

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

**HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
May 12, 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, 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

Public Comment:

Steve Willard, 3568 Jayden Court, Holland, MI 49424 stated that he is proposing a change to how residential street parking is handled and stated that he presented a full draft of a proposal at the December 4, 2025, Township Board meeting. Mr. Willard asked the Commissioners for a recommendation to move forward with a formal review of a proposal to permit daytime parking and prohibit parking overnight between 2 am and 6 am with the exception of a guest permit. Chairman Kortering asked if this is in the Planning Commission's purview. Director Broersma noted that roads are under the authority of the Ottawa County Road Commission.

Chairman Kortering closed the public comment.

Minutes:

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Barajas to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of April 14, 2026. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Abstain- 2. Motion carried.

Public Hearings

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a request for a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan submitted by Aaron Besmer on behalf of Andrew & Deborah Tacoma Trust & Wesley and Necia Glass Trust for property located at 0 (vac) Quincy Street, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-09-100-012. The proposed development plan for the "Lantern Village" would consist of a single-deed, detached and attached single-family and two-family residential community on 9.2 acres of land. The property was previously zoned AG Agricultural and is now zoned R-2A Medium Density, as of May 2, 2026.

Present for this request were Aaron Besmer and Dan Larabel of Allen Edwin Homes, 795 Clyde Court, Byron Center, MI 49315.

Mr. Besmer stated that he is here for the proposed "Lantern Village" PUD and that the property was recently rezoned to R-2A. Mr. Besmer noted that the property is 9.2 acres, and they are proposing 60 units of attached and detached single family homes. Mr. Besmer noted that they have a parallel plan that has not been presented yet, but it also yielded that same 60 units in a

cul-de-sac figuration. Mr. Besmer stated that the development would have private streets, public water and sewer, and 4 acres of green space. Mr. Besmer pointed out that Quincy Street is to the north, to the west is the Redwood development, there are 2 residential properties to the east, and an additional Redwood development to the south.

Mr. Besmer presented a slide of the proposed layout. Mr. Besmer stated that there is a single road entrance drive along the east side which would allow for future connections. Mr. Besmer noted that there is additional visitor parking along the main route. Mr. Besmer stated that there is fire access on the top left which would be gated for vehicles and used for fire and emergency only. Mr. Besmer stated that there is sidewalk connectivity in the north and could also be in the south. Mr. Besmer stated that there will be a wet pond up front which would also serve as retention. Mr. Besmer noted that they have connectivity to a pathway on Quincy.

Mr. Besmer stated that three quarters of the development would be single family attached and detached units and the remaining quarter would be alley load, meaning single family houses with the garage on the back side. Mr. Besmer noted that the houses would be two-story, have basements, 2 stall garages, 3-4 bedrooms, 22-foot-deep minimum, attached units are 3,600 square feet, and alley load are 1,640 square feet. Mr. Besmer noted that the common wall for the attached units will be the garage wall. Mr. Besmer pointed out that the view from Quincy Street would be unique because it would be the front of the houses.

Mr. Besmer stated that they did develop a parallel plan that they haven't shared yet. Mr. Besmer noted that the parallel plan includes 20 3-unit townhomes on a straight end cul-de-sac road off of Quincy Street. Mr. Besmer stated that they feel the current plan is a unique and innovative layout.

Mr. Besmer went on to explain how the plan satisfies the intent of the PUD ordinance's qualifying conditions and recognizable benefits. Mr. Besmer stated that the first qualifying condition, innovative land development design and types of structure were met with the facades/porches facing the Quincy Street entrance, a unique product type with the alley load, less traffic with the access configuration and owned by a single entity, Copper Bay, and operated as a rental facility. Mr. Besmer noted that the efficient use of land to facilitate more economic arrangement of buildings condition was met due to the 45 percent green space. Mr. Besmer stated that the minimal adverse traffic impacts and accommodating safe and efficient pedestrian access and circulation condition was met with the sidewalk access to the Quincy Street pathway and the connection to Redwood next door. Mr. Besmer stated that the use and improvement of land where site conditions make development under conventional zoning difficult or less desirable condition was met when compared to a traditional zoning plan of a straight cul-de-sac layout.

Mr. Besmer discussed how they met the recognizable benefits. Mr. Besmer stated that what they are planning to build is different than what the neighbors have. Mr. Besmer stated they are proposing houses with basements, two stories, and garages which provides a different type of housing. Mr. Besmer noted that they have a pedestrian oriented design with sidewalks and parking in the rear. Mr. Besmer stated that they have a variety of siding types and colors, varying elevations, columns, and concrete porches. Mr. Besmer also noted that they will be doing extensive landscaping. Mr. Besmer stated that they will provide an open space with the pond which will provide a nice street presence and that they will have 4 acres of green space over the entire property. Mr. Besmer noted that there will be shared access between properties with a connection to the Redwood project.

Chairman Kortering asked where people are going to park regarding the dead ends and are people going to park on the road. Mr. Besmer stated that there is space in the driveways for two

cars, there is additional parking on the main road, and they do not plan on people parking on the street. Chairman Kortering asked where are they going to put the snow. Mr. Besmer stated there is room off the east side and to the west at the dead ends. Chairman Kortering asked if the garages are 22 feet. Mr. Besmer stated that the plan is showing a 20' x 70' footprint with a 22-foot garage and knows that that would have to be a waiver because the house depth to width ratio has to be maximum three to one.

Ms. Molotky asked if they were going to be rentals and what the price point would be. Mr. Besmer stated yes, the whole development would be rentals, and rent would be between \$2800-\$3000. Mr. Barajas asked if there were any other sidewalks, especially for safety in the winter. Mr. Besmer noted that there are sidewalks in the front, and on the alley load side, and there's a sidewalk from Quincy all the way down. Mr. Besmer stated any more sidewalks would cut down green space, but they are open for discussion. Mr. Besmer stated that the connectivity to Redwood is important because to the south there is a drainage ditch and residents are to the east.

Ms. Molotky asked if they were owned by Copper Bay. Mr. Larabel stated that they own the investment, they don't parcel out pieces for other investors, and that Copper Bay is the property management. Mr. Larabel confirmed that there is one parcel number and one owner.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he doesn't see any turnarounds and is concerned about how people will back up at the end of the road. Mr. Besmer stated that with similar layouts initially it was a concern, but then people tend to figure it out and navigate overtime. Ms. Molotky asked if this was reviewed by the Fire Chief regarding ample room for the fire trucks. Staff noted that the Director of Public Works and the Fire Chief did have concerns with the length of the dead-end driveways and having hydrants or water mains at the dead ends. Staff noted that there is also concern with general access since there is one way in and one way out and emergency vehicles would have to stack behind each other. Ms. Molotky noted concern about a fire spreading. Staff stated that each individual unit would have to be sprinkled due to the lack of secondary access. Mr. Besmer noted that they did talk to Redwood about that connection and was told that a traffic signal was being required by Blains. Mr. Besmer stated that access would be behind Blains, not out the front to the west. Staff stated that the signal that the Ottawa County Road Commission desires with any further development along West Shore Drive is going to be at West Shore Drive and Quincy, and it has yet to be determined who will be responsible for that cost.

Mr. Sharp asked if there was going to be a place to congregate outside. Mr. Besmer stated that the green space is the pond and that each unit has a backyard and there is green space between the units. Mr. Besmer noted that there is an opportunity on the east side for a mowed path and that there are trees along the property lines that they want to save as well. Staff noted that they do not have a grading plan and will need to see one because there will be a need for multiple drainage structures. Staff stated due to the narrow space between the houses there will likely be drainage issues from roof water and discharge from gutters.

Chairman Kortering asked for clarification regarding the next steps of the PUD. Staff noted that this is the preliminary PUD meeting and this is the first of three steps; the Commissioners have to determine whether this is creating a superior product to what traditional development could provide. Chairman Kortering confirmed that they will see it again and that tonight they are looking for comments. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that one thing they are very consistent about is fire truck radius turnings, and he sees issues with that. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he is also concerned with noise issues with two story houses and only 35 feet between them.

Ms. Huesman asked if they have this product anywhere else and have they been successful. Mr. Larabel stated that they have these units in Kalamazoo and Lansing, and the Lansing site has been fully built out in the last few months. Ms. Molotky asked if these rentals were geared towards families. Mr. Larabel stated that with 3 to 4 bedrooms, they are family friendly. Mr. Larabel asked if they would prefer to see preservation of natural areas or open spaces with amenities. The Commissioners agreed they would like to see more recreational availability. Ms. Molotky stated concern with the compact space which could cause problems with noise issues and parking issues.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Steve Willard, 3568 Jayden Court, Holland, MI 49424 stated that he is concerned these units will not be single family homes and will turn into multi-family homes. Mr. Willard stated concern with cars being stacked everywhere and people parking all over the place.

Loretto Smallenburg Everingham, 12450 Quincy Street, Holland, MI 49424 stated that she lives just to the east of the proposed development and shares the property with her sister who lives just to the south. Ms. Everingham stated that her main concern is water and having basements without sump pumps. Ms. Everingham stated that the entire woods have been flooded, and there's nowhere for that water to go. Ms. Everingham also noted concern with snow removal and snow being put on her property. Ms. Everingham said that the proposed bike path would infringe on her property. Ms. Everingham stated concern with the lack of green space and that kids would be playing in the woods on her property and who is making sure the kids don't play near the pond. Ms. Everingham stated that this place is just too tightly compacted, and they are also worried about having light come onto their property all hours of the night, especially with the driveways facing their property. Ms. Everingham noted concern with light pollution, sound pollution, and pollution in general. She already has trash issues with the surrounding communities. Ms. Everingham asked whether there would be a passing lane at the postal box when people stop to get their mail.

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

The Commissioners discussed that the layout was too compact, and the level of density magnifies the concerning issues. The Commissioners stated that they like the product and the concept. The Commissioners noted concern with too many dead ends, which could cause problems for delivery trucks not being able to turn around, and they worry about the lack of a turning radius for emergency vehicles. The Commissioners stated that the lack of connectivity and only one way in and one way out is concerning. The Commissioners reiterated that the plan would need the Fire Chief's approval. The Commissioners noted that the plan is better than apartments, and that they like the residential feel of it. The Commissioners stated concern that there wasn't much usable outside space and feel it is not family friendly. The Commissioners voiced concerns regarding drainage problems, especially with basements and also problems regarding snow removal. The Commissioners discussed the possibility of putting a driveway on the west side and possible fencing on the east side to prevent children from going onto the neighbors' property. The Commissioners talked about possible parking issues and the location of the postal box. In conclusion, the Commissioners stated that they did not feel this was a valid use of a PUD and that a lot of work still needs to be done.

Staff noted that they have not seen the parallel plan yet, but the applicant mentioned it was prepared using three-unit town homes which means it would not be an acceptable parallel plan. Staff noted that this PUD plan contains single-family and two-family homes so in a parallel plan, each building would need to be on its own lot. Staff stated that they would need to get approval from the Fire Chief.

The Planning Commissioners 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, the Commissioners stated that there is not the level of variety in design and types of structures that would qualify.

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

Not met, the Commissioners stated that the circulation system is an issue, and there's also issues with utilities and water looping.

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

Not met, there are no significant historic buildings on site.

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

Not met, there are no mixed-use buildings.

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

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

6. Promote efficient provision of public services and utilities;

Not met, the Commissioners stated that the Fire Chief said the current plan is not efficient.

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

Not met, the Commissioners noted traffic concerns related to dead-end streets and the lack of adequate turn-around areas for delivery trucks and emergency vehicles.

8. Convenient recreational facilities;

Not met, the Commissioners agreed that there are no recreational facilities.

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, the Commissioners stated that they are not seeking this.

Chairman Kortering stated that they did not meet the minimum number of standards so the PUD is not viable per the plan presented.

Mr. Larabel asked if he could request to table the PUD. Staff noted that with tabling the PUD there is concern regarding what changes are made and whether or not a new PUD should be sought and a new public notice given. Staff confirmed that they would review the new plan and could recommend whether it should be a new PUD or untabled as long as the Commissioners are comfortable based on the comments in the staff report.

The Commissioners discussed that they would like to see a study done regarding the water table and the basements. The Commissioners agreed that they talked about many improvements needed including green space and parking and possible fencing. Staff noted that landscaping and lighting would be included in the final phase.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to table the proposed preliminary development plan for “Lantern Village” for Parcel Number 70-16-09-100-012. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Other Business

0 (vac) Crossings Court – Amendment to P.U.D Final Development Plan, Crossings Court – Parcel Number 70-16-22-271-011 – Submitted by William Sikkel of Sikkel & Krommendyk, PLC on behalf of Tom Vroon of T2 Properties LLC in consideration of a proposed amendment permitting a contractor facility, warehousing to be used for storage of personal and recreational property, and outdoor storage on Lot 4; modifying the current PUD building setbacks for Lot 4 to comply with the C-2 Community Commercial setback requirements; and modifying the parking calculations to be 1 space per 145 square feet for Lots 2 & 3 and 1 space per 720 square feet on Lot 4.

Staff stated that the Resolution and Report was sent to the Commissioners and the applicant, and we have not received any comments from either party. Staff stated that they are comfortable moving forward. Staff referred the Commissioners to the last section of the Resolution and Report to make sure they are comfortable with the expected completion date. Staff noted that the report states that the completion date is written as June 24, 2028, and states that if the contractor cannot comply with this condition, they have a right to request an extension from the Township.

** It was moved by Huesman and supported by Molotky to approve the Resolution and Report recommending approval of the amendment to the Crossings Court Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan and direct Staff to distribute the document to the Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

2332 North Park Drive – Parcel Number 70-16-21-100-046 – Site Plan Review

Submitted by Chick-Fil-A, Inc. for site plan approval for an expanded drive-thru lane. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request were David Caldon of Varnum LLP, 333 Bridge Street NW, Grand Rapids, MI 49504 and Jason Toole of CPH, 1031 W 23rd Street, Panama City, FL 32405.

Mr. Caldon stated that Mandi Brower, owner of Quality Car Wash, could not be here tonight, but she did attend the recent ZBA meeting and sent a letter of support. Mr. Caldon recapped that in January they were seeking a modification via a PUD of the 10-foot landscape buffer on both properties to enable the construction of an additional drive-thru lane to improve circulation for better service and better traffic control. Mr. Caldon stated that the Planning Commission thought it would be preferable to address the buffer via variance instead of a PUD. Mr. Caldon stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals approved the variance on April 28, 2026. Mr. Caldon stated that tonight they are seeking site plan approval for the additional drive-thru lane.

Mr. Toole stated that they are proposing an additional lane for better efficiency and safety for employees. Mr. Toole noted that this configuration is used at Chick-Fil-A restaurants all over the country. Mr. Toole explained that there would be a 2-foot walk zone up against the building that's striped out, a 9-foot drive-thru lane, another 3-foot walk zone, and then another 9-foot drive-thru lane that would be the bypass. Mr. Toole stated that the walk zones are for employees delivering food to customers and that they are not raised so a car can drive over the pavement. Chairman Kortering confirmed that the 2-foot walk zone is the existing walk zone and that they are adding on another lane and 3-foot walk zone.

Mr. Toole noted that they are in contact with the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner. Mr. Toole stated that they have no concern with the landscaping plan including shrubs at least 24 inches tall and can provide a copy of the easement. Mr. Toole stated that they have the width for the 10-foot lane and 10-foot stacking as well.

Chairman Kortering confirmed that the additional lane was meant to be used during their busy times. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that Mandi Brower, owner of Quality Car Wash, was at the Zoning Board of Appeals meetings, and she was very supportive. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that Mandi Brower's biggest concern was to get traffic off of North Park Drive and that she was glad to see the landscaping proposal. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that they worked together to come up with a good landscaping plan that would last all year round and create a barrier between the businesses. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that the most important thing is the employees' safety and reducing traffic on North Park Drive.

Chairman Kortering asked for clarification regarding the 2 proposals tonight. Staff stated that this one is specifically for the Chick-Fil-A restaurant showing the proposed alignment of the double drive-thru lane and landscaping. Staff noted that in the Staff report's comments there are a couple of items that will need to be revised such as the 10-foot drive-thru lane will need to be met. Staff stated that the second proposal is in regard to recognizing an easement and an encroachment onto a property agreement between the two businesses.

Staff noted that the applicant will have to get approval from the office of the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner. Staff stated that the drive-thru stacking lanes need to be 10 feet wide. Mr. Caldon stated that section 10.3C of the zoning ordinance requires stacking spaces to be at least 10 feet in width, it doesn't define how that's measured and that's contrary to how parking spaces are addressed in the ordinance. Mr. Caldon noted that the ordinance says that parking spaces shall be striped to identify each parking space, permanently maintained and visible. Mr. Caldon stated that there really is no corresponding requirement for stacking spaces. Mr. Caldon noted that they have 11½ feet for each of the two spaces and are just striping some of it for safety purposes. Mr. Caldon noted that they meet the width requirement, but it's just striped a little differently.

Mr. Caldon stated that they technically meet the letter of the ordinance but that the ordinance says for every building or use having a drive-thru facility sufficient stacking capacity shall be provided to ensure the queuing of vehicles does not extend into a street or alley and stacking spaces shall be designed to minimize conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and parking area traffic. Mr. Caldon noted that Chick-Fil-A already has adequate stacking capacity and are here tonight to establish additional effective traffic stacking. Mr. Caldon stated that they meet the ordinance requirements, are adhering to safety and best practices, and have this layout throughout the country. Mr. Caldon stated that the 10-foot-wide lanes are not what's best for the project or for the employees.

Chairman Kortering asked about the 3-foot-wide walkway for employees. Mr. Caldon noted that there's 23 feet so they can't have 3 feet plus two 10-foot lanes plus the existing 2 feet so instead they have 9-foot lanes. Chairman Kortering confirmed that there isn't enough room to have 10-foot lanes.

Chairman Kortering confirmed that they would be submitting an updated landscaping plan and a copy of the signed and recorded easement plan. The Commissioners discussed that they do not feel strongly regarding the 10-foot-wide lanes. Staff noted that they are more comfortable that the lanes need to be 10 feet wide and that the existing drive-thru lane is 10 feet with the 3-foot employee pathway width, and they made that work and it would be consistent to continue those lanes through. Staff noted that they can revise their plan and get rid of the 2-foot raised walk and keep the 3-foot walkway. Mr. Caldon noted that they are not seeking another drive-thru but just adding additional space for cars which is primarily a bypass lane. Mr. Toole noted that the lane is 10 feet at the order point, which has an island with the menu board and with the striping it is actually 9 feet. Mr. Toole noted that the additional lane will be no different than the existing lane, which meets the intent. Staff stated that it might have been measured wrong, but it should be 10 feet. Mr. Toole noted that the 2-foot walkway section is not raised. Mr. Caldon stated that the measurements really come down to how the lanes are striped. The Commissioners continued to discuss the importance of maintaining 10-foot lanes. Staff noted that the lanes are 10 feet based on the survey and in some areas are only 9 feet wide. Chairman Kortering confirmed that they are operating with some 9-foot sections.

Mr. VanderMeulen noted that they have worked together and have come up with a workable plan, and this works in other parts of the country. Staff recommended that the motion not grant approval for the 9-foot lanes and that it be left to the zoning administrator's determination at a later date. Staff stated that the Planning Commission cannot give relief from a zoning ordinance rule. Staff noted that unless we find a reasonable reason with our attorney to give relief or it goes to the ZBA, it is 10 feet for a drive-thru lane. Ms. Molotky asked if stacking and a drive-thru are different. Staff confirmed that they are the same. Mr. Caldon noted that there is no requirement that a drive-thru lane must be 10 feet wide, but there is a requirement that stacking be 10 feet wide and

striping is not required. Mr. Caldon stated that they technically have 11½ feet of stacking, and they have already been approved with stacking with the existing drive-thru. Mr. Caldon noted that all they are doing is adding an additional lane with more stacking above and beyond what is already there. Staff confirmed that the current drive-thru lane is 9 feet wide at the pick-up window. The Commissioners discussed the stacking requirements. The Commissioners discussed that if they approve the site plan, they can include the stipulations noted by Staff and the applicant and Staff can work through the 10-foot requirement.

** It was moved by Sharp and supported by Molotky to approve the site plan for an expanded drive-thru lane at 2332 North Park Drive with the conditions that:

- Applicant shall provide a copy of the written approval from the Office of the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner noting the proposed or existing means of site drainage is sufficient for the proposed work;
- Landscape plan shall be updated to ensure all proposed shrubs will have a minimum installation height of 24" as required by Ordinance;
- A copy of the signed and recorded easement permitting Chick-Fil-A's drive-thru and associated landscaping improvements to encroach onto 2352 North Park Drive shall be provided to the Township prior to the commencement of site work.
- Those items are to be obtained and reviewed in a final site plan completed by Staff

A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

2352 North Park Drive – Parcel Number 70-16-21-100-046 – Site Plan Review

Submitted by Chick-Fil-A, Inc. on behalf of Essenburg Car Wash of North Park for site plan approval of site modifications relating to the drive-thru expansion at 2332 North Park Drive. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Chairman Kortering noted that they received a letter from Mandi Brower, owner of Quality Car Wash, in support of the site plan and also Mr. VanderMeulen's testimony that Mandi Brower was in support during the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. Chairman Kortering read the conditions outlined in the sample motion. There were no comments or concerns.

** It was moved by Barajas and supported by Huesman to approve the site plan for modifications on 2352 North Park Dr relating to the drive-thru expansion at 2332 North Park Dr with the condition(s) that:

- Applicant shall provide a copy of the written approval from the Office of the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner noting the proposed or existing means of site drainage is sufficient for the proposed work;
- Landscape plan shall be updated to ensure all proposed shrubs will have a minimum installation height of 24" as required by Ordinance;
- A copy of the signed and recorded easement permitting Chick-Fil-A's drive-thru and associated landscaping improvements to encroach onto 2352 North Park Drive shall be provided to the Township prior to the commencement of site work.

A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Tabled Business

2332 & 2352 North Park Dr - Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan - 70-16-21-100-046 & -045 - Request by Michael Lewis of Chick-Fil-A Inc for 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 subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled January 6, 2026)

** It was moved by Huesman and supported by Becker to remove the Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan request from the table. Motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Caldron stated that he is withdrawing their request of the PUD approval and handed a letter stating that to Staff.

** It was moved by Chairman Kortering to accept the letter of removal. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Planning Commission Discussion

Draft Ordinance Discussion on Battery Energy Storage Systems

Staff stated that this is just a draft at this point and that the attorney hasn't reviewed it yet. Staff started the discussion with definitions, the first one being Battery Energy Storage Systems, which was pulled exactly from PA233 which is the state act that basically circumvents local zoning for utility scale, renewable energy products. Staff explained that on-site is an accessory use that is intended to primarily serve the needs of the consumer on site, and off-site is a principal use that is designed and built to connect into a distribution or transmission grid.

Staff noted that the use permissions are similar to that of a commercial solar energy farm. An off-site Battery Energy Storage System would require a special land use permit and on-site would be permitted across the board. Staff stated that on-site Battery Energy Storage Systems would have the same setback requirements of their applicable zoning district.

Staff discussed the following pertaining to off-site Battery Energy Storage Systems. There will be a minimum of 100 feet from all lot lines, a minimum of 5 acres, and a maximum height of 16 feet. Fencing was discussed, and it was agreed to strike the word security from the fencing definition. Staff noted that the sound section was written exactly as it's written for our wind energy storage and that a sound study could be required. Staff discussed that the facility would have to show compliance with the National Fire Protection Association, NFPA 855. Staff explained that regarding landscaping, the applicant would be required to install a type A buffer on all property lines and that the Planning Commission could authorize additional screening measures.

Staff talked about parking and the need for an access drive. Staff noted that they met with the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner regarding surface water management. Staff discussed the installation and operational safety issues and the conformities to connect to the grid. Staff noted that a public safety plan would be required.

Staff discussed the need to repair or replace components to maintain the system would not require a new site plan as long as it's in the same footprint as the original site plan. The Commissioners discussed adding a statement that would say any changes would need to be provided to and approved by the Fire Chief. They discussed talking to the attorney about the transfer of ownership and whether it was going to be handled by the Township Board or the Planning Commission.

Staff discussed the special land use permit and site plan application requirements. It was suggested that the part stating a fire response plan and an emergency response plan acceptable to the Township Fire Chief or their designee be changed to approved by instead of acceptable.

Staff discussed that a decommissioning plan would be required and would be provided with their special land use permit application. Staff discussed the manner in which the project would be decommissioned, the projected costs, and the method of ensuring that funds would be available for decommissioning. Staff noted that there would be a review every four years regarding the amount of the surety bond based on inflation and current removal costs. The Commissioners discussed the language used regarding surety bonds and decommissioning and the fact that the attorney still needs to review it.

Staff talked about a Battery Energy Storage System that has not operated for 12 months would be considered abandoned and that the owner needs to proceed with decommissioning. The Commissioners discussed how to define not operating. It was proposed to include not connected to the grid for 12 months in the not operating definition. The Commissioners discussed adding, "it shall be considered abandoned unless an extension was approved by the Planning Commission". The Commissioners commended Staff on the quality of the draft. Staff stated that the next step is sending the draft to the attorney, and then it will come back to the Planning Commission for another discussion before being scheduled for a public hearing.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 2, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Webb
Recording Secretary