordinance. Mr. Bultje did say that doing so could potentially cause problems. However, typically the way things move in the legal system by the time any legal action can be taken the moratorium would be over, so it shouldn't be a problem. Mr. Bultje pointed out that he has never been challenged with a municipality putting a moratorium in place while studying an issue for a limited period of time.

Mr. Kortering asked if we are allowed to put a cap on a certain zoning district? For instance, can we say the Township has reached the limit on R-3 zoning? Mr. Bultje stated that absolutely you can, you can put some "whereas's" in the resolution. He would recommend that the Commission send a recommendation to the Township Board to adopt a resolution saying they are going to instruct Staff to not issue any permits for "this land use" for "this amount of time" while we conduct a study. Staff asked if this is something that we can address and handle tonight? Mr. Bultje asked for clarification if this is for rental or multi-family housing? Staff said they asked for a study to be done on rental but they can change their study to also include multi-family housing. Mr. Bultje would prefer it be on land use as opposed to land ownership because that is what the zoning ordinance is for. Mr. Kortering asked if we need a public meeting. Mr. Bultje stated a public hearing is not needed. Mr. Becker pointed out that if we can vote on this tonight then it can go before the Township Board on July 15.

Staff asked about the applications that have been submitted already. If the notice has gone out for a public meeting, how do we handle that? Mr. Bultje stated that you will have to hold the public meeting but then the Commission will then table the item(s) until the moratorium is over because they have been instructed to do so by the Township Board.

** It was moved by Kortering and supported by VanderMeulen to ask the Township Board to put a moratorium on individual requests for Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and for Zoning Map

Amendments for multi-family dwellings until the Township has an opportunity to conduct an independent study. All in favor. Motion carried.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 3, 2021.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary