

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
October 1, 2024

Chairman Randy Kortering called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

Present: Chairman Randy Kortering, Members, Leo Barajas, Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Evan Sharp, Jack VanderMuelen, and Russ TeSlaa (joined at 6:05pm). Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White.

Absent: Tricia Kiekintveld, Recording Secretary.

Public Comment: None.

Minutes:

** It was moved by Huesman and supported by Barajas to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of September 10, 2024. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Abstain – 2, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

Member Russ TeSlaa entered the meeting at 6:05 pm.

Public Hearings:

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Holland Charter Township Master Plan submitted by Stephanie Hoekstra of Agora Flats, Inc. on behalf of Scott Potter of Ridge Point Community Church. Petitioner is seeking to amend the land's designation from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. Said land consists of 7.05 acres from 0 (vac) 104th Avenue, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-36-300-015. The proposed land is located south of Ridge Point Community Church at 340 104th Avenue.

Present for this request was Todd Stuve of Exxel Engineering, 5252 Clyde Park Ave SW, Wyoming, MI 49509.

Mr. Stuve noted that this item has been previously reviewed and discussed by the Planning Commission, so he was going to provide only a brief summary of the request. He noted they are looking to change the roughly 7 acre parcel south of Ridge Point Church from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map in the Township Comprehensive Plan. This request is tied to another request on the agenda for a Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment which is currently tabled.

Chairman Kortering asked Mr. Stuve how their plans are coming along for development of the property. Mr. Stuve replied that he, Ms. Hoekstra, and an architect met recently to go over

program design for their proposed development but have not gotten too far in development planning given they still need to get the Future Land Use Map amendment and rezoning approved.

Member Barajas noted that he feels the subject property is not very desirable for single-family housing development given it abuts the freeway.

Chairman Kortering asked Member TeSlaa whether the Township Board of Trustees had any opinions on the proposed amendment when it went to them for approving the 42-day comment period letter. Member TeSlaa noted they did not voice any concerns at that time.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one in the audience to speak to the request.

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

Vice-Chair VanderMeulen acknowledged the comments made by Staff in their report, however, he stated that while 104th Avenue is not classified as a County Primary Road and that creates a conflict with their rezoning request, he noted that 104th Avenue feels like a County Primary Road with the traffic that runs through there. Also, he did not see any issue with the proposed location of higher density housing given the nursing home that is located on 104th Avenue as well as its relative proximity to the resources to the west. He stated that he felt the area would hold this use well.

A Future Land Use Map Amendment does not have specific standards of approval, but Chairman Kortering went through some general considerations used for Zoning Ordinance Map Amendments offered by Staff. The Planning Commission did not have any comments of concern regarding these items.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by VanderMeulen to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees for the proposed Future Land Use Map Amendment, changing the 7.05 acres of the subject property from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and Map of Holland Charter Township submitted by Logan Dykgraaf of Space Source, Inc. on behalf of Jacob Essenburg Co. to change 0 (vac) James Street, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-126-058, from I-2 General Industrial to I-1 Light Industrial.

Present for this request was John Tenpas, Driesenga & Associates, Inc., 12330 James St Suite H80, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Tenpas noted that the property they are requesting to change is a vacant parcel located just west of the Holland Bowl Mill on James Street. They would like to change the zoning of the property from I-2 to I-1. He noted that the property is surrounded by Industrial zoned properties and uses to the east, Office and Service zoned properties and uses to the west, and Residential zoned properties to the south and north of James Street.

Mr. Tenpas noted that he sees their request presents a discrepancy with the Future Land Use Map and Township Comprehensive Plan, however, he feels that with the existing industrial uses

to the east, as well as with Holland Bowl Mill's recent expansion and investment on their property, that single-family residential may not make sense here. He also stated that with the current I-2 zoning, a more intense, heavy industrial use could go in by-right, but the rezoning to I-1 would allow for less intense uses.

Mr. Tenpas noted that the I-1 rezoning is a better transitional use in the area, would eliminate the heavy industrial uses that could go there, and would reduce setbacks for development. Mr. Tenpas argued that the reduction in setbacks would help to locate buildings at the perimeter of the property and allow for overhead doors and activity to be located more interior to the site. He said that with the I-2 setbacks, it could push overhead doors and that associated activity outwards and closer to other neighboring properties.

Mr. Tenpas noted that he has no concerns about the I-1 uses being compatible with the property; he argued the I-1 uses may be more compatible with the site than what would currently be allowed with I-2.

Member Sharp asked what the developer would like to put there? Mr. Tenpas stated that the plan is to build small business suites for contractor type businesses as well as some storage condominiums.

Chairman Kortering reminded the Planning Commission that the applicant is not seeking a conditional rezoning so they would not be limited to contractor's facilities or storage condos.

Chairman Kortering asked Mr. Tenpas about the three landlocked parcels located just west of the property? Mr. Tenpas noted they do not own those so they do not know what the plans are for those.

Chairman Kortering asked whether the developer has considered the potential a residential development project that could incorporate some of the Burke Avenue properties for a larger, connected development? Mr. Tenpas noted that having to work with those property owners along Burke Ave would be very difficult and they may not want to give up their deep back yards. Mr. Tenpas stated that he did not feel a residential development is realistic.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

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

Member Sharp noted that he feels more comfortable with the I-1 uses on this property over I-2 uses. He also noted that he drives this area and those uses may not be out-of-place with the existing industrial/businesses to the east of the property. Vice-Chair VanderMeulen noted when he saw this petition, he was originally worried that it may be spot zoning, but after reviewing more closely and seeing the area, he is not concerned about it.

The Commissioners then reviewed the Criteria for Map Amendments:

- 1. Whether or not the proposed rezoning is consistent with the goals, policies and future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan; or, if conditions have changed significantly since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, whether the map change would be consistent with recent development trends in the area.**

The Commission agreed that this rezoning is not consistent with the future land use map of the Comprehensive Plan, but there are other factors to consider that make sense for the rezoning like the existing adjacent uses.

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

The property is largely vacant and treeless, so the I-1 uses may be compatible with the 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.

No incompatibility issues are expected with the presence of the industrial uses to the east.

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.

James Street has adequate infrastructure so there are no concerns with capability of accommodating the uses.

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

None.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by TeSlaa to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees to change the subject land from I-2 General Industrial to I-1 Light Industrial. A roll call vote was taken. 7 – Yes, 0 – No. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration an Amendment to the Macatawa Legends Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan, submitted by Kelly Kuiper of Eastbrook Homes on behalf of REIP Land Investments, LLC. The Petitioner is seeking approval for a Major Amendment to the Macatawa Legends PUD for changes in the Fairway View Development Phase 1 which will consist of 40 single-family dwelling units. Changes in Fairway View Phase 1 consist of: (1) the elimination of the 20-foot-wide maintenance access between Units 57-58 of Fairways Phase 2 and proposed Unit 1 of Fairway View Phase 1; (2) the extension of side lot lines west of Mattison Drive to eliminate a varying width gap that was shown behind rear lot lines in the previously approved final development plan; (3) the two cul-de-sac roads in Phase 1 have been extended 10 feet east to widen the frontage of the pie-shaped lots at the cul-de-sac ends; and (4) three units of the east side of Mattison Drive that abut the four stub road units have had their rear lot lines shifted 12 feet west to create more width for the stub road units.

Present for this request was John Tenpas, Driesenga & Associates, Inc., 12330 James St Suite H80, Holland, MI 49424, and Kelly Kuiper, representative for Eastbrook Homes.

Mr. Tenpas noted that the Staff Report does a fair job of summarizing the request tonight. Mr. Tenpas emphasized that there are no proposed changes in unit count or density. Some of the lots will be extending slightly in this development phase, but Mr. Tenpas stated that there will be no changes to the open spaces they were previously required to provide.

Ms. Kuiper noted that they are aware that this part of the development will be limited to 30 dwelling units given the requirements of the International Fire Code, and that should they build more than 30 units in this phase, it will require them to complete the connection to Georgian Bay. Ms. Kuiper clarified that they will still include 40 units in Phase One of Fairway View to be recorded and legally established, but that they will be restricted to 30 units for construction.

Mr. Tenpas noted that in this development phase, Eastbrook Homes is still planning on continuing the same schedule of paving for their development. Eastbrook will place base course pavement down for the roads, which includes an extra half inch of pavement, in order to get building permits. They will then install the finish course pavement two years later from when the first building permit is issued in that development phase.

Vice-Chair VanderMeulen asked about the planned vacant lot between Unit 36 and 37 in this phase and how it will be maintained? Ms. Kuiper noted that this development phase will have a Homeowners' Association with recorded deed restrictions/covenants which will place the responsibility of maintaining the lot on the HOA.

Chairman Kortering asked Staff if they had any comments. Community Development Director Broersma noted that there is a 20-foot-wide maintenance path that was planned just north of Unit 1 in this phase which would be eliminated with this amendment. Director Broersma noted he had not heard from the owner's north of this maintenance path on whether they are in support or are against the pathway elimination. Mr. Tenpas and Ms. Kuiper also noted they did not hear anything about it from those owners.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

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

Chairman Kortering asked Staff about whether they track pavement installation and the timeline for finish course completion. Staff noted they do.

Chairman Kortering asked whether their motion for this item should include language about the finish pavement installation timeline for the streets and about the development phase being limited to 30 units for construction? Staff stated that it would be recommended that they include those items in their motion.

** It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Huesman to approve the request as presented with the stipulation that (1) no more than 30 dwelling units be constructed in this phase before the connection of Mattison Drive to Georgian Bay Drive is completed; and (2) upon issuance of the first building permit that the base course be installed for the streets and that upon two years of that building permit being issued, the top course for the streets be completed. A roll call vote was taken. 7 – Yes, 0 – No. Motion carried.

Tabled Items

410 & 414 E 8th Street – Parcel Numbers 70-16-28-328-002 & -003 – Preliminary P.U.D. – Submitted by Paul DeBoer of MONDAY Impact Development of behalf of David DeKruyter to approve a proposed preliminary development plan for de Anker Planned Unit Development. The subject properties are zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled Sept. 5, 2023)

Item to remain tabled at this time. Staff noted that the developer is looking at different options for development.

0 104th Avenue – Parcel Number 70-16-36-300-015 – Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment – Submitted by Stephanie Hoekstra of Agora Flats, Inc. on behalf of Scott Potter of Ridge Point Community Church. To conditionally rezone 7.05 acres of the subject property from R-1 Low Density Residential to R-2A Medium Density Residential. (Tabled June 4, 2024)

Item to remain tabled at this time.

0 (vac) Perry Street, northeast of 10245 Perry Street – Parcel Number 70-16-24-300-038 – Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan – Submitted by Brad VanderZwaag of Bauvan Land Co. LLC. For a residential development consisting of 2 single-family units and 15 two-family units served by a public street and utilities. The subject property is zoned R-2 Moderate Density Residential. (Tabled July 9, 2024)

Item to remain tabled at this time.

0 (vac) N 120th Avenue – Parcel Number 70-16-22-301-010 – Special Land Use Permit – Submitted by SVB + Reckley on behalf of Travs Timmer of Timmer Holding LLC. The request is for Warehousing. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial and FP Floodplain. (Tabled Sept. 10, 2024)

Item to remain tabled at this time.

Planning Commission Discussion

Staff gave an update to the Commissioners of projects that are currently underway in the Township.

Staff also reminded the Commissioners of the importance of going through the standards of approval for applications and ensuring that there is consensus and discussion on those standards.

The Commissioners discussed outdoor storage regulations, including adding allowances for existing vegetation to serve as screening, changing language to allow passenger business vehicles to not count as outdoor storage, and add some language regarding vehicle repair facility storage.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2024, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate White
Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator