

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026

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

Present: Chairman Randy Kortering, Members, Leo Barajas (arrived at 6:02 pm), Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Gretchen Molotky, Evan Sharp and Jack VanderMeulen. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White, and Recording Secretary Sheila Webb

Absent: None.

Election of Officers:

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Sharp to appoint Mr. Kortering to the office of Chairman and Mr. VanderMeulen to office of Vice-Chairman/Secretary. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

Public Comment: None.

Commissioner Barajas arrived at 6:02 pm.

Minutes:

** It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Molotky to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of December 2, 2025. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Public Hearings

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of an amendment to the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan (Master Plan) to incorporate the Township's 2025 Housing Analysis as "Chapter 8" and the Plan, including previous Future Land Use Map amendments, as the Township's guide for development through 2040.

Chairman Kortering stated that the Commissioners reviewed the Master Plan 5 years into the 20-year plan and now wish to include the housing assessment. Chairman Kortering noted that the amendment has been available for a 42-day review and comment period, so a recommendation for approval is now needed to send the amendment to the Township Board.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Staff noted that one comment was received via writing from Raechel Haller, 302 Hoover Boulevard, Holland, MI 49423. Staff stated that Ms. Haller had some concerns about the area north of East 16th Street at the end of Lane Avenue. Ms. Haller indicated that it's unfortunate that this space wasn't kept as green space. Ms. Haller also had concerns about a proposed secondary

road connecting Hoover Boulevard and Lane Avenue which could affect her property. Staff stated that the Master Plan is a vision, not a mandate.

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

Chairman Kortering stated that the current pace of housing growth is sufficient and should not slow down which was determined by using different growth factors. Chairman Kortering noted that the land currently zoned for housing is sufficient through 2040. Chairman Kortering stated there was no need to change the Future Land Map.

Mr. Barajas stated that he has concerns about being unable to make changes to the land map.

Chairman Kortering spoke about ideas to encourage housing development.

The Commissioners discussed the ability to review the Future Land Use Map and that the housing analysis has been accepted and should be included in the Master Plan.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Huesman to recommend approval to the Township Board for an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate the Township's 2025 Housing Analysis as Chapter 8 and affirm the Plan, including previous Future Land Use Map amendments, as the Township's guide for development through 2040. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a request for a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan for Chick-Fil-A. The proposed development would consist of a dual-use development containing the existing Chick-Fil-A and existing Quality Car Wash. The proposed Planned Unit Development would allow Chick-Fil-A to expand their outdoor meal delivery operation by creating a second drive-thru lane. The petition is submitted by Michael Lewis of Chick-Fil-A Inc. for property located at 2332 and 2352 North Park Drive, described specifically as Parcel Numbers 70-16-21-100-046 & -045. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was David Caldon of Varnum LLP, 333 Bridge Street NW, Grand Rapids, MI 49504, Jason Toole of CPH, 1031 W 23rd Street, Panama City, FL 32405, and Shaun Page of Chick-Fil-A, 2332 North Park Drive, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Caldon stated that they are here not to propose any change in the structure, but to utilize the existing tools under the zoning ordinance so that Chick-Fil-A can improve traffic circulation and improve service efficiency. Mr. Caldon noted that the proposed drive-thru lane would provide a positive outcome for residents, faster and more efficient service, and better traffic circulation on North Park Drive. Mr. Caldon stated that there is no detriment associated with the proposed PUD. Mr. Caldon noted that the only deviation they are requesting from the local requirements is the elimination of buffering between the two parcels that are part of the PUD. Mr. Caldon stated that they would shift the buffering along US 31 to provide streetscape beautification, which is in the updated plan provided tonight. Mr. Caldon said that relative to the intent and purpose of PUDs, they are to meet one of the standards in section 16.1, and they believe that they meet at least four standards. Mr. Caldon noted that the standards met include making a more economic and efficient use of the land and circulation systems, minimizing traffic impacts, and improving land

where site conditions make development under conventional zoning difficult or less desirable conditions.

Mr. Caldon stated that relative to the qualifying conditions under section 16.2 of the ordinance, they are required to meet four conditions and claimed they meet five.

Mr. Caldon said that relative to the standards of approval in section 16.8, Staff reported that they did not meet the standards for A and E. Mr. Caldon noted that this new design is used by hundreds of Chick-Fil-A restaurants, and it has been shown to be safe.

Chairman Kortering noted that this is not a normal PUD and asked why they didn't go through the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Caldon stated that they were told a variance application would not be supported and that the self-created hardship would not be met.

Chairman Kortering questioned if this was being done in partnership with Quality Car Wash. Mr. Caldon stated yes and that both owners have signed the application for the PUD. Mr. Caldon noted that the extra drive-thru lane being proposed would go from one parcel onto the other parcel and back to the original parcel to facilitate effective traffic flow. Chairman Kortering asked if there was a lease agreement. Mr. Caldon stated that there is an easement that is granted that persists throughout the life of the restaurant.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked for clarification in reference to the section that deals with poorly dimension lots with difficult site conditions. Mr. Caldon stated that it is impossible to establish this extra drive-thru lane without reducing or eliminating the buffering under conventional zoning. Mr. VanderMeulen stated concern that this could cause problems in the future and questioned why this parcel is different than any other parcel. Mr. Caldon stated that there are benefits to the property owners, customers, and surrounding area. Chairman Kortering noted that there is concern of setting a precedence.

The Commissioners stated that a driveway did not meet the high-quality architectural design beyond the site plan requirements standard. Chairman Kortering confirmed that there would be landscaping along US 31 and not between the two businesses. Chairman Kortering moved on to the next standard, mitigation to offset impacts on public streets, and noted that it was not a public street.

Mr. Toole stated that the purpose of the project would be to continue the two lanes that wrap around the building. Mr. Toole talked about the landscaping plans. Mr. Becker asked about the traffic flow with the additional lane. Mr. Toole noted that there is a natural merging flow with the delivery of the food. Mr. VanderMeulen voiced concern regarding more strain would be put on North Park Drive and James Street. Mr. Toole stated that traffic won't increase, and there will be better traffic flow on North Park Drive because the backed-up traffic will be on-site.

Mr. Page stated that Chick-Fil-A wants to be Holland's most caring company and believes the dual lane can help accomplish that. Mr. Page noted that safety would improve because they wouldn't have to park cars waiting for food, and it would streamline the exiting cars. Mr. Page said that this would enhance safety for the team, create a more efficient streamline for the guests, and help with congestion on North Park Drive. Mr. Page noted that this will be a bypass lane, not a serving lane, so it will be easier to get out instead of holding up cars, and servers would not be going between the cars. Mr. Becker confirmed that there is not a barrier between lanes. Mr.

Toole stated that 85% of the time it will be a bypass lane, but at high peak times, they could have two lanes for food.

Mr. Becker stated that he is comfortable with the site plan but concerned with the PUD and the precedence it sets.

Chairman Kortering noted that Staff and the attorney don't agree that the standards were met which means they wouldn't qualify for a PUD. Mr. Caldron stated that he disagrees and feels they meet the standard that says the conditions of the land make development under conventional zoning not only difficult and less desirable but impossible. Chairman Kortering disagreed and stated it was their plan and because it's a bad design, they have to have a PUD.

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

The Commissioners discussed that this is an unusual path for a PUD and are concerned with the precedence it could set. Chairman Kortering referred to the attorney's statement that the standards were not met and that he is uncomfortable with the two different owners and two different businesses instead of a developer. Staff noted that the attorney stated that this does not qualify for a PUD, and there is not an increase benefit to the Township for granting this. Staff stated that the PUD has to meet at least one of the intent and purpose standards and four parts for the recognizable benefits which the attorney stated that the minimum requirements were not met. The Commissioners discussed whether or not to go against what Staff and the attorney have presented and the possibility of tabling it.

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

Chairman Kortering went through Section 16.1.C to determine whether the proposed PUD meets the intent and purpose of Article 16. The purpose of the PUD process is to provide a design option to allow for one (1) or more of the following:

Preliminary PUD Planning and Zoning Analysis

1. Innovative land development in terms of variety, design, layout, and type of structures constructed;

Not met.

2. Efficient use of land to facilitate a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use, and utilities;

Not met, the Commissioners did not reach a consensus that the PUD request met this standard.

3. Adaptive re-use of significant or historic buildings;

Not met.

4. Mixed use development projects and/or mixed use buildings;

Not met, housing is not part of the PUD.

5. Preservation and protection of significant natural features, open space, and cultural/historic resources;

Not met.

6. Promote efficient provision of public services and utilities;

Not met.

7. Minimal adverse traffic impacts and accommodate safe and efficient pedestrian access and circulation;

Yes, the Commissioners agreed that this standard is met.

8. Convenient recreational facilities;

Not met.

9. Use and improvement of land where site conditions make development under conventional zoning difficult or less desirable; and

Not met, the Commissioners did not reach a consensus that the PUD request met this standard.

10. Open Space Development option, per Section 16.3 E.

Not met.

Chairman Kortering next went through the following: The qualifying conditions for a PUD involve consistency with the (1) Master Plan, (2) Unified Control, and (3) Recognizable Benefits for the Community per Section 16.2 – Qualifying Conditions.

PUD – Preliminary Qualifying Conditions

Mr. Becker questioned if both properties, Quality Car Wash and Chick-Fil-A, are part of this one PUD or just one with an easement. Mr. VanderMeulen questioned how taxes would be assessed. Staff stated that both applicants will be impacted by this and have to adhere to the final resolution and report. Mr. Becker questioned that anytime Quality Car Wash wants to make a change, it has to be a PUD adjustment and align with Chick-Fil-A. Staff confirmed that and noted that Quality Car Wash signed the application but does not have a representative present at the meeting. Mr. Caldon stated that unified control is defined as “shall be under the control of one owner or group of owners and shall be capable of being planned and developed as an integral unit”. Chairman Kortering stated that interpretation would mean that both owners are controlling this PUD. Staff agreed that is how they interpreted it and integral unit is the term used. The Commissioner expressed their concern that Quality Car Wash was not present. Chairman Kortering voiced

concern that any future changes would require both businesses. Chairman Kortering noted that PUDs traditionally have one representative. The Commissioner agreed they would like to get further clarification from the attorney. Staff noted that if the Commissioners were to consider granting the preliminary PUD, it is recommended that the Commissioners address the vehicle wash special land use permit as being embedded in the PUD and that the car wash had a non-use variance for their sign so both of these items should be wrapped into the PUD.

The Commission then discussed the recognizable benefits where the applicant shall demonstrate that the PUD provides at least four (4) of the following site design elements, which could not be attained under conventional zoning:

1. Mixed-use development with residential and non-residential uses or a variety of housing types.

Not met. The project contains neither mixed-use nor housing.

2. Pedestrian/transit-oriented design with buildings oriented to the sidewalk and parking to the side or rear of the site.

Not met. The project consists of car-oriented businesses.

3. High quality architectural design beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance.

Not met. The PUD request is for an added drive-thru lane.

4. Extensive landscaping beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance.

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

5. Preservation, enhancement, or restoration of natural resources (trees, slopes, wetland areas, water views, etc.).

Not met.

6. Preservation or restoration of significant or historic resources.

Not met.

7. Provision of open space or public plazas or features.

Not met.

8. Efficient consolidation of poorly dimensioned lots of record or property with difficult site conditions (e.g. topography, shape, etc.).

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 9. Effective transition between higher and lower density uses, and/or between non-residential and residential uses; or allowing incompatible adjacent land uses to be developed in a manner that is not possible using a conventional approach.**

Not met.

- 10. Shared vehicular and pedestrian access between properties or uses.**

Not met.

- 11. Mitigation to offset impacts on public facilities (such as street improvements).**

Not met, North Park Drive is not a public street.

- 12. Significant use of sustainable building and site design features such as: water use reduction, water efficient landscaping, innovative wastewater technologies, low impact stormwater management, optimize energy performance, on-site renewable energy, passive solar heating, reuse/recycled/renewable materials, indoor air quality or other elements identified as sustainable by established groups such as the US Green Building Council (LEED) or ANSI National Green Building Standards.**

Not met.

Chairman Kortering stated that they don't have the minimum 4 recognizable benefits per the standards which means the interpretation is that the PUD cannot be approved.

The Commission then reviewed the Preliminary PUD Approval Standards. A preliminary PUD development plan shall only be approved if it complies with each of the following standards and applicable standards established elsewhere in Article 16.

- A. Intent and Qualification. The proposed PUD complies with the intent and the applicable qualifying conditions of Sections 16.1 C and 16.2 C of this article, respectively.**

The Commission did not find that the request met a minimum of 4 of the recognizable benefits under Section 16.2 C.

- B. Uses. The uses conducted within the proposed PUD, the PUD's impact on the community, and other aspects of the PUD are consistent with the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.**

The Commissioners stated that this standard was previously discussed.

- C. Design. The proposed PUD shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in a manner harmonious with the character of adjacent property, the surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the development.**

Chairman Kortering stated that he does not see a challenge with this standard.

D. Character. The PUD shall not change the essential character of the surrounding area.

The Commissioners agreed with this standard.

E. Impact. The PUD shall not be hazardous to adjacent property or involve uses, activities, materials, or equipment that will be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, or glare.

The Commissioners agreed there will not be an impact since they are already in operation.

F. Public Service Capacity. The PUD shall not place demands on public services and facilities more than current or anticipated future capacity.

The Commissioners discussed whether a second bypass lane would increase traffic; however, there was no concern with this standard.

G. Utilities. Underground utilities, including telephone and electrical systems, are required within the limits of all PUDs. Appurtenances to these systems, which can be effectively screened, may be exempt from this requirement if the Planning Commission finds that such exemption will not violate the intent or character of the proposed planned unit development.

The Commissioners agreed this is not an issue.

The Commissioners discussed that the qualifications were not met. The Commissioners stated that there are a lot of ramifications not being accounted for. The Commissioners discussed the reasons for tabling it.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to table the request with the following suggestions to the applicant: consideration of a submittal to the ZBA, further clarification regarding managing a PUD with two different entities within the existing special land use and how to manage changes to the PUD and what qualifies as unified control, and providing information that Quality Car Wash understands the ramifications of the PUD. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for a wetland mitigation bank. The petition is submitted by Randy Koetje of Koetje Builders & Dev LLC for property located at the NW Corner of Quincy Street and 120th Avenue, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-04-400-026. The subject property is zoned AG Agriculture.

Present for this request was Matthew MacGregor of MacGregor & Associates, 2222 Englewood Drive SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49506.

Chairman Kortering inquired about the current status. Staff noted that the attorney said it would be appropriate to consider this a new use and decide whether it required a Special Land Use permit. Staff said that the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Township Board

that a wetland bank should be considered a special land use permit within agricultural zoning districts. The Township Board subsequently approved the text amendment. The applicant is now seeking a special land use permit for a wetland bank.

Mr. MacGregor stated that they have applied to EGLE for the Wetland Mitigation Bank. Mr. MacGregor noted that EGLE conducted the site evaluation, and everything looks good with just a couple of minor modifications needed to the grading plan. Mr. MacGregor noted that the Township will get the public notice from EGLE. Mr. MacGregor stated that their hope is to start construction this spring, hopefully planting trees before Memorial Day. Mr. MacGregor noted that as soon as they get the water control structures in, they will have wetland hydrology and then they will have wetland habitat once the seeds pop. Mr. MacGregor clarified that signs will be posted; it's a requirement of the EGLE permit. Mr. MacGregor noted that there is no buffer requirement by EGLE, but they will maintain a 25-foot vegetative buffer as the remaining property will still be farmed. Chairman Kortering asked about parking for the maintenance workers and voiced concern about parking on the road. Mr. MacGregor stated that they would propose a gravel spot to park which would probably be off of 120th Avenue.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

John Baumann, 4211 N 120th Avenue, Holland, MI 49424 stated that he is a neighbor to this property and was concerned that this was the first time he has heard about this wetland mitigation. Staff explained that as a Township wide ordinance, it was publicly noticed in the paper and on the website per state law for text amendment changes. Staff noted that since it is now site specific as opposed to a Township wide ordinance, letters get mailed to all properties within 300 feet per state rules. Mr. Baumann inquired about what was going to be put on the land.

Paul Scholten, 4155 N 120th Avenue, Holland, MI 49424 stated that his property connects on two sides. Mr. Scholten voiced concern about whether the water issue will be addressed and that EGLE knows the volume of water that runs through that piece of property. Staff stated that Joe Bush, Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner, is in favor of the wetland mitigation.

Mike Nyland, 12345 Quincy Street, Holland, MI 49424 stated that when he first moved in there were a lot of drainage problems. Mr. Nyland noted that he hasn't seen any land shaping and would like to have a copy of that. Mr. Nyland stated that a lot of years have been spent on how to differentiate the water between the properties.

Mr. MacGregor noted that there will be an opportunity for residents to express concerns to EGLE during the EGLE permit process. Mr. MacGregor talked about the reason this site was identified as a good place for a wetland mitigation bank.

Staff stated that an email was received from Steve Morren, farmer of property at the NE corner of 120th and Quincy and Laurie Hekman, property owner of the land at the NE corner of 120th and Quincy. Staff stated that the email had questions regarding the size of the wetland, how the wetland will affect drainage, who is funding the project, and how it will be taxed. Mr. MacGregor noted that the wetland is 34 acres, drainage will be on-site, and the applicant is funding the project. Staff noted that their email was forwarded to the Assessor to answer the tax question. Staff noted that the email included concern with the wetland attracting wild birds and causing a threat to the poultry farms.

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

The Commission then reviewed the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

- 1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.**

The Commissioners agreed with this standard given the existing farming uses in the area.

- 2. The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

The Commissioners agreed that this is a net positive for the County given the Water Resources Commissioner's approval of the project.

- 3. The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

The Commissioners have no concerns with this standard.

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

The Commissioners stated that this will validate the Comprehensive Plan; the property will be "used" in a different way than farming, but it will not be developed.

- 5. The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

The Commissioners noted that with the additional trees and plants, the natural state of the area will be improved.

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

The Commissioners stated this will not negatively impact traffic.

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

The Commissioners agreed there is a need since similar uses of land are already expanding within the County.

Chairman Kortering reviewed the Staff recommendations regarding a driveway, parking spaces and whether to prohibit structures. Staff stated that the understanding of the typical State agreement is that it would prohibit the general public from being in these areas. Staff noted that a wetland bank can help with the storm water, but can the space be used for more than that?

Chairman Kortering inquired if they should ask EGLE to remove the prohibition condition. Mr. MacGregor stated that EGLE said that public use of the land is up to the owner, and EGLE would not prohibit public use. Mr. MacGregor noted that in their plans they could include paths on the berms. Mr. MacGregor also noted that they are set back off the road so there would be plenty of room for parking or access outside of the easement along Quincy.

Chairman Kortering confirmed with Mr. MacGregor that if pathways are included on the berms and EGLE approves it, they wouldn't have to include a prohibition in the permit.

Ms. Huesman asked for clarification regarding the size of the wetland bank. Mr. MacGregor confirmed that the parcel is 54 acres, the wetland bank is 34 acres, and the rest would continue to be farmland. Chairman Kortering noted that they shouldn't include removing the prohibition but should request the consideration of bike paths or pathways on the berms. Staff stated that the plans brought to the Planning Commission should include paths. Mr. Sharp agrees that it should be approved but with paths shown on the plans. Chairman Kortering questioned if a parking stipulation needs to be included. Mr. Becker stated that there could be a stipulation to include a gravel spot for parking. Staff noted that it shouldn't be parallel parking along Quincy.

****** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Huesman to approve the Special Land Use Permit for a wetland mitigation bank for Parcel Number 70-16-04-400-026 with the stipulation that the site plan be approved by Staff, a copy of the approved Ottawa County Road Commission driveway permit shall be provided during the plan review, a new driveway which does not need be paved will be required leading to at least two parking spots, and the site plan includes pathways on the berms. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for a specialized training school involving martial arts training. The petition is submitted by Mark Tomasik of Innovative Design P.C. on behalf of Kevin Irwin of Guardian Jiu-Jitsu Academy for property located at 12330 James Street, Suite D10, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-21-200-080. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was Kevin Irwin of Guardian Jiu-Jitsu Academy, 396 Beech Street, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Irwin stated that he is the owner and operator of Guardian Jiu-Jitsu and also the head coach. Mr. Irwin said that he is requesting a special land use permit for a new location to upgrade to a 10,500 square foot facility. Mr. Irwin noted that the new location is in the same building within the Holland Town Center. Mr. Irwin stated that the request is due to the school's growth. Mr. Irwin noted that they offer classes to the general public and that structure and safety is very important. Mr. Irwin stated that having a bigger space would allow more structure and more classes.

Mr. Becker questioned why it wasn't by right instead of a special land use. Chairman Kortering explained that it was necessary to look at the definition of a school.

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

The Commission then reviewed the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

- 1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.**

The Commissioners agreed that it is fitting for the neighborhood; the use is already in the Holland Town Center.

- 2. The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

The Commissioners stated that they are already operating the business.

- 3. The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

The Commissioners noted that the use will not be detrimental to any persons or property.

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

The Commissioners agreed the use is consistent.

- 5. The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

The Commissioners noted that there will be no changes to the environment.

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

The Commissioners stated that this is an existing facility, and there is plenty of parking available.

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

The Commissioners stated that since the business is expanding, there is a need.

**** It was moved by Barajas and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the Special Land Use Permit for a specialized training school involving martial arts training for Suite D10 of 12330 James Street. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.**

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for a contractor's facility with outdoor storage. The petition is submitted by Diane Sinclair of Sinclair Recreation for property located at 176 E Lakewood Boulevard, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-275-029. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was Melinda Whitten of MCSA Group, 529 Greenwood Avenue, East Grand Rapids, MI 49506.

Ms. Whitten stated that she was hired by Sinclair Recreation to design improvements to their parking lot and to incorporate an additional fencing area to help with the capacity of storing temporary play equipment or construction items.

Chairman Kortering asked for clarification of the nature of their business. Ms. Whitten stated that Sinclair Recreation sells and installs playground equipment. Ms. Whitten noted that this location is primarily their office for marketing and sales, and their other location operates more of the construction side where they store their tools. Ms. Whitten pointed out that almost the entire site is paved so they are designing plans to improve drainage, remove and replace the paving, and incorporate more landscaping and greenspace buffers. Ms. Whitten stated that part of the design is to have more storage space on the west side of the building to temporarily hold play equipment. Ms. Whitten noted that there would be an 8-foot-tall vinyl fence of faux wood to accent and complement the exterior of the building. Ms. Whitten noted that the fence would also serve as a deck and patio space for employees and would screen views to the adjacent property.

Chairman Kortering questioned the layout and use of the storage area. Ms. Whitten explained that there is a double gate on the north side of the fence that is 12 foot wide and will allow equipment in and out and that there is a man gate on the west side. Ms. Whitten confirmed that the fence is outside of the shared easement and does not interfere with the adjacent automotive business.

Chairman Kortering noted that one of the plans included a pickleball court. Ms. Whitten stated that they did show a spot for a temporary moveable net, but it does not need to be included in the plan. Chairman Kortering stated that it could create parking flow issues and suggests not to include it.

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

Chairman Kortering summarized that the outdoor storage complies, there would be modification of the parking lot to add an outdoor break area, additional front yard landscaping, and removal of a potential pickleball court. Chairman Kortering inquired about a missing location of an off-street loading space. Staff explained that all commercial and industrial plans are required to have an off-street loading space which should be a 12'x40' area. Staff noted they would be satisfied with a space within the 12-foot gate that goes back 40 feet. Staff noted that clarification is needed that the overhead doors are not intended for shipping and receiving.

The Commission then reviewed the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.

The Commissioners agreed that the use will be harmonious and appropriate.

2. **The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

The Commissioners stated that they are already operating the business.

3. **The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

The Commissioners noted that the outdoor storage area for playground equipment is shown to comply with Ordinance requirements, so the standard is met.

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

The Commissioners agreed that the use will be consistent with the intent and purposes.

5. **The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

The Commissioners agreed that they are enhancing the environment with the additional landscaping.

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

The Commissioners stated that this was addressed with the easement.

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

The Commissioners agreed that there is a need.

Chairman Kortering reviewed the staff recommendations regarding the pickleball court not being permitted, no need for off-street loading, and overhead door conditions. Staff noted that they didn't need to address the overhead doors given their primary use wasn't shipping and receiving.

** It was moved by Huesman and supported by Molotky to approve the Special Land Use Permit for a contractor's facility with outdoor storage for 176 E Lakewood Boulevard with the stipulation that the pickleball court is not permitted to encumber drive aisles and shall be removed from the plans. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Tabled Business

11483 Lakewood Blvd – Special Land Use Permit – 70-16-22-271-005 - Consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for "Vehicles, Recreational equipment, manufactured homes, heavy equipment sales and rental" and "Vehicle Repair, including outdoor storage of vehicles awaiting repair". Petition is submitted by Dave Timmerman of Union Land LLC. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled August 12, 2025)

Staff stated that the application moved forward to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and they granted some approvals. Staff noted that the plans are being revised and will return to the Planning Commission soon.

Planning Commission Discussion

The Commissioners discussed how to preserve industrial land to support growth, text changes and clarifications, contractor facilities, future housing options, and renewable energy. Staff noted that the next few meetings will be held at the Riley Street Fire Station.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 3, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Webb
Recording Secretary