AGENDA
Park Township
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
February 12, 2020
6:30 p.m.

(Please turn off or set to silent mode all cellphones and other electronic devices)

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes: Regular meeting December 11, 2019

4. New Business:
   a. Planned Unit Development
      i. Anchorage Marine – Major Amendment, Preliminary Development Plan – 1825 Ottawa Beach Road

      **Anticipated Action:** Provide recommendations to the applicant, together with any recommended changes or modifications. Section 38-373(e), PTZO.

5. Old Business:
   a. Ottawa Beach NHP
      i. Second draft Ottawa Beach Overlay District – Division 6B
      ii. Second draft North Beach Master Plan amendment

      **Anticipated Action:** Review and provide direction to staff

6. Public Comments

7. Announcements
   a. Tree Preservation Committee
   b. Joint meeting date March 26, 2020
   c. Next Planning Commission meeting date March 11, 2020

8. Adjourn
CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Pfost called to order the regular meeting of the Park Township Planning Commission at 6:30 P.M., held in the Township Hall at the Park Township Office.

ATTENDANCE:

Present: Terry DeHaan, Dennis Eade, Rosemary Ervine, Diana Garlinghouse, David Kleinjans, Denise Nestel, Jeff Pfost

Staff: Greg Ransford, Planner, Dan Martin, Legal Counsel

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by Ervine, supported by Kleinjans, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Garlinghouse noted two changes on pages 2 and 3; Kleinjans also pointed out two corrections on page 2, and Nestel suggested a rewording on page 4 regarding the Township Board’s intent about firewood sales. Further, Ransford noted that the minutes should reflect action on the Swimming Pool language within section 38-492. These were duly noted for the record.

Motion by Ervine, supported by Garlinghouse, to approve the November 13, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes as amended.
**Voice Vote:**

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Public Hearing**

Pfost advised that he had a conflict of interest and recused himself for the first agenda item.

**Ervine moved, supported by Garlinghouse,** to allow Chair Pfost to recuse himself for the Geerlings Development Company Special Use Application item.

**Voice Vote:**

Ayes 6, nays 0. Motion carried.

Vice-Chair Ervine assumed the role of chair for the remainder of the meeting.


Ransford said the zoning ordinance permits for existing lots of record to be merged as noted pursuant to a special use permit from the Planning Commission. He pointed out that the Planning Commission may allow contiguous lots of record under the same ownership to merge into a lot less than the minimum requirement of the zoning district in which it is located but equal to or similar to existing lots in the surrounding neighborhood as a special use so long as it meets the four standards, as well as the general special use standards.

Ransford provided background for the request. The applicant states there are 18 lots of record in the Jenison Park Plat that are part of the proposed area. In addition, the applicant believes the proposed Special Use would create nine residential lots that are less than the minimum requirements but similar to the existing lots in the surrounding neighborhood. The subject area is located within the R-3 Low Density One Family Residence Zoning District.
Ransford explained that the Township hasn’t defined neighborhoods in its ordinances. The Planning Commission can interpret the term “neighborhood” as it believes is appropriate and should consider whether the lots as proposed are consistent, equal to or similar to other lots in the surrounding neighborhood, based on the four related standards.

Erwine asked Ransford if the numbers are accurate regarding the lot sizes in the proposed plan. Ransford said the numbers used were from the Ottawa County GIS system, however, the Township and the applicant varied on the data to a minor degree.

Erwine asked for confirmation there are nine lots that are requested. Ransford confirmed that number.

Erwine opened the Public Hearing at 6:39 P.M.

The applicant’s representative, Attorney Bill Sikkel, spoke for the Geerlings Development Company and Big Sky Enterprise, LLC, which owns the property. He focused on two primary questions prompted by the Staff Report: 1) How many lots are allowed? The property consists of 19 platted lots in Jenison Park. The Planning Commission may allow contiguous lots of record to be merged under the same ownership into a lot less than the minimum requirement, 15,000 square feet. Is the tax parcel the lot of record or is the platted lot the lot of record? He believes that the plat is the lot of record. They want to merge to the existing platted lots, 19 into 9 new lots. The staff report says the tax parcel is the lot of record.

Mr. Sikkel noted a similar request related to the Harrington School Project. That was a single tax parcel but there were 47 platted lots. Mr. Sikkel noted that those platted lots were made into 20 lots even though it was a single tax parcel. It is his opinion this is a similar issue to go from 19 platted lots to 9 lots of record.

2) The second issue is the lot size of the proposed new lots. He cited the ordinance language (Sec. 483(d)(4)), which states the lots may be merged to something less than the minimum requirement but equal to or similar to existing lots. He noted that the ordinance doesn't require the new lots to be the average size of all lots in the surrounding neighborhood, and it doesn't say how many lots. He asked how this should be interpreted.

Mr. Sikkel noted the drawing in the submitted packet. He pointed out what the neighborhood looks like. He compared some of the lots to what the developer wants to do. The proposed new lots range from 6,743 square feet to 9,796 square feet. He suggested that in one section 11 out of the 15 existing lots are approximately the same size range as the proposed lots. He suggested that to the south there are four lots that are within the same size range of the proposed lots. South of the proposed development along Scott Street he suggested there are four out of six lots that are approximately within the size range of the proposed lots. He noted that along Park Avenue, many lots are larger in size than what is proposed. The question is:
are they equal to or similar to the existing lots? He pointed out 26 lots within the surrounding neighborhood that he believes are within the same size parameters as the proposal.

The proposal recognizes some of the lots are larger. Mr. Sikkel noted that all of the proposed lots are larger than 6,750 feet. Mr. Sikkel suggested that because the ordinance does not require that the new lots be the average size of the existing lots, and doesn't use any mathematical formula, Planning Commission members should use an “eye test” Does this proposal look and feel the same as the lots already developed in the neighborhood? The developers are aware the Master Plan supports smaller neighborhoods and is trying to preserve the character of the neighborhood.

Garlinghouse commented the existing lots are twice as long as what is proposed, given the proposed alley divides the proposed lots in the special use application. It was her opinion the proposed lots do not look and feel as the existing neighborhood lots.

Martin asked if all of the lots proposed are larger than 6,750 square feet. Sikkel said the smallest lot is 6,743 square feet. One proposed lot is smaller but the rest are larger.

Martin noted that he agreed with Sikkel regarding the definition of an existing lot of record. Martin shared copies of the Ottawa County GIS illustration, the first page of which shows the platted lots of record in the Jenison Park Plat, the second page of which showed both the platted lots of record and the tax parcels, and the third of which showed only what is an existing tax parcel. Martin noted that these are 19 existing platted lots of record that have been previously combined in part to comprise 8 existing tax parcels. Now that they are in common ownership, he noted that the courts would consider the 19 existing platted lots that comprise 8 existing tax parcels to be one property for a takings analysis.

Martin noted that pursuant to the zoning ordinance, Subsection (d)(3) regarding lots that have been previously combined under Subsection (d)(1) shall not be split into new lots that do not meet the zoning district requirements. Martin noted that the Planning Commission could argue that two or more lots adjacent to one another and held under common ownership have previously been combined under (d)(1), whether or not they have been given new tax parcel numbers, and therefore cannot be split unless they comply with the zoning district requirements. Or, the Planning Commission could find that the standards in Subsection (d)(4) have been met, and allow the special use application as proposed, or a smaller number of lots that are larger than are proposed that the Planning Commission believes are more equal or similar to the existing lots in the neighborhood.

DeHaan asked when this area was platted. Martin said it was platted in the late 1800s, and he’d check the plat for the exact date.

Jeff Pett said he wrote to the Township and stated most of the neighbors are against this proposal. He urged the Planning Commission to look at the broader view of the neighborhood regarding this proposal. It is not clear what the developer wants for the neighborhood.
Mitch Padnos noted the plat was laid out in 1891 for Jenison Park. Martin confirmed that date. Padnos stated these proposed lots are 60% smaller than what is already there. The plan should be more in line with R-3 requirements. He is opposed to the alley in the plan. There will be too much density, resulting in both parking and traffic problems. He shared photos of the property as it has been used during yacht center activity – there isn’t enough parking for the PUD so they have been using the property subject to the special use application. He noted that several proposals for this property have been denied in the past. The application is silent on boating slips and what impact they will have.

Chris Meyer, Legal Counsel for Padnos, stated that Mr. Sikkel cited the Harrington School project as precedent, and he agreed that the Planning Commission should consider it as precedent. Mr. Meyer referenced the Township ordinance (d)(3): “Lots combined under Subsection (d)(1) shall not thereafter be split, re-divided or otherwise reduced in area unless all the resulting lots comply with the minimum lot area requirement for a buildable lot in the district in which the land is located.” In the Harrington School project those 47 lots that comprised one tax parcel were allowed to be merged into 20 lots, each of which were equal to or larger than the requirement for the R-3 zoning district. Each one of those lots from the Harrington School project met the requirement. Clearly, Harrington School is a precedent. He said the part of the ordinance, (d)(3), is what applies here.

In Mr. Meyer’s opinion, the “eyeball test” for the neighborhood is a soft standard for a decision. He recommended that the Planning Commission use a reasonable formula for determining whether the proposed lots were equal or similar to existing lots in the neighborhood, even if the ordinance doesn’t specify a particular formula. He suggested that the Planning Commission take the average lot size of 12,918 square feet – their proposed average lot is less than that – or take the median, which is 10,611 square feet. By that calculation you would have six not nine lots. Finally you have a Master Plan – that is your guide. It says in-fill development on the south side of Lake Macatawa should meet R-3 requirements. It can be done. Mr. Meyer suggested that if the special use application were to be approved, then the Township would be spot zoning in this case. He requested the proposal be denied.

Nestel asked if Meyer had an opinion if the developer had a second look at the setbacks.

Meyer said this would require a zoning variance.

Dale Koch lives on the south side. He asked if a retention pond would be part of the plan.

Milt VanVente sent a letter to the Township and understands the difference between a lot and a parcel. He owns a large lot along Scott Street. He has a large oak tree on one of his lots and wants to preserve it. It is between 300 and 400 years old. Compromise is acceptable, he loves the neighborhood, but there is no public water. The residents are on wells, and Scott is a narrow street. Infrastructure will be a problem.
Ann Kiewel lives in the neighborhood. She recalled they were approached as a neighborhood to allow something that they could live with and after much discussion with the Township they agreed to go along with it. However, the proposal ended up being rejected. This proposal makes no sense to her. She envisions a strip development which would create even more traffic on a narrow street.

Donna Nugent has lived in the Jenison Park area all her life. She lives a block east of this property. She expects changes but requests they are approved within the guidelines of the Township zoning ordinance.

Ervine closed the Public Hearing at 7:25 P.M.

Ervine asked Martin for comment.

Martin said he wasn’t asked by the Township to be involved in the Harrington School situation. He stated that because the Planning Commission didn’t review a special use application for the Harrington School project, then the resulting parcels that were created out of the 47 platted lots and one tax parcel would most likely have been in compliance with the Township zoning ordinance requirements. Martin advised that the Planning Commission has options: request more numbers from the developer for clarification if you believe the additional information is necessary for you to consider the standards to make your decision; approve the proposal as presented if you believe that it meets the standards; or deny the application as presented and tell the developers they have to develop the property as it exists, or create new lots out of the combined lots that are no smaller than those permitted by (d)(3), meaning the new lots would have to meet the 15,000 square feet requirement.

Martin said the lots that are in contiguous ownership must be combined under Subsection (d)(1), but subject to the possibility of merging into smaller lots than permitted under the zoning ordinance as provided in (d)(4); however, once the lots of record that are contiguous and in common ownership are combined under (d)(1), then they cannot be divided unless the resulting lots comply with the zoning requirements. Martin noted that from a Court’s standpoint, in a regulatory takings analysis, the court will look at the property as a whole, which once you have property that is contiguous and under one common ownership, it is generally considered by the courts to be one property, and then the court looks at whether the Township’s regulations deprive the owner of the economically viable use of the property. Martin noted that the US Supreme Court recently ruled that it looks at three factors to determine whether the property in question is one or more pieces of property, including the treatment of the land under state and local law. Martin noted that the Township ordinance states that nonconforming existing lots of record that are contiguous and in common ownership have got to be combined to become more conforming, and cannot be subsequently split.

Ervine asks if the developers have the right, as the property is now, to develop the property.
Martin said they have to combine the parcels according to (d)(1) requirements, as the platted lots are contiguous and in common ownership. The property owner would have to either comply with the zoning ordinance requirements for any new lots to be created pursuant to the (d)(3) requirement, or get the special use authorization from the Planning Commission pursuant to the (d)(4) provision for something smaller than the lot size required in the zoning district.

DeHaan said this proposal meets only one of the eight criteria. The developer is asking for nine parcels. In his opinion, the developer wants to maximize his investment.

Martin stated that from a regulatory-taking analysis, the Court is not going to ask whether the developer is able to maximize his investment, but rather will ask if it will allow him a reasonable return on his legitimate investment-backed expectations.

Kleinjans observed that the Harrington School is an excellent comparison. He noted that the 47 lots of record that were contiguous and in common ownership were combined into one tax parcel, and were subsequently allowed to be re-divided into lots that complied with the minimum requirements of the zoning district. He suggested that the Planning Commission follow that precedent, as noted by the attorneys.

Nestel said she was persuaded by the Master Plan guideline.

Garlinghouse said the Planning Commission decided this area was R-3 – we cannot go against the Master Plan. She disagreed with this proposal.

Eade is influenced by the Harrington School precedent. He would be comfortable with more square feet. This could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for yard setback variances.

DeHaan asked about water for the project.

Sikkel said the plan is the lots would be served by municipal water.

Kleinjans said he likes some of the small lots to allow more people to be near the water. He was sensitive to what the neighbors said about the look of the homes.

Martin said the size, character, and nature of the buildings to be constructed, as well as the effect of the proposed use, being single family houses, on the surrounding neighborhood are both important considerations and part of the standards the Planning Commission must review.

Garlinghouse was also concerned about location of boat slips and outdoor storage which can be an issue.

Ervine asked if the Planning Commission wanted to review the standards, send the request back to the applicant, or deny the request.
Kleinjans moved, supported by Garlinghouse, to deny the applicant’s request as presented.

Martin recommended the Planning Commission review the standards to explain the rationale for the denial.

Kleinjans reviewed the standards for Section 38-483(d)(4) Contiguous Lots of Record:

   a. *The size, character and nature of any buildings to be erected and constructed on the lot;*

The developer should make the lots larger to make them more conforming with the neighborhood. The plan for an alley and the planned lookalike construction of the proposed single family buildings does not conform with the surrounding neighborhood. The surrounding neighborhood has been developed with an eclectic style of structures, and the row houses would stand out. The standard is not met.

   b. *The effect of the proposed use on adjoining properties and the surrounding neighborhood;*

The proposed special use of 8 smaller lots as presented would have a negative effect on both adjoining properties and the surrounding neighborhood. Problems include the planned alley, and increased density, both of which would lead to traffic congestion in the neighborhood. Another problem is high water. The impact of the infrastructure that would have to be put in place is a potential problem. Only four properties would be conforming which is 10% of the total proposed units. The current square footage is too small. The lot size proposed is not compatible and the size of the proposed units are considerably smaller than what is there now. The standard is not met.

   c. *Available parking for the intended use; and,*

There is a plan for adequate parking so this standard is met.

   d. *The size of the lot in question compared to the lots in the surrounding neighborhood.*

The size of the proposed lots are too small compared to the lots in the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Commission believes the surrounding neighborhood consists of the homes along Park Avenue north of South Shore Drive, along South Shore Drive to the north, to where Scotch Street, East Avenue, and South Shore Drive meet. While some of the lots in the surrounding neighborhood may be smaller than the 15,000 square foot requirement of the R-3 Zoning District, other lots in the surrounding neighborhood exceed that requirement. The average lot size in the surrounding neighborhood is 12,918 square feet. The median lot size in the surrounding neighborhood is 10,611 square feet. What has been proposed doesn’t meet the
standards, because each proposed lot seeks to be smaller than both the average lot size and the median lot size of the surrounding neighborhood. Even using the “eye test” as suggested by the applicant’s attorney, the proposed lots appear to be too small compared to the lots in the surrounding neighborhood. This standard is not met.

Martin said the Planning Commission doesn’t have to move forward with the other general special use standards if the members agree the above standards have not been met.

Roll Call Vote:

Garlinghouse, aye; Kleinjans, aye; Ervine, aye; Nestel, aye; DeHaan, nay; Eade, aye.

Ayes 5, Nays 1. Motion approved to deny the request.

B. Joint Meeting Regarding Affordable Housing in Park Township

The proposed date for this meeting is March 26, 2020. The Planning Commission should notify Chair Pfost if they cannot attend. DeHaan said he would not be present at the meeting.

C. 2020 Proposed Meeting Schedule

Garlinghouse moved, supported by Nestel, to approve the 2020 meeting schedule.

Voice Vote:
Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Text Amendment – Proposed Section 38-516 of the Park Township Ordinance – Campfire Wood Sales

Martin said the Township Board discussed the sale of firewood at the August 8 meeting and agreed to not regulate front yard sales. This issue is now off the table. The Planning Commission does not have to follow up at this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ervine opened Public Comment at 8:10 P.M

There was no comment.

Ervine closed Public Comment at 8:10 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be January 8, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

Kleinjans moved, supported by DeHaan, to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 8:12 P.M.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith R. Hemwall
Recording Secretary
December 13, 2019
Approved:
Executive Summary

Pursuant to the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Act 33 of 2008, as amended, the Park Township Planning Commission (PTPC) was formed to review land use proposals and provide approval, denial, or recommendation to the Park Township Board of Trustees regarding the same; draft and maintain the Park Township Master Plan; conduct revisions to the Park Township Zoning Ordinance and provide recommendation and; conduct review and analysis of other related land use matters as requested by the Park Township Board of Trustees.

As a result of the responsibility of the PTPC, the Department of Community Development provides this monthly activity report as a synopsis of the land use planning efforts of the PTPC.

Current Land Use Proposals

Anchorage Marine Planned Unit Development Amendment

The applicant seeks to amend the existing Planned Unit Development and establish six (6) residential units in the existing second story and a proposed third story, as two (2) story units. The Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan will be reviewed by the PTPC at their February 12, 2020 meeting.

Current Ordinance Reviews

Tree Preservation Committee

The second draft of a Tree Preservation chapter was sent to the township Manager and township Legal Counsel for review and comment. Following, the draft will be presented to the Tree Preservation Committee, which is scheduled to meet on February 11, 2020.

Neighborhood Heritage Preservation (NHP)

Ottawa Beach (West Michigan Park Association)

Following a second Focus Group held with Ottawa Beach residents, as well as additional feedback from attendees regarding language revisions as a result of the Focus Group, the draft language has been finalized for Planning Commission review at their February 12, 2020 meeting.
Four Remaining NHP Areas

Following the conclusion of the Ottawa Beach NHP effort, staff intends to present their findings and recommendations regarding the subsequent NHP areas.

Construction Observation Update – Approved Land Use Projects

The Reserve on Lake Macatawa

NO CHANGE – The applicant submitted a zoning permit application for a site construction trailer and continues work on public utility lines. No permits have been sought for any residential units.

Beachwalk Condominiums – Ottawa Beach Road

Permit applications have been submitted for two (2) additional residences. One (1) unit under construction added a third stall garage (permitted under PUD amendment) without zoning/building permit, but has since obtained a permit.

Coastal Condominiums

NO CHANGE – This project is currently inactive.

KIN Coffee – 1200 Ottawa Beach Road – Coffee Shop and Residential Use

NO CHANGE – A sign permit (and associated electrical permit) was issued on October 21, 2019. Remodel permits were issued on April 24, 2019 and have been limited to the interior. Interior work continues.

Cityside Apartments

NO CHANGE – A building permit was issued on October 8, 2019. Work continues.

Upcoming Matters

Itty Bitty Bar Parking Lot

The Itty Bitty Bar is seeking to construct additional parking to serve their multi-tenant building located at 1130 Ottawa Beach Road. Staff has provided review comments to the applicant but has not received a response for several months. Most recently, the applicant illegally expanded their parking area again and a Stop Work Order was posted by the Township. Subsequently, we understand the applicant is seeking quotes to compile the required revisions to the site plan for review.

Macatawa Legends Planned Unit Development Amendment

The applicant seeks to amend the existing Planned Unit Development and establish 57 single family lots on an existing private road. The applicant is revising the plans as a result of our review comments and is anticipated to be on a subsequent agenda. However, we have not received any response for a couple of months.
MEMORANDUM

To: Park Township Planning Commission
From: Gregory L. Ransford, MPA
Date: February 4, 2020
Re: Anchorage Marine Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – Preliminary Development Plan

Attached is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application for major amendment to the Anchorage Marine PUD located at 1821 Ottawa Beach Road. The Anchorage Marine PUD was originally approved in 1985, which pre-dates the current PUD language within the Park Township Zoning Ordinance (PTZO). Anchorage Marine seeks Preliminary PUD Development Plan approval for six (6) single-family residential condominium units within the second floor of the existing building, as well as within a new third floor. The proposed PUD would also include required open space, parking, and other site improvements. The PUD consists of three properties, all of which are located within the C-2 – Resort Service Zoning District (C-2), and are identified as follows:

1. 1821 Ottawa Beach Road, Parcel 70-15-27-140-020
2. 1800 Ottawa Beach Road, Parcel 70-15-27-270-185
3. 1807 Ottawa Beach Road, Parcel 70-15-27-141-003

The application has been reviewed and found generally complete. Further below we provide our findings specific to the proposed site plan and relevant provisions of the PTZO for your review. We believe a resubmission of the Preliminary PUD Development Plan is appropriate with specific direction to the applicant to address and fulfill our considerations section at the end of this memorandum, as the Planning Commission deems appropriate.

Planning Commission Action

Pursuant to Section 38-373(5) – Procedures of the PTZO, the Planning Commission is tasked with reviewing the Preliminary Development Plan and providing recommendations to the applicant regarding the PUD, with any changes or modifications thereof. Following, the Planning Commission shall either direct the applicant to return with a revised Preliminary PUD Development Plan or return with a Final PUD Development Plan.

General Findings, Observations, and Relevant Ordinance Provisions

Existing PUD Operations

As aforementioned, the original PUD was approved in 1985. Several amendments were performed to the PUD throughout subsequent years (1987, 1989, 2002, and 2006), authorizing building additions, a wireless communications facility (cellular tower), and other improvements. Given the number of amendments since the original approval, and for your convenience, we provide the photograph below in an attempt to illustrate the current conditions and operations within the site. This photograph was taken in the Spring of 2018 by Ottawa County. Not only do we believe this photograph provides you with an understanding of (pre-season) operations but illustrates the potential conflict of uses between what currently exists on site and what is proposed within the PUD amendment (i.e. site parking, dumpster location and access).
Section 38-367(2) – Development Requirements for PUDs with Residential Uses – Formula to Determine Number of Dwellings on Net Buildable Acreage

In accordance with Section 38-367(2) of the PTZO, the applicant shall determine the net buildable acreage of the site and multiply that figure by the number of dwelling units permitted per acre within the C-2 Zoning District to determine the maximum base density permitted on the site. The applicant has provided their calculations within the Anchorage Marine/Boat Yard Lofts PUD sheet dated January 2020 (“Calculation Sheet”), which provides that three (3) base units are permitted. We agree with their conclusions.

Section 38-367(3) – Development Requirements for PUDs with Residential Uses – Additional Dwellings

While we believe the applicant correctly determined the maximum base density of residential units, we are unsure of what they are implying with the “38-367, 3d Bonus” portion of the Calculation Sheet. It appears that they are suggesting they are entitled to one (1) bonus unit because of their preservation of wetlands. While such preservation may contribute to the justification of bonus density, in our opinion, Section 38-367(3) of the PTZO provides only the Planning Commission with the discretion to determine the number of bonus units, based on the criteria therein. As a result, we believe this portion of their Calculation Sheet is incorrect. This incorrect bonus calculation is also reflected on site plan Sheet C-101 of the application materials as “bonus space wetland.” Regardless of this error, the applicant is requesting fewer total units than the maximum bonus density could permit.

Section 38-368 – Dedicated Open Space Requirements

Pursuant to Section 38-368 – Dedicated Open Space Requirements of the PTZO, a PUD is required to provide for a minimum amount of dedicated open space. Given that the subject parcel proposes multifamily development, a minimum of fifteen percent (15%) is required. The applicant has provided for this area within Sheet C-101 of
the application materials. While the applicant provided their open space calculations within the “Open Space, 38-368” section of the Calculation Sheet, the calculations do not appear to exclude the area of required setbacks pursuant to Section 38-368(b)(5) and landscaping buffers and greenbelts pursuant to Section 38-368(b)(9) of the PTZO.

While the applicant is seeking relief from the required greenbelts, as noted within page 4 of their letter dated January 27, 2020 regarding 1821 W. Ottawa Beach Road...Narrative Letter, Revision #3, it is our opinion that those areas, nonetheless, should be properly excluded from the open space calculations. The applicant should show these areas within the appropriate site plan sheet as well as within the Calculations Sheet.

All that said, it is important to note that the Planning Commission can recommend more than the minimum amount of dedicated open space in the instance the Commission finds that additional dedicated open space is necessary to achieve the purpose and objectives of the PUD District.

Section 38-369 – Standards for Dedicated Open Space

As you are aware, the Planning Commission must determine if the proposed open space meets the standards provided within Section 38-369 of the PTZO. In particular, we encouraged the applicant to illustrate, at minimum, how the proposed open space met subsection (4) and subsection (7) within the site plan materials. While we would ordinarily highlight these standards during Final Development Plan review, based on recent comments from the Chairperson to the applicant regarding the primary use of wetlands as open space, we felt it was appropriate to provide you these standards during the Preliminary Development Plan review. For your convenience, they are provided below.

Sec. 38-369. Standards for dedicated open space.

The following standards shall apply to the dedicated open space provided in a PUD:

1. Dedicated open space shall be located so as to preserve significant natural resources, natural features, scenic or wooded conditions, bodies of water, wetlands, or significant cultural features, such as existing landmark structures or vegetation.

2. A portion of the dedicated open space may be required to be located along the public road frontage abutting the site. This area shall be left in its natural condition or landscaped to provide a view compatible with the existing or desired character of the area. When required, the depth of this area shall be recommended by the Planning Commission and as approved by the Township Board, but in no case shall it be less than 30 feet, and it shall not include the road right-of-way.

3. If the site contains a lake, stream, or other body of water, the Township Board, following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, may require a portion of the dedicated open space to abut the body of water.

4. Dedicated open space areas shall be linked with adjacent open spaces, public parks, bicycle paths or pedestrian paths where practicable.

5. Grading in the dedicated open space shall be minimal, with the intent to preserve existing topography where practicable.

6. Dedicated open space may consist of ballfields, tennis courts, children’s play area, skate parks, swimming pools and related buildings, community buildings, and similar recreational facilities. No more than 50% of the dedicated open space may be devoted to these uses.

7. The dedicated open space shall be available and usable for all residents of the PUD, subject to reasonable rules. Safe and convenient pedestrian access to the dedicated open space shall be provided.

8. The dedicated open space shall be designed to be used primarily by residents of the PUD, but this shall not prohibit non-PUD residents from utilizing these accessory uses, provided
rules for such use are set forth in the open space agreement required by Section 38-371 herein.

(9) Noncontiguous dedicated open space. If requested by the applicant, the Planning Commission may recommend and the Township Board may approve dedicated open space that is not contiguous with the rest of the PUD. In determining whether to approve noncontiguous dedicated open space, one or more of the following criteria shall apply:
   a. The noncontiguous dedicated open space is located such that residents of the PUD can reasonably access and use the noncontiguous dedicated open space.
   b. The noncontiguous dedicated open space will be open to use by the residents of the PUD and the general public.
   c. The dedicated open space contains unique features not found on the lands contiguous to the PUD, and the noncontiguous dedicated open space will be open to use or observation by the residents of the PUD and the general public.

Section 38-370 – Dedicated Open Space for Nonresidential Uses

As you are aware, PUDs with nonresidential uses shall provide a portion of the Dedicated Open Space as a central green, plaza, or civic square which functions as a focal point where social, civic, or passive activities can take place. Further, the space shall be of sufficient size and design to serve as a visual and functional amenity. The Planning Commission will need to determine if the proposed pocket park meets this section. If so or if not, we recommend that the Planning Commission direct the applicant to provide the paver details for the pocket park at the time of final plan submission.

Section 38-371 – Guarantee and Maintenance of Dedicated Open Space

Coupled with the minimum dedicated open space, the applicant is required to draft and record an open space preservation and maintenance agreement to provide for scheduled management of the dedicated open space. The applicant intends to provide a draft open space document with Final Development Plan submission. We recommend that the final draft is reviewed by the township legal counsel and found to his satisfaction prior to final plan public hearing.

Section 38-366 – Development Requirements for All Uses

The proposed building heights, landscaping, setbacks, and other development regulations such as open space shall be determined by the Board of Trustees following recommendation of the Planning Commission based on several criteria pursuant to Section 38-366 of the PTZO.

As outlined within pages 4 and 5 of their letter dated January 27, 2020 regarding 1821 W. Ottawa Beach Road...Narrative Letter, Revision #3, the applicant outlines seven (7) requirements from which they seek relief. They include:

1. PUD Open Space – The Pocket Park is located within the required setbacks and utility easements, and is within the required greenspace area
2. Building Height – The building exceeds the maximum height of 35 feet, with a proposed height of 40 feet. The Township Fire Chief did not express any concerns with the proposed height.
3. Garages – the garages are proposed to be located at a setback of zero (0) feet, where 25 feet is required.
4. Green Space – An area no less than 15 feet in width shall be provided along the public street. While the applicant contends that they have provided a space of 25 feet, this area is bisected by a bike path, and is not entirely outside of the right-of-way. In addition, a solid wall, fence, or equivalent vegetative screening of at least six (6) feet in height is required along abutting residential (west and northwest) or agricultural (north and east) zoning districts.
5. Landscape Screening – As noted within Section 38-605 of our memorandum below, the applicant does not propose to install any required parking lot or driveway screening
6. Parking Setbacks – The existing parking along Ottawa Beach Road is positioned at 6.5 feet, where 10 feet is required.

7. Street Trees – As you are aware, the Park Township Master Plan encourages the placement of street trees along this corridor. The applicant has indicated that they have added as many trees as possible. In fact, the Township Engineer noted that additional trees beyond that proposed would likely block the storm water overflow and direct water into the parking area.

While we would ordinarily highlight the review criteria during Final Development Plan review, given the number of requests to deviate from PTZO requirements, we felt it was appropriate to provide you the review criteria during the Preliminary Development Plan review. For your convenience, they are provided below.

Sec. 38-366. Development requirements for all uses.

The lot area, lot width, building height, setback, and other dimensional and yard requirements, supplemental regulations, landscaping, signs, lighting and parking regulations and other development regulations which would otherwise be applicable to the type of land use being requested for the PUD shall be determined by the Township Board following a recommendation from the Planning Commission in order to achieve the objectives of this division. Criteria which shall be used in making these determinations shall include the following:

1. Number, location, size, and type of dwelling units.
2. Type, location, and amount of nonresidential uses proposed.
3. Proximity and impact of the PUD on adjacent existing and future land uses.
4. Preservation of existing vegetation or other natural features on site.
5. Topography of the site.
6. Provision of public and/or community water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer or approval of the Ottawa County Health Department for on-site well and septic systems.
7. Access for emergency vehicles to all buildings and areas.
8. Provisions for pedestrian circulation, recreational amenities, and open space.

Section 38-453 – Required Conditions

The applicant shall equip all existing and proposed exterior lighting with shielding to reflect light downward and away from adjoining properties. The applicant has indicated that they will provide this detail with final plan submission. Despite this, the Planning Commission should emphasize the same to the applicant.

Section 38-455 – Area regulations of the C-2 Zoning District

As noted within Section 38-366 of our memorandum above regarding deviations, the applicant seeks relief from installing a solid wall, fence, or equivalent vegetative screening of at least six (6) feet in height along abutting residential (west and northwest) and agricultural (north and east) zoning districts. In addition, the applicant contends that they satisfy the front yard green space.

For your convenience, the applicable portion of this section of the PTZO is provided below.

Section 38-455(4)

Screening and buffering. Side yards and rear yards adjoining any lot in an R [Residential] or AG [Agricultural] zoning district shall be screened by a solid-wall or tight-board fence six feet in height or equivalent screening with vegetative plantings. A green space of not less than 15 feet deep shall be maintained along each public street and private road to act as a buffer.
As you are aware, Section 38-605 – Requirements for Parking Areas of the PTZO requires any off-street public or private parking area for ten (10) or more vehicles to be screened in certain instances. As noted in Section 38-366 of our memorandum above regarding deviations, the applicant seeks relief from these screening requirements as well.

A copy of the related provision is below for your convenience.

Section 38-605(1) – Requirements for Parking Areas

The parking lot and its driveways shall be effectively screened on each side which adjoins premises situated in any R or AG zoning district by a fence of acceptable design, wall, or compact evergreen hedge. There shall also be provided on each side and rear which adjoins any R or AG zoning district, a greenbelt 10 feet in width landscaped with lawn or low shrubbery clumps or trees.

In addition, Section 38-605 of the PTZO requires that a parking lot shall be provided with wheel or bumper guards so that no part of a parked vehicle will extend beyond the parking area. We note on sheet C-101 of the application materials that the northwest four (4) parking spaces do not include wheel stops. The applicant should include wheel stops as part of the final plan submission.

Reciprocal Access Easements

While we would ordinarily direct the applicant to provide reciprocal access easements to adjacent property, given that the west property is a newly constructed public parking lot and the east property is generally wetlands, we agreed with the applicant that such easements were unnecessary. Nonetheless, if the Planning Commission disagrees, you can direct the applicant accordingly. In the instance the Planning Commission determines that no easements are necessary, a bubble note on Sheet C-101 of the application materials will need to be removed.

General Findings

We recommend that the Planning Commission requires the following for final plan submission or otherwise concludes that enough information has been provided.

1. Show off-season boat storage as noted in the aerial photo within this memorandum
2. Screening of roof-top mechanical equipment from Ottawa Beach Road or adjoining properties (the applicant has indicated they will provide such at final plan submission)
3. A potential vehicular turning movement conflict at and because of the six (4 and 2) immediate parking spaces adjacent to the west apron
4. While the PUD consists of three (3) separate properties, the applicant does not own all of them. Consequently, and according to the Township Legal Counsel, each property owner must consent in writing to the proposed amendment or sign the application.

Township Department Reviews

Fire Department

The Park Township Fire Department has reviewed the proposed plans and found them generally satisfactory.

Township Engineer
The Township Engineer noted that the previously requested width of 14 feet between the front parallel parking areas and the lift station was not provided, but rather 12.4 feet is shown. As a result, this dimension is not compliant with the direction of the Township Engineer and should be corrected. Otherwise, attached is the review letter of general comments from the Township Engineer.

Master Plan

As you are aware, a PUD should substantially meet six (6) objectives provided by Section 38-363 of the PTZO. As you will note within the application materials, the applicant provided a response to each objective to establish how the proposed development achieves the objectives (see page 2 and 3 of their letter dated January 27, 2020 regarding 1821 W. Ottawa Beach Road...Narrative Letter, Revision #3). Two (2) of those objectives are specific to the goals and objectives of the Park Township Master Plan (PTMP) as well as the implementation of the vision of the PTMP.

While we ordinarily provide our review of the PTMP provisions during Final Development Plan submittal, and will do so holistically with that submission, it was important to note why the applicant provided architectural elevations of both the residential units and the garages.

In short, the subject property is within the North Beach subarea of the PTMP, which indicates that, “as existing commercial uses are redeveloped or upgraded, their architectural design should reflect the residential and resort character of the area.” This resort character language repeats throughout the PTMP, as the applicant further notes within their letter. In response, the applicant believes that the “Victorian feel” of the proposed buildings is consistent with the provisions of the PTMP. The Planning Commission will need to determine if the proposed elevations are consistent in this regard.

Planning Commission Considerations and Recommendation

Considerations

As the Planning Commission deliberates regarding this application, we believe the following warrant your review and consideration. They are listed in no particular order.

- Whether the requested bonus density is appropriate
- Clarification of the open space calculations (excluding setback area, landscaping buffers and greenbelts)
- Whether the proposed open space is sufficient or should be increased
  - Whether the proposed open space meets the standards of Section 38-369 of the PTZO
  - Whether the pocket park design is sufficient as open space
- Direction to the applicant to provide paver details for the pocket park with final plan submission
- The seven (7) deviation requests and whether they meet the review criteria
  - PUD Open Space Pocket Park
  - Building Height
  - Garages
  - Green Space
  - Landscape Screening
  - Parking Setbacks
  - Street Trees
- Whether the “Victorian feel” elevations are consistent with the PTMP
- Show off-season boat storage in the final plans
- Screening of roof-top mechanical equipment from Ottawa Beach Road or adjoining properties
- Whether a vehicle turning movement conflict at and because of the six (4 and 2) immediate parking spaces adjacent to the west apron exists
- Whether reciprocal access easements are necessary
- Four missing wheel stops at northwest parking spaces
- Provide exterior light fixtures that comply with Section 38-454 (existing and proposed)
- Whether potential conflicts exist between boat storage and on site attributes, such as parking and dumpster access
- Direction that the open space preservation and maintenance agreement is reviewed by the township legal counsel and found to his satisfaction prior to final plan public hearing
- Signatures of other property owners within the PUD
- A minimum of 14 feet is required between the front parallel parking area and the lift station, at the direction of the Township Engineer
- Whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is necessary
- Direction to the applicant that review and approval is required by the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner’s office prior to final plan submission

Recommendation

Pending your review of our considerations above, we believe direction to the applicant to address and fulfill said considerations and return with a revised Preliminary PUD Development Plan is appropriate.

The application has been scheduled for your review at your February 12, 2020 meeting. We expect the applicant to be in attendance. If you have any questions, please let us know.

GLR
Planner

Attachment

cc: Howard Fink, Manager
     Tracy Hutchinson, Driesenga & Associates, Inc.
January 27, 2020

Mr. Gregory Ransford  
Township Manager  
PARK TOWNSHIP  
52 - 152nd Ave  
Holland, Michigan  49424

Re:  1821 W. Ottawa Beach Road  
Anchorage Marine Service PUD Amendment (Boat Yard Lofts)  
Narrative Letter, Revision #3

Dear Mr. Ransford:

Anchorage Marine Service requests amendment of their existing Planned Unit Development (PUD). This letter is intended to serve as a Revised Narrative for the PUD Application. The requested amendment would add residential use to the existing mixed use PUD. The proposed residential use would consist of six (6) condominium units constructed above the existing office/retail space at the front of the existing primary building. The existing marine storage use would remain as is in the rear portion of the building.

The following shall address the narrative requirements:

   a. The objectives of the PUD and how it relates to the intent of the PUD District as described in Section 38-363.  

      The requested amendment would add residential use to the existing mixed use PUD. The proposed residential use would consist of six (6) condominium units constructed above the existing office/retail space at the front of the existing main building. The existing marine storage use would remain with the structures unchanged. Additional structures on the site owned by Anchorage Marine and a separate Condominium Association, would remain unchanged.

      1. To allow a mix of uses structures, facilities, housing types and open space that is compatible with existing and planned use on nearby properties.

      The requested PUD amendment will add residential use to the existing commercial uses on-site. It adds more units of a popular housing type for the area. It combines the residential/resort/marina flavors of the immediate area.

      2. To encourage land development that, ...preserves natural site features.

      Because the proposed residential units are not adding additional structural footprint, the proposed PUD amendment will not impact natural features of the area. The site has undisturbed wetland in the northeast that will remain,
and is immediately adjacent to a large wetland area to the east that is part of the Park West Drain District.

3. To provide for the regulation of lawful and reasonable land uses not otherwise authorized in this chapter.

The proposed amended PUD is within the existing authorized land uses of the Ordinance and Master Plan.

4. To provide for single or mixed-use developments which respect the goals and objectives of this chapter and the Park Township Master Plan.

The amended PUD request blends well into the goals and objectives of the Master Plan as described below, in item b.

5. To encourage the provision of open space and the development of recreational and other support facilities in generally central locations or within a reasonable distance of all dwellings or uses.

With the limited land available, the proposed PUD has allotted space for a public historical marker. The marker would be in the southwest corner of the property as part of a pocket park and adjacent to the existing public recreational path.

6. To implement the vision of the Park Township Master Plan in order to provide a high standard of quality of life, varied housing options, and richness of natural assets.

The amended PUD request blends well into the goals and objectives of the Master Plan as described below, in item b. The proposed PUD provides housing options tucked in to an existing vibrant area. The future residents can enjoy the bustle of the nearby marinas and the serenity of the adjacent wetlands.

b. The relationship of the PUD to the Park Township Master Plan.

The site property is located in the North Beach Subarea with a Resort Commercial future land use designation in Park Township’s 2017 Master Plan (Master Plan). The proposed PUD, with the addition of residential units, fits well into the Master Plan.

For the North Beach subarea, the Master Plan, notes on page 32: “As existing commercial uses are redeveloped or upgraded, their architectural design should reflect the residential and resort character of the area”
The proposed PUD will be a significant investment in the property, the residential expansion will spur a façade upgrade with the intention of creating a more resort-style residential expression.

For the future land use as Resort Commercial, the Master Plan, notes on page 49: “….architectural character should be appropriate to the resort character of the township, as well as the predominantly residential character along these corridors.”

Additionally noted in the North Beach concepts of Master Plan, page 57: Design Standards. Although an expansion of existing commercial uses is not anticipated in this area, many of the current businesses are aging and may soon need to be refurbished, or redeveloped. It will be important to ensure that the architectural character of the new or improved business structures continues to reflect the area’s historic beachfront charm.

The proposed PUD will be an opportunity for the owner to remodel the façade of a dated building constructed in the 1980s. The proposed façade will mirror nearby residential architecture with a residential Victorian feel.

c. Phases of development and approximate time frame for each phase.

The proposed addition of residential units and any related site work will be considered one phase of the project and will take approximately one year for completion.

d. Proposed deed restrictions, covenants, or similar legal instruments to be used within the PUD.

The proposed PUD amendment does not add deed restrictions, covenants, or similar legal instruments, at this time.

e. Anticipated start and completion of construction.

The anticipated start of construction is Fall of 2020 with substantial completion approximately by Spring 2021, and final completion by Fall 2021. The construction will be planned to avoid creating congestion during the peak summer season and minimize disruption to the existing commercial operations at the site.

f. Location, type, and size of areas to be dedicated open space.

Dedicated open space proposed, includes a historical marker at the southwest portion of the property. The historical marker will be located adjacent to the pedestrian/bike path in front of the property. The proposed area is approximately 937 square feet.
Dedicated open space is also available in the undeveloped wetland area. The site wetlands total 3.01 acres, with half of that value allowed to contribute (1.5 acres)

g. **All proposed modifications from the zoning regulations which would otherwise be applicable to the uses and structures of the current zoning of the property in the absence of a PUD.** The proposed modifications from the zoning regulations include;

a. **PUD Open Space, 38-368**
   Boat Yard Lofts has undeveloped land available to meet the provision for open space. The wetlands are 3.01 acres of space, with half allowed to be considered open space of 1.50 acres.

   The proposed open space of the pocket park is an additional 967 sft, (0.02 acres). With limited area for creation of open space, the proposed pocket park is placed at the southwest corner of the property. However the pocket park location does not meet the provisions of 38-368 (2&5) with regards to setbacks and utility easements. The pocket park is partially located inside buffer/greenspace areas of 38-368(9).

b. **Building Height, 38-454**
   Boat Yard Lofts requests a building height of approximately 40 feet in place of the allowed height of 35 feet. The increased height will allow for improved façade aesthetics and also be in-line with the easterly adjacent Anchorage Condominiums at 44 feet.

c. **Building Setbacks, 25’ to Residential zoning, Section 38-455(2)**
   The proposed PUD includes garages on the westerly property line with a zero setback. Other structures on the site abutting the same property line are constructed without a setback. The ownership and use of the westerly adjacent property is a public parking lot and not used for residential purposes. The proposed PUD is hopeful the same standards will apply to the proposed garages.

d. **Green Space, Section 38-455(4)**
   According to the Ordinance, green space of not less than 15 feet is required along each public street. Currently, at the southern property line, adjacent to the edge of the pavement, there is a green space of approximately 25 feet. The green space is bisected by the existing pedestrian/bicycle path. We believe this configuration meets the intent of the green space.

e. **Screening, Section 38-605(1)**
   The proposed PUD does not provide screening to the adjacent properties to the north, east, or west. The north screening was omitted due to the existing conditions being unchanged at the northern lot perimeter and due to the extensive wooded unbuildable buffer between the site property and the adjacent north property. The easterly screening was omitted due to being adjacent to the undeveloped heavily brushed regulated wetland and is several hundred feet to the next property. The
westerly screening was omitted due to the property use as a MDNR parking lot for
overflow parking and boat trailers.

The proposed PUD does not provide a 10 foot greenbelt to the westerly zoned
residential property. The adjacent property has a commercial/recreational use and
existing site conditions do not allow for adjustment to fit.

f. Parking setback from ROW, Section 38-605(8)
The existing parking is less currently than 10’ from ROW, no changes are proposed
in this area. The existing conditions are 6.5 feet the ROW.

g. Street Trees, Master Plan
The proposed trees are limited due to the limited green space available along the
southern perimeter. A large portion of the existing green space, between the
parking and the pedestrian path, is designated for storm water storage and cannot
be filled with trees while maintain its function. Additionally, space in front is also
owned by the utility authority for the lift station. Trees have been added to the
proposed PUD to meet the intent of the Master Plan.

For Proof of Ownership, a deed has been provided by Mr. Jeff Cavanagh of Anchorage Marine
Service. There are no additional owners of the property of the proposed PUD. If Exception No.
1 is utilized in the actual PUD additional owners may apply.

The PUD application package also includes a PUD Development Plan drawing. Materials
provided on October 25, 2019 and December 20, 2019 included a signed application, application
fee, and proof of ownership. Please feel free to contact me at 616-396-0255 or
tracyh@driesenga.com if you have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DRIESENGA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Tracy Hutchinson, P.E.
Project Manager

enclosure

cc: Jeff Cavanagh – Anchorage Marine
January 28, 2020

Mr. Gregory Ransford
Township Planner
PARK TOWNSHIP
52 - 152nd Ave
Holland, Michigan  49424

Re:  1821 W. Ottawa Beach Road
Anchorage Marine Service PUD Amendment (Boat Yard Lofts)
Review Comments response

Dear Mr. Ransford:

Anchorage Marine Service requests amendment of their existing Planned Unit Development (PUD). The requested amendment would add residential use to the existing mixed use PUD. The proposed residential use would consist of six (6) condominium units constructed above the existing office/retail space at the front of the existing primary building. The existing marine storage use would remain as is in the rear portion of the building.

The following are a response to the Review Comments provided by the Township on October 26, 2019, December 27, 2019, December 31, 2019, and January 25, 2020.

General Comments:

Site Acreage:
According to the documents reviewed by our surveyor department, the property owned by Jeff Cavanagh does not include the Exceptions shown; Exception No. 1 and No. 2 to obtain the acreage of 5.96 acres. When adding Exception No. 1 (0.40 acres) and Exception No. 2 (0.25 acres), the site gross total is 6.61 acres.

Reciprocal Easement for access east and west of the site were considered, but were not proposed due to MDNR use to the west and the regulated wetland/drain to the east.

Lighting details will be provided in the final PUD submission.

Dumpsters have been updated.

Pocket Park pavers are yet to be selected, will be provided in final PUD submission.

Elevations and garage facades have been provided via email.
Mechanical Equipment, for HVAC, will be roof mounted and screened. Screening method to be finalized with architectural in final PUD submission.

Division 8- PUD

Section 38-366 – Development Requirements; All Uses, Criteria Response
- Green Space; See revised narrative letter dated 1-27-2020
- Side Yard Setback; See revised narrative letter dated 1-27-2020
- Building Height; See revised narrative letter dated 1-27-2020

Section 38-367 – Development Requirements for PUDs with residential:
38-367(2) Density Calculations, 3 units permitted, base density, additional units with bonus. See spreadsheet for calculations.

(3) Bonus density is requested based on the proposed project incorporating significant natural features and preserving significant unique open space. The wetland portion of the property compromises 3.01 acres of the property, over 50% of the total land. The undeveloped 3.01 acres translates in to additional allowed density of 6 units.

The undeveloped wetland provides public benefit opportunities. As the undeveloped wetland is a part of the adjoining Winstrom Park, with a deck and scenic overlook viewing this wetland.

The undeveloped land serves also as an important environmental feature. The wetlands are part of the Park West Drain and serve as a filter protecting local water quality, removing sediment and pollutants before entering the larger water bodies of Lake Macatawa and Lake Michigan. The wetlands have been noted for capturing sediment and preventing deposition into Lake Macatawa.

Beyond the open space previously describe, additional Amenities for recreational facilities in the form of a pocket park are proposed. The pocket park is located in the southwest corner of the site adjacent to the pedestrian path. It is planned as an accessible surface with benches, a historical marker, and landscaping. It will serve as an aesthetically pleasing point of interest or resting point along the existing pedestrian path.

Additional units based on the overall property size of 6.31 acres @ 0.50 units per acre, equates to a total of twelve (12) units. Additional units based on the wetland area of 3.01 acres @ 0.50 units per acre equates to additional five (6) units, totaling nine (9) when added to the base units. Meanwhile this PUD plan is only seeking an additional three (3) units, for a total of six (6), which is under the quantities described above.
Section 38-368 – Dedicated Opens Space (for Residential Use)
(a) For PUD with residential uses shall provide the minimum amount of open space in accordance to this article. Requirements are listed for proposed multi-family residential use, with the minimum requirement listed is 15%.
(b)(3) The proposed site has undeveloped wetland property serving as open space. Per the ordinance, only 50% of the wetland may be considered open space. Half (50%) of 3.01 acres of wetland, is 1.5 acres. While only 0.99 acres are needed to meet the 15% open space.

Section 38-370 – Dedicated Opens Space (for Nonresidential)
The proposed pocket park provides dedicated opens space serving as a civic amenity providing passive activity such as sitting while providing an object or area of interest with the historical marker.

C-2, Resort Services District
Section 38-453- Existing lights shown, proposed lights pending design, with intent to meet ordinance, materials to be provided.
Section 38-455- Area Regulations, plans have been updated
Section 38-605 -Screening deviation discussed in Narrative letter.

Division 3, Site Plan
Section 38-102
Additional details and notes added to plans with updated topography.
Existing lights shown, proposed lights pending design, with intent to meet ordinance, materials to be provided with final PUD.
Building materials will be a part of the final PUD.
The overall height is 39'-8”, height from the road crown will be approximately 39’-4” to 40'-5” across the front of the site changing with the road grade.

Article VII – Parking and Loading
Section 38-601
General; Original 1981 Floor plans have now been provided for parking calculations. Additional materials to be provided in final PUD package.
Section 38-605(1) Ten (10) foot wide Greenbelt is provided on North and East, See Narrative letter
Section 38-605, plans have been updated with parking bumpers
Existing lights shown, proposed lights pending design, with intent to meet ordinance, materials to be provided.
Section 38-605, Parking no closer than 10 feet to ROW, see narrative letter
Signage has been added on PUD drawing.

The PUD application package also includes materials previously provided on October 25, 2019 and December 20, 2019 including; a signed application and proof of ownership. Please feel free to contact me at 616-396-0255 or tracyh@driesenga.com if you have any questions. Thank you.
Sincerely,

DRIESENGA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Tracy Hutchinson, P.E.
Project Manager

Enclosures
-Density Calculations

cc: Jeff Cavanagh – Anchorage Marine
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**DENSITY**

Anchorage Marine/Boat Yard Lofts PUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 38-367</th>
<th>Anchorage Marine/Boat Yard Lofts PUD with Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a Main Acreage</td>
<td>5.96 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Exception #1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Exception #2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Gross Area</td>
<td>6.61 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b Wetland</td>
<td>-3.01 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2d Main Building | (28,650) (0.66) acres |
| 2d Building 1 in Ex 2 | (10,800) (0.25) acres |
| 2d Building 2   | (12,876) (0.30) acres |
| 2d Pavement     | (21,000) (0.48) acres |
| 2d Pavement in Ex1 | (14,000) (0.32) acres |

(87,326) 1.59 acres 0

Condo, res credit | 4,560 0.10 |

2f Base Density | 1.70 acres |

acres per unit | 0.5 2 units/acre |

3.40

3.00 Units, base

Open Space, 38-368

Wetland as open space allowed | 50% 1.51 acres |

Req'd Open Space, total | 15% 0.99 acres |

Wetland left over | 0.51 acres |

38-367, 3d Bonus

Unique Wetland (left over) | 0.51 acres |

acres per unit | 0.5 2 units/acre |

1.02

1.00 Units, bonus

Total Calculated Units | 3.40 Base Units |

1.02 Bonus Units, 3d |

4.42

4.00 Units, Total Allowed

3f Bonus Units, Max | 6.61 acres |

2 units/acre for C2

13.22 units

13 Units, Max allowed

Requested Units | 6 units planned |
ANCHORAGE MARINE SERVICES
BOAT YARD LOFTS
1825 OTTAWA BEACH ROAD
SECTION 27, T05N, R16W
HOLLAND, MICHIGAN 49424

SHEET INDEX
Q-001 TITLE SHEET
V-101 SKETCH OF PARCEL
V-102 EXISTING CONDITIONS
CD-101 CIVIL DEMOLITION PLAN
C-101 SITE PLAN
C-102 UTILITIES PLAN
C-501 DETAILS
SKETCH OF PARCEL

SCHEDULE "A" - LEGAL DESCRIPTION
PROPERTY: [Insert Property Information]
DATE: [Insert Date]

THE PRESENT DESCRIPTION IS TO BE RECORDED AS PART OF THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:

1. [Insert Document 1 Information]
2. [Insert Document 2 Information]

THE PRESENT DESCRIPTION IS AS FOLLOWS:

[Insert Sketch Description Details]

[Map of Property]

[Scale and Orientation Information]

[Location Map Exception]

[Schedule B-II Exception Details]

[Schedule A Exception Details]

[Other Relevant Information]

[Revised by: [Insert Revised By Information]]
Know what's below before you dig. Call R BM #1
Know what's below. Call before you dig.

Call BM #1
Know what's below. Call before you dig.

PROJECT SUMMARY

1. PRELIMINARY SITE CONDITIONS
   - Soil conditions require additional testing and engineering to determine suitability for construction.

2. SITE UTILITIES
   - Water supply: Municipal water supply is available.
   - Sewerage: Public sewer is available.
   - Electrical: Public electrical service is available.

3. SITE ACCESS
   - Temporary access via existing road is available.
   - Permanent access via new road is necessary.

4. SITE IMPROVEMENTS
   - Site grading and landscaping.
   - Construction of new roads.
   - Installation of utilities.

5. SITE UTILITIES
   - Water supply: Municipal water supply is available.
   - Sewerage: Public sewer is available.
   - Electrical: Public electrical service is available.

6. SITE ACCESS
   - Temporary access via existing road is available.
   - Permanent access via new road is necessary.

7. PROJECT TIMETABLE
   - Construction to be completed within 12 months.

8. CONTRACTOR
   - The contractor will be selected through a competitive bidding process.

9. SAFETY
   - Safety procedures will be strictly enforced.
   - All contractors will be required to comply with OSHA standards.

10. PERMITS
    - All necessary permits will be obtained prior to commencement of construction.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL
    - Environmental impact assessments will be conducted to mitigate any adverse effects.

12. QUALITY CONTROL
    - Quality control procedures will be implemented to ensure project excellence.

13. COMPLETION
    - Project to be completed within the specified timeline.

14. HANDOVER
    - Site will be handed over to the owner in a condition that meets all agreed-upon standards.

15. DISPUTE RESOLUTION
    - Disputes will be resolved through mediation or arbitration.

16. ACCESS AGREEMENTS
    - Access agreements will be negotiated with all affected parties.

KEY

- Paved roads
- Existing structures
- New structures
Know what's below. Call before you dig.

BEFORE YOU DIG:

1. Contact March 811 before you dig to locate any subsurface utility lines.
2. Provide your plan number to your local March 811 office.
3. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
4. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
5. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
6. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
7. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
8. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
9. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
10. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.

UTILITY NOTES:

1. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
2. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
3. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
4. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
5. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
6. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
7. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
8. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
9. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
10. Contact your local utility companies or directly with your local March 811 office to locate any underground utility lines.
Know what's below.

Before you dig.

Call 811.
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Park Township Fire Department
Inspection Form

Inspector: Chief Scott Gamby
Badge # 126

Date: 11/18/2019

__ Preliminary sketch or inquiry
__ Zoning Board review
__ Planning Committee review
__ PUD requirements
__ Rough-in Inspection
__ Final Inspection
__ Site Visit

PROJECT INFO:

Name: Anchorage Marine Condominiums
Address: 1825 Ottawa Beach Rd
Holland, Michigan 49423 ______ 49424 ___ X___

Developer / Builder:

Builder: TBD
Developer: Anchorage Marine Services
Architect: J. Andrew Baer 222 South River Ave Holland, Mi. 49423 (616) 395-8235

Review / Field Notes:

- Project must be in compliance with International Fire Code (IFC) 2012
- Addresses – If owner / occupied each will have their own address, If Condo rental they will have suite #.
- Complete building must be brought up to IFC 2012 or newest version adopted by Township
- Complete building will be sprinkled; Fire Department connection will be located on west side of building, address side (Fire Chief will approve on site)
- 3 hour fire rating between Boat storage and Condo's / Businesses – note: must be at grade level and extend above the highest roof line
- 2 hour fire rating between 1st and 2nd floor (business and condo's)
• Exhaust system in café must extend beyond the roof line or have a no exhaust system installed over their grill.

• All Utility meters will be labeled with correct tenant

• No common attic and all penetrations between Condo’s will be sealed.

• Anything omitted on this plan review is still subject to field inspections.

Note: We are open to sit down with the Architect and discuss this project in further details to make sure we covered everything and interpreted the code correctly. In the past I have scheduled a meeting with the Architect, Building inspector, Mechanical / plumbing inspector and myself.
November 14, 2019
2190701

Gregory L. Ransford, MPA
Park Township Planner
Fresh Coast Planning
950 Taylor Avenue, Ste. 200
Grand Haven, MI 49417

RE: Anchorage Marine Condominiums - Engineering Review Comments
Park Township – Section 27

Dear Greg:

On behalf of Park Township, our office has reviewed the preliminary drawings dated October 25, 2019 for the above referenced project involving the construction of 6 residential condos within a proposed addition to the existing Anchorage Marine Building off Ottawa Beach Road. This letter is to inform you of our comments and questions in advance of your report to the Planning Commission.

Our comments regarding the project are as follows:

1. The proposed entrance drive configuration impacts access to the public sanitary sewer lift station in front of the building. Further discussion and coordination with Holland Charter Township Public Works is necessary to ensure operations and maintenance for the lift station is not negatively impacted by the proposed site plan.

2. The detectable warning plates should be added to the path at a curbed entrance driveway.

3. Construction of the proposed garages will require the relocation of many utility services and revisions to many easements. Witness cards are available for the 3 water services believed to be in this area. The final site plan should show the proposed location for all the relocated utilities including easement limits.

4. Sanitary sewer shall be tied into the existing building lateral. Witness card is available.

5. Options for metering of new residential units, water service configuration, and curb box locations should be further discussed with Holland Charter Township Public Works and shown on the final site plan.

6. Will fire protection by added or required?

7. All work in the public right-of-way must be approved by Ottawa County Road Commission.

8. This project is located within the Non-Master Metered Water Service Area of Park Township. Water is supplied by Holland BPW, but services, and metering are to be
coordinated with Holland Charter Township Public Works. Also sanitary sewer service is to be coordinated with Holland Charter Township.

9. No public water or sanitary sewer capacity related concerns are noted at this time.
10. A Soil Erosion and Sediment Control permit will be required from Ottawa County.
11. Construction plans should be submitted for review when final.

If you have any questions or comments regarding the above, please call me at 616-432-6693.

Sincerely,

Prein&Newhof

Dana R. Burd, P.E.
DRB/drb

cc: Mr. Aaron Nyboer, HCT
    Mr. Howard Fink, PT
    Ms. Susan Barkel, PT
    Ms. Tracy Hutchinson, Driesenga & Associates
Pursuant to your direction at your August 14, 2019 meeting, attached is revised language to create an overlay district for the Ottawa Beach neighborhood, as well as an amendment to the Park Township Master Plan regarding the same. As you will recall, your direction included the following:

1. Meet with the residents of the neighborhood again to discuss structure height concerns, and revise the language accordingly;
2. Create an appendix within the Master Plan to include a copy of the Trust documents;
3. Revise page one of the Master Plan draft from “is being located” to “is located,” and;
4. Update the master plan map to reference the County and State properties, in accordance with the text.

In addition, Manager Fink intended to contact property owners of vacant commercial lots within the neighborhood. Staff found that no vacant commercial property exists in the neighborhood, except for property owned by Holiday Haven that is used for parking or outdoor storage related to the park. As a result, it appears that voluntary downzoning inquiries may be unnecessary.

Second Ottawa Beach Meeting & Overlay District Language

While the purpose of the second Ottawa Beach meeting was to discuss concerns regarding structure height, the participants provided feedback on all of the language, which resulted in modifications to several sections of the draft. Below are the additional modifications as well as our explanation regarding each, for your convenience.

1. Front Yard averaging – participants felt that the existing Park Township Zoning Ordinance language allowing Front Yard averaging was sufficient for Ottawa Beach
2. Side Yard averaging – participants felt that Side Yard averaging was appropriate, but never to a setback less than five (5) feet
3. Rear Yard averaging – participants felt that the existing Park Township Zoning Ordinance language allowing Rear Yard averaging was sufficient for Ottawa Beach
4. Recreational Fires – participants felt that a 25-foot setback for recreational fires, particularly in the Rear Yard, would render the yard space unusable for that purpose. As a result, and after consultation with Fire Chief Gamby, a lesser setback of 15 feet can be used, not only in the Rear Yard but in any yard, when the recreational fire is within a Portable Outdoor Fireplace, as defined by the International Fire Code.

As you know, subsequent to this second meeting, our draft language addressing the above matters was provided to identified stakeholders to provide review and comment. Following, revisions were performed and the attached language was finalized as the second draft to the proposed overlay district. Subsequently, this language was provided to the stakeholders in advance of your agenda distribution to allow sufficient time for review and comment by the residents it would directly impact.
**Master Plan Language**

For your convenience, the attached Master Plan draft language includes the previously proposed revisions, as well as the revision noted above. As always, proposed additions are shown in bold text and proposed deletions are shown in strikethrough text.

**Anticipated Action**

*Master Plan Amendment*

Pending your review of the draft materials, in the instance the Planning Commission agrees with an amendment to the Park Township Master Plan, direction should be provided to staff to initiate the Notice of Intent to Plan. In addition, direction should be provided to staff regarding necessary revisions, if any.

*Overlay District*

Pending your review of the draft materials, the Planning Commission should provide direction to staff to either revise and return with a third draft for review, revise and schedule the draft for public hearing, or schedule the draft as presented for public hearing.

Concurrently, or soon after a public hearing is scheduled, the Planning Commission should initiate the process to downzone vacant commercially zoned properties, as Manager Fink may provide. As you know, Manager Fink indicated that the rezoning of these properties would be voluntary by the property owners. In the instance any property owners agree to downzone following conversation with Manager Fink, those properties should be scheduled accordingly.

The proposed amendments have been scheduled for your consideration at your February 12, 2020 meeting. If you have any questions, please let us know.

GLR  
Planner

Attachments

cc: Howard Fink, Manager
DIVISION 6B

OB Ottawa Beach Overlay District

Sec. 38-303B. Description and purpose.

The OB Ottawa Beach Overlay District is designed to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the township through the following goals and objectives:

(1) Limit densities that would compromise safe access by emergency vehicles, unnecessarily increase fire loads, and restrict the ability to provide adequate emergency service.

(2) Improve access on roads by lessening congestion.

(3) Provide for the safe movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

(4) Prohibit the expansion of commercial uses to protect and promote the historic residential character and lessen the congestion of streets and pedestrian pathways.

(5) Protect woodlands, dune areas, and areas adjacent to Lake Macatawa and Lake Michigan, and other environmentally sensitive areas from overdevelopment.

(6) Limit site improvements to blend with the existing topographic character of the earth.

(7) Allow for the modernization of existing single-family and two-family dwellings.

(8) Maintain stable single-family and two-family neighborhoods within Ottawa Beach.

Sec. 38-304B Use regulations.

(1) The Ottawa Beach Overlay District does not replace or restrict the range of uses allowed in the underlying zoning districts but provides additional development standards that must be met for any lot located partially or completely within the Ottawa Beach Overlay District identified on the zoning map, which includes the lots listed within Section 38-305B of this Ordinance.
Where the standards of the Ottawa Beach Overlay District are less restrictive or more restrictive than the underlying zoning district or any other provision of this Ordinance, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, the standards of the Ottawa Beach Overlay District shall apply. Where the standards of the Ottawa Beach Overlay District are silent, the general regulations and restrictions of the zoning ordinance, including but not limited to the underlying zoning district, shall control. Except for Home Occupations, no new commercial uses within the Ottawa Beach Overlay District shall be permitted.

Permitted and special uses within the Ottawa Beach Overlay District shall be regulated in the underlying zoning district subject to the following additional provisions:

a. Improved Lot. A Lot containing a single-family dwelling or a two-family dwelling shall comply with the following:

i. Front Yard averaging. The required Front Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Front Yards of existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district; provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to utilize a minimum of three (3) such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining the average depth, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.

ii. Side Yard averaging. Where the average depth of at least two (2) side yards of existing adjacent buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block on the same side of the Street is less than the minimum side yard depth of the underlying zoning district, then the required side yard shall be modified to be no less than the average depth of the existing adjacent buildings, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator, provided, however, that the depth of the side yard shall not be less than five (5) feet, in any event. The required Side Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Side Yards of existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district; provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to
utilize a minimum of three (3) such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining
the average depth, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.

iii. Rear Yard averaging. The required Rear Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced
to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Rear Yards of
existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in
question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district;
provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within
three hundred (300) feet of the lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot
distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to utilize a minimum of three (3)
such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining the average depth, as
established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.

iv. Principal Building Character Height. [If deemed necessary] The maximum Principal
Building height shall not exceed the average height of all Principal Buildings of the
same use on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question within the
same Block and on the same side of the Street, or the maximum height of the
underlying zoning district, whichever is less.

v. Parking Area. Any Improved Lot subject to a building permit shall provide an on-site
Parking Area meeting the minimum number of parking spaces and the minimum
dimensions for each parking space pursuant to Section 38-601 of this Ordinance.
Alternatively, off-site parking or a combination of on-site parking and off-site parking,
when located entirely within OB Overlay District, may be provided.

vi. Pre-existing Principal Building and Reconstruction. All setbacks for a Principal Building
in existence prior to the adoption of this Chapter shall be considered conforming. Any
Principal Building destroyed by fire, wind, act of God, public enemy, or any other
means not self-inflicted, except that for which a demolition permit has been issued by
the Township, may be rebuilt and restored to its former building footprint.
Reconstruction of a pre-existing principal building is subject to Section 38-304B(3)a.iii
of this Division and may be expanded pursuant to Section 38-304B(3)a.i through iv.

b. Unimproved Lot. A Lot vacant of a Principal Building, Accessory Structure or combination
thereof shall comply with the following:

i. New Construction. No new Principal Building shall be constructed on an unimproved
or vacant Lot unless the Lot meets the minimum Lot Area and the minimum Lot Width
of the underlying zoning district.

ii. Principal Building Character Height. [If deemed necessary] The maximum Principal
Building height shall not exceed the average height of all Principal Buildings of the
same use on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question within the
same Block and on the same side of the Street, or the maximum height of the underlying zoning district, whichever is less.

iii. Front Yard averaging. The required Front Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Front Yards of existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district; provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to utilize a minimum of three (3) such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining the average depth, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.

iv. Side Yard averaging. Where the average depth of at least two (2) side yards of existing adjacent buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block on the same side of the Street is less than the minimum side yard depth of the underlying zoning district, then the required side yard shall be modified to be no less than the average depth of the existing adjacent buildings, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator, provided, however, that the depth of the side yard shall not be less than five (5) feet, in any event. The required Side Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Side Yards of existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district; provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to utilize a minimum of three (3) such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining the average depth, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.

v. Rear Yard averaging. The required Rear Yard of the Principal Building may be reduced to seventy-five percent (75%) of the average depth of at least three (3) Rear Yards of existing Principal Buildings on Lots within three hundred (300) feet of the Lot in question and within the same Block and within the same underlying zoning district; provided, however, if there are fewer than three (3) such Principal Buildings within three hundred (300) feet of the lot in question, then the three hundred (300) foot distance shall be extended to the distance necessary to utilize a minimum of three (3) such Principal Buildings for the purpose of determining the average depth, as established by a licensed surveyor or the zoning administrator.
vi. iv. Building Footprint. The building footprint shall include all foundation walls and any cantilevered building faces together with any attached accessory buildings, but excluding decks and patios of thirty (30) inches or less in height.

vii. v. Parking Area. Any Unimproved Lot subject to a building permit shall provide an on-site Parking Area meeting the minimum number of parking spaces and the minimum dimensions for each parking space pursuant to Section 38-601 of this Ordinance. Alternatively, off-site parking or a combination of on-site parking and off-site parking, when located entirely within OB Overlay District, may be provided.

(4) Recreational fires. All Recreational Fires shall be prohibited except for not more than one (1) Recreational Fire on a Lot, which complies with following:

a. Located no less than twenty-five (25) feet from any Structure, other combustible material, lot line, roadway, bike path, sidewalk, boardwalk, alleyway, or fence. When contained within a Portable Outdoor Fireplace, as defined by the International Fire Code, as amended, the Recreational Fire may be located no less than fifteen (15) feet from any Structure, other combustible material, lot line, roadway, bike path, sidewalk, boardwalk, alleyway, or fence.

b. Located no less than 20 feet from tree branches and overhead wires.

c. Fire rings must be built or lined with non-combustible material, such as brick, rock, or metal, or be otherwise designed for recreational fires with a Fire Grate or cover approved by the Park Township Fire Department.

d. No greater than three (3) feet in diameter and two (2) feet in height.

e. Contains only a Fire Grate as defined by this Ordinance.

f. Only seasoned wood and paper may be burned. Leaves, yard waste such as grass clippings, dune grass, ornamental grass, household waste, construction materials, commercial or industrial waste, or any other material that would cause a public nuisance is prohibited to be burned.

g. A reliable water supply able to extinguish the fire shall be readily available any time a fire is present, which includes but is not necessarily limited to, a portable fire extinguisher or garden house connected to an active water service.

h. Wind speeds shall be of 10 miles per hour or less when a fire is present. Any fire that is present in wind speeds greater than 10 miles per hour shall be immediately extinguished.

i. Any fire shall be extinguished prior to midnight or when directed by the Park Township Fire Department or their designee.
i. Any fire shall be attended by a competent person of 18 years or older until fully extinguished.

j-k. Recreational Fires are prohibited on an Unimproved Lot.

k-l. All Recreational Fire locations shall be subject to approval by the Park Township Fire Department.
Sec. 38-6 Definitions.

FIRE GRATE
A metal cover that fits over the fire pit or Recreational Fire that helps control sparks from leaving the outdoor Recreational Fire, fireplace, fire pit, or container with openings not to exceed 12.5 millimeters / 1.25 centimeters in dimension.

RECREATIONAL FIRE
An outdoor fire burning material other than rubbish where the fuel being burned is not contained in an incinerator, outdoor fireplace, barbeque grill or barbeque pit and has a total fuel area of 3 feet (914 mm) or less in diameter and 2 feet (610 mm) or less in height for pleasure, religious, ceremonial, cooking, warmth or similar purpose.

Sec. 38-155 Zone districts.

The Township is hereby divided into the following zoning districts:

(1) AG agricultural and permanent open space district.

(2) R-1 rural estate residence district.

(3) R-2 lakeshore residence district.

(4) R-3 low density single-family residence district.

(5) R-4 medium density single- and two-family residence district.

(6) R-5 low density multifamily residence district.

(7) C-1 neighborhood business district.
(8) C-2 resort service district.

(9) MP macatawa park overlay district.

(10) OB ottawa beach overlay district

Sec. 38-506 Home occupations

[Introduction omitted]

(1) All home occupations, whether permitted by right pursuant to Subsection (2) of this section or permitted as a special use pursuant to Subsection (3) of this section, shall be subject to the following requirements.

a. [Omitted]
b. [Omitted]
c. [Omitted]
d. [Omitted]
e. Retail sales are prohibited within the OB Ottawa Beach Overlay.

Sec. 38-601 General.

In all zoning districts, there shall be provided, before any building or structure is occupied, or is enlarged or increased in capacity, off-street, outdoor parking spaces for motor vehicles as provided in the following table, except that the required parking spaces may be located inside one (1) garage or one (1) other accessory building on parcels within the MP Overlay District or the OB Overlay District. All parking shall be designed and constructed to be in compliance with relevant provisions of all state and federal laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Michigan Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act and the federal American Disabilities Act. This shall include, but not be limited to, the requisite number of handicapped parking spaces to be made available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Spaces Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Two for each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Minimum Parking Spaces Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly uses such as theaters, clubs, community halls, arenas,</td>
<td>One for each 25 square feet of assembly area and 1 for each employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museums, pools, studios, mortuary, or other similar uses. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically excludes restaurants and bars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, institutions</td>
<td>Two for each patient bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitariums, convalescent, or nursing homes</td>
<td>One for each patient bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes for senior citizens</td>
<td>Two for each dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, motels, resorts</td>
<td>One space per each unit between 250 square feet and 400 square feet;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling alleys</td>
<td>Eight for each alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, elementary and junior high schools</td>
<td>One for each employee normally engaged in or about the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high schools and institutions of higher learning</td>
<td>One for each employee normally engaged in or about the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>One for each 3 seats in the main worship unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional offices and buildings</td>
<td>One for each 200 square feet of floor area and 1 for each employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical doctors office, dental clinic, or veterinarian office</td>
<td>Eight for each doctor plus 1 for each employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Minimum Parking Spaces Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, business offices, and public buildings not specifically mentioned elsewhere</td>
<td>One for each 150 square feet of floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taverns, bars, restaurants and ice cream parlors</td>
<td>One for each 2 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas</td>
<td>One for each slip or mooring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-in establishments</td>
<td>One for each employee plus 4 additional spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor cafes and ice cream shops without indoor seating</td>
<td>One for each employee plus 1 for each 2 outdoor seats but not less than a minimum of 4 additional spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail stores, supermarkets, department stores, billiard/pool rooms, personal service shops</td>
<td>One for each employee and 1 for each 150 square feet of retail sales area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses not specifically mentioned</td>
<td>In the case of buildings which are used for uses not specifically mentioned, those provisions for off-street parking facilities for a use which is so mentioned and to which said use is similar in terms of parking demand shall apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed uses in same building</td>
<td>In the case of mixed uses in the same building, the amount of parking space for each use specified shall be provided and the space for 1 use shall be not considered as providing required spaces for any other use except as to churches and auditoriums incidental to public and parochial schools permitted herein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Beach (page 58)

This area is dominated by Holland State Park. Many of the land uses along Ottawa Beach Road exist because of the Park and depend on it for survival. This subarea has residential, retail, entertainment and resort-oriented land uses. During the summer season, Ottawa Beach Road carries high volumes of traffic. The challenge is to preserve the area’s beachfront character while accommodating the intense activities and traffic associated with this popular destination. The Future Land Use Map designates this subarea for Residential-Low Density, High Density Residential, Historical Residential, Inland Lake Residential, Resort Commercial, and Public/Open Space land uses.

Commercial development should not be expanded here, nor should current land use patterns dramatically shift. New zoning regulations could be developed to ensure that infill development or redevelopment is consistent with the character of the existing West Michigan Park Association cottage neighborhood.

Specific Plan Elements
State Park Gateways. The new trailhead to the Mt. Pisgah Trail underscores the entrance to this key destination. Other gateways, such as to the campgrounds or to the beach are ill-defined and anti-climactic. The township should work in partnership with the Department of Natural Resources and Environment and the Ottawa County Road Commission to enhance the streetscape and create a gateway to strengthen a sense of arrival for visitors. Park Township completed the Ottawa Beach Corridor improvement streetscape which dramatically increased the aesthetics of the gateway. The improvements and streetscape more accurately reflect the prominence of the district and have strengthened the sense of arrival for visitors. As this area is a key tourist destination, the Township should continue to evaluate this area for streetscape and branding improvements. A new Ottawa County Marina is being located near the entrance to the Holland State Park. As part of this marina, Park Township has created in partnership with Ottawa County a plaza celebrating the history and evolution of parks in Park Township. Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Department and in particular the Ottawa County Park 12 Plan also significantly has played a significant role in improving the visitor experience improves the visitor’s experience. In 2019, a conversation with principals in the Ottawa County Recreation Department and the township explored the possibility of placing an electronic sign in advance of the State Park to inform beachgoers when the Park is near capacity, with alternative destinations. Additional signs further east combined with shuttle service may help relieve road and beach congestion.

Shuttle Service. Traffic congestion on Ottawa Beach Road was a dominant concern throughout the planning process. The township, with the State and the Macatawa Area Express, should explore the feasibility of a shuttle bus service between the beach and remote parking lots, like Ottawa County Fair Grounds. This is a complex and challenging issue and will require strong partnerships and a good understanding of all issues.

Ottawa Beach Area Neighborhood. The Ottawa
Beach cottage neighborhood is on the National and State Registers of Historic Places. It helps shape the resort and beachfront character of this area. Efforts to ensure the integrity of the historic neighborhood, with the West Michigan Park Association, should be made through the adoption of an overlay district to control new development and preserve the existing neighborhood character. Demolition of historic homes should be discouraged; redevelopment or additions to existing homes should fit the existing neighborhood context and be guided by character-based development regulations, like a form-based code. The historic brick pumphouse that once served the long-gone Hotel Ottawa has been converted into a museum that highlights local history. This approach is consistent with these efforts.

**Park 12 Parcels and Michigan Department of Natural Resources Properties.** In an effort to protect the character of existing open spaces within North Beach, this Plan recognizes the significance of the property owned by Ottawa County as a result of the 2005 Stipulation and Order Regarding Park 12 Parcels with the West Michigan Park Association. In addition, this Plan recognizes the same open space significance of the State park property owned by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. To preserve these open spaces, all property within the areas owned by Ottawa County, in particular, the Park 12 Parcels as identified on the Future Land Use Map and within the Appendix, as well as all property owned by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, also identified on the Future Land Use Map, are never intended to be altered beyond their existing predominant open space character, except for those improvements necessary to manage the State park properties.

**Design Standards.** Although an expansion of existing commercial uses is not anticipated in this area, many of the current businesses are aging and may soon need to be refurbished, or redeveloped. It will be important to ensure that the architectural character of the new or improved business structures continues to reflect the area’s historic beachfront charm. Again, the township should consider guidelines for site and architectural standards for any commercial development in this area (Figures 37 and 38).
Appendix

- 2005 Stipulation and Order Regarding Park 12 Parcels with the West Michigan Park Association

[INSERT 2005 DOCUMENT]
[ADD TO TABLE OF CONTENTS]