

**MINUTES
PARK TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Park Township Hall
52 152nd Street
Holland, MI 49418

Regular Meeting
April 18, 2017
6:30 P.M.

DRAFT COPY

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Pfof 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: Jeff Pfof, Eric DeBoer, Linda Dykert, Dennis Eade, David Kleinjans, Denise Nestel, Tom Vanderkolk

Staff: Howard Fink, Manager, Ed de Vries, Zoning Administrator, Dan Martin, Legal Counsel

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by Vanderkolk, supported by Nestel, to approve the agenda as presented.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Kleinjans noted one correction on page 7. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph should end at ordinance. The Special Meeting minutes of March 14, 2017 were approved as corrected.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Kleinjans suggested the word “use” be plural in (1). The Regular Meeting minutes of March 21, 2017 were approved as corrected.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing – PUD Proposed Ordinance

de Vries said it was determined at last month’s meeting the final language in the PUD document prepared by Legal Counsel should have a Public Hearing at this meeting. It will then be forwarded to the Township Board.

Martin noted there is one correction on page 8, Section 38-359, Subsection 8. There is a reference to Section 38-671; it should be changed to 38-371.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pfost opened the Public Hearing at 6:35 P.M.

There was no comment.

Pfost closed the Public Hearing at 6:35 P.M.

Pfost noted the work session with the Township Board and the Planning Commission will be held on May 8 at 6:30 P.M. for the purpose of discussing PUD ordinance language.

Nestel said she had asked Legal Counsel regarding a concern in the PUD language on page 3, Section 38-364, paragraph B, which references “any other lawful or reasonable use....” Nestel asked if it should reference the zoning district rather than zoning ordinance.

Martin said it could be correct to include this language. It changes it from being too broad to more specific land uses which makes it something you are permitted to do. He recommended it be changed as Nestel indicated if that was the Planning Commission’s intent.

Vanderkolk asked if we should recognize the change in a formal motion. Pfost agreed.

de Vries advised the wording should include “other lawful and reasonable land uses that are authorized by the zoning ordinances rather than the zoning district.”

Pfost requested a motion for the adoption and recommendation of the PUD ordinance to the Township Board for their consideration, with the amended language.

Fink suggested the following wording: “Any land use allowed by the Park Township zoning ordinance and any lawful and reasonable land uses authorized in the Township zoning ordinance.” He suggested deleting the words “are not.” The Planning Commission achieved consensus that Section 38-364(2) should be modified to read:

Any land use allowed by the Park Township Zoning Ordinance may be approved by the Township Board within a PUD as a principal or accessory use subject to adequate provisions for the public health, safety, and welfare within the PUD, except Manufactured Housing Communities may only be approved within a PUD in areas recommended in the Park Township Master Plan for High Density Residential and zoned R-4 Medium Density Single and Two-Family Residence District prior to consideration as a PUD.

Eade moved, supported by Vanderkolk, to submit the recommended changes and amended PUD language for Section 38-354, Subsection 2, first sentence, and forward to the Township Board.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

B. Meyering Storage Building (postponed from September 2016)

de Vries provided the background for this item. The applicant, Ron Meyering, is requesting site plan approval to construct a storage building at the northeast corner of South 160th St. and Woodlawn Ave. This is proposed for personal storage.

The lot is zoned C-1 Neighborhood Business District and is currently vacant. To the north is a party store, to the east and south are single family residences in the R-3 zoning district. Across the street to the west the property is zoned C-1, but except for the Fire Station and south it is used for residences.

The site plan review application was received and scheduled for the September 20, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. It was postponed to this meeting.

The property had previously been authorized for a special use for a storage building on March 17, 2015 with the following conditions:

1. Outdoor storage is not permitted on the property
2. Provision for adequate parking

3. Provision for maneuverable space for vehicles
4. No impact of traffic on site
5. All work should be performed inside the building
6. No living or taking up residence on the property
7. Secure storage must be ensured
8. Storage on property limited to watercraft or vehicles
9. No adverse effect on environment

The previous applicant did not build the facility. In June of 2016 the property was sold to the current owner, Ron Meyering, with the understanding the special use approval for a storage facility went with the land (property) and was not only for the applicant.

The site plan approved in 2015 was for a 3 unit building 65' x 80' x 24' high. Of the nine conditions required by the Planning Commission, none of the conditions addressed the building size.

This proposal is for a building 65' x 85' x 35' high with a single owner/occupant. The building does meet zoning requirements for setback and height. The change in building size from the approved site plan requires a new site plan review.

Tim Allspach of DA Architecture, PLC, represented Meyering regarding the application.

Eade asked for the height of the building that houses the fire station.

Pfost asked Martin if it is just the site plan that requires approval, given the change in the building size.

Martin confirmed, and said the Planning Commission has already granted the special land use plan approval. The Planning Commission could impose additional conditions on the site plan approval if you aren't satisfied with the conditions that were previously approved. Under the Michigan Zoning and Enabling Act the Planning Commission has the authority to do this.

Pfost asked for clarification that although this is a commercial use outside vehicle repair would not be permitted.

Allspach confirmed this won't be a repair place. He asked for clarification on what is allowed under vehicle repair.

Pfost said normal maintenance on a storage vehicle but no company would be allowed to conduct this as a commercial entity. The condition would be for personal maintenance only. This would be conducted inside the building.

de Vries clarified that 30' is the height of the fire station. The top eave of the storage facility would be 35'.

Kleinjans had several concerns: 1) The drawing mentions storing trailers which he understood is not permitted.

Allspach replied the reference on the drawing is for temporary parking of a trailer, not permanent storage.

2) There are 5 overhead doors so how many spaces are there?

Allspach said there are no separate spaces – it is designed to be open as one large space.

Fink explained if there is any change in outdoor storage there would have to be permission for changing land use.

Kleinjans asked if a new owner should assume this space in the future would it have to come back to the Township for permission.

de Vries confirmed that any change would require a permit from the Township.

3) Kleinjans noted a reference to the sewer holding tank on the map.

Allspach said there is no sewer tank located on the property.

5) Kleinjans asked about the light which is shown on the upper left of the drawing. He asked if it is shielded. It needs to be shielded down on all sides.

Allspach said it is shielded on three sides but can be corrected to shield on all sides.

6) Kleinjans asked about the 14x14 door on a neighbor's property.

Allspach said that was an error.

de Vries recommended the motion should be with the conditions regarding the change in the light fixture and noting of a temporary trailer parking.

Kleinjans moved, and Nestel supported, to approve the site plan with changes regarding the word “temporary” and provision of a different light fixture that is down shielded according to the ordinance. The prior approval conditions are included in this approval.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Master Plan – Board concern, airport plan, infrastructure language

Airport Plan:

Martin said the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Section 33, has language that references airports. He cited the references on the airport from the Act and noted the language in the Master Plan that supports the requirements. However, he recommended adding language to the Master Plan that currently reads:

“The Park Township Airport is a basic utility airport with facilities for recreational, environmental, emergency and educational uses. Established in 1934, the airport is one of the oldest continually operating airports in the State of Michigan. Park Township owns the airport and assigns maintenance and operations to Ottawa Aviation Services, Inc.”

Martin said that the Michigan Planning Enabling Act does not require a lot of specificity in the Master Plan. Airports are covered by the Airport Zoning Act, Michigan Aeronautics Code and the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. Martin recommended that additional language should be added to read:

“The Township Board should consider adopting an airport plan or an airport approach plan for the Park Township Airport pursuant to and consistent with Section 151 of the Michigan Aeronautics Code (MCL259.151), Section 12 of the Airport Zoning Act (MCL259.442), and Section 203 of the Michigan Zoning and Enabling Act (MCL259.3202).”

Pfost said this satisfies the necessary requirements.

Fink asked Martin about adding an additional sentence: “Park Township wishes to preserve the protection of the airport approach plan for the health, welfare, and safety for the benefit of its residents.”

Martin concurred.

Infrastructure Language:

Pfost asked de Vries about a map illustrating water and sewer services for the township.

de Vries said there were concerns about too much detail on a previous map. He asked Vanderkolk if the references should be more general.

Vanderkolk said the service area has to be included in the Master Plan, however, following the guidelines provided by Homeland Security, utilities do not have to be included. The rule is to provide enough information that can be helpful for service work, but not too much to be compromising for security purposes.

Pfost asked if this satisfies Homeland Security rules.

de Vries says he has a statement from the BPW and we could incorporate a sentence to include this.

Nestel observed that the Master Plan addresses the needs of what we want. She offered a statement from the City of Holland that is generic regarding the infrastructure element:

“Continue to be proactive with plans for future improvement, maintenance and expansion of Public utilities and infrastructure and ensure it compliments and enhances the area.”

Nestel will share the statement with de Vries so he can incorporate it in the Master Plan draft.

Kleinjans asked to include the reference to “health, safety and welfare” in the statement.

NHP Designation

Pfost said we had consensus on that designation.

Dykert recalled Martin and Johnson were going to write a statement including 3 units per acre.

Nestel remembered the discussion.

Martin said there was an October 2016 e-mail regarding this subject, but it was not specific.

Pfost had a note from July 2016 regarding page 49 in the Master Plan draft that we would examine the NHP area for a better representation of the nonconforming areas. Where do we want to go at this point?

Nestel recalled discussion about returning to the language in the last plan. This was what the Planning Commission agreed to include in the Master Plan.

Dykert found a reference in September 2016 recommending specific density in Macatawa Park.

Nestel read the statement that went to the Township Board that was agreed to by the Planning Commission.

Nestel moved, supported by Vanderkolk, to accept that language. She recommended not including the reference to specific density which would compromise the nonconforming nature of the Macatawa Park neighborhood.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 1. Dykert denied. Motion carried.

DeBoer moved, supported by Nestel, to remand the Master Plan to the Township Board. This will include the airport language, infrastructure and NHP language.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes, 6, Nays 1. Dykert denied. Motion carried.

B. Ordinance Amendments (special use additions, waterfront setback cleanup, signs, subdivisions, minimum roof slope and more)

Pfost suggested the staff will outline these in a package for future review by the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pfost opened Public Comment at 7:30 P.M.

Nikki Arendshorst was surprised the NHP language was approved. She hoped different language had been prepared with the help of legal counsel. Macatawa Park wouldn't be unhappy regarding language stating 3 units per acre.

Pfost closed Public Comment at 7:32 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Eade noted the Zoning Board of Appeals has been struggling with standards regarding corner lots. He requested that the Planning Commission add this to the "to do" list.

The Planning Commission will have a joint meeting on May 8 with the Township Board. The next regular meeting is scheduled May 16, 2017 which may be a conflict. It was agreed that the substitute date will be May 10 at 6:30 P.M. Martin suggested notice on the website.

ADJOURNMENT

DeBoer moved, supported by Kleinjans, to adjourn the meeting at 7:38 P.M.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Hemwall
Recording Secretary

April 20, 2017

APPROVED:

DRAFT