

**MINUTES
PARK TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Park Township Hall
52 152nd Street
Holland, MI 49418

Regular Meeting
May 9, 2018
6:30 P.M.

DRAFT-APPROVED 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, Terry DeHaan, Rosemary Ervine, David Kleinjans, Denise Nestel, Tom VanderKolk

Absent: Dennis Eade with notice

Staff: Ed de Vries, Community Development Director, Gregory Ransford, Staff Planner, Dan Martin, Legal Counsel

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Kleinjans moved, supported by Ervine, to approve the agenda as presented.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Kleinjans noted one correction in the minutes on page 2.

Motion by Ervine, supported by Nestel, to approve the Special Meeting Minutes of May 2, 2018 as corrected.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. Final Planned Unit Development Application – Douglas DeHaan of DeHaan Homes

Ottawa Beach Road, parcel number 70-15-27-351-026, which is located in the C-2 Resort Service District (C-2).

Ransford presented the agenda item. The Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) application from Douglas DeHaan of DeHaan Homes outlines a plan to construct sixteen (16) single-family condominiums and four (4) duplex condominiums, as well as a swimming pool, pool house, pathways, open space, and related site improvements on Ottawa Beach Road, parcel number 70-15-27-351-026, which is located in the C-2 Resort Service District (C-2). Pursuant to the direction of the Planning Commission provided at the March 14, 2018 meeting, the applicant has revised the Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan to incorporate staff and Planning Commission comments. The applicant has addressed bike path area and public elements. The applicant also provided photometric guidelines.

There were three e-mails received. One concerned safety items, one with questions, and a suggestion for fewer home but was in support, and one supporting the development.

Pfost advised the Planning Commission they will forward a recommendation for either approval or denial of this PUD to the Township Board.

Doug DeHaan, applicant, provided an update on changes since the preliminary presentation. He briefly reviewed the plan for the development. He has modified plans for the bike path. He also has an environmentally sensitive landscape and lighting plan. Only dead and old sassafras and poison sumac trees will be removed but the pines will be retained. Old trees that hang over his neighbor's property are to be cleared. The photometric lighting plan will illuminate parkway areas with LED lighting. Light will be deflected as a result of work with a lighting engineer. The pool, pool path and pool house will be limited to association use only.

The units will be zero step, with 24 units planned. There are three floor plans. It is to be an active adult project. There is a lot of community interest in the development. He noted the zero step is a better idea since the water table is only nine feet. It is a popular idea for senior living according to surveys.

Commissioner DeHaan asked if the community building will be open to the public.

Applicant DeHaan said the pavilion will be open to the public. It's an architectural property of the development but will be maintained by the association.

Ervine asked to look at the plan to see what the specific changes are.

Don De Groot, Engineer with Exxel Engineering, addressed the question pointing out the bike path and the one way drive into the development. Based on advice from the County Road Commission, the geometry of the drive will be changed. He pointed out the edge of the path and road where trees will be planted based on the recommendation of the Road Commission.

Ervine asked about signage for safety of bikers in the area and if it would be possible to post a warning sign about the entrance drive into the development.

De Groot said that can be arranged.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pfost opened the Public Hearing at 6:57 P.M.

Nancy Benedict was concerned about the rentals of the neighboring property in Waukazoo Woods. She would like to see an ordinance regarding short term rentals in the Township.

Rod VandenBerg expressed concern about construction noise during the summer at the Oak Grove resort location which is adjacent to the proposed PUD. For the record the resort has been there over 30 years. He has one of the Top rated RV parks in the country. He supports the development but would like to hear about the time of construction activity.

Keith VanOosterhout was concerned about increased traffic in the area. He would like to see a cross walk on Ottawa Beach Road for safety reasons. He also had a question regarding the tree canopy. Will it decrease visibility for people accessing the development?

Randy Bouwkamp said the project is going to be awesome. He owns the beach house adjacent to the property. He would like to hear about a definite start time and/or ending time during the day for construction so he can tell his guests who rent the guest house he owns.

Pfost closed the Public Hearing at 7:07 P.M.

Applicant DeHaan addressed the amount of traffic which will be impacted. A pedestrian pathway is a good idea. He will certainly work with Bouwkamp and VandenBerg regarding their concerns. He plans on a late summer start and will take it all under consideration.

Pfost thanked the staff for the very comprehensive review of standards.

Ransford said the Planning Commission can review each standard or rule on the entire package.

Martin advised if certain standards are of concern the Planning Commission can adopt the recommendations of staff, or if the Planning Commission wants to adopt others, those should be reviewed. Otherwise, those that do not need to be deliberated can be ruled on as a group.

Nestel asked about the trees. She asked Ransford if he has been at the site to look at the trees.

Ransford said the applicant has identified the plan that explains what trees will remain and what will have to be removed.

DeHaan said the trees to be removed are marked. Many that are tagged will stay. There are some old 36' diameter oaks that will be preserved.

Zoning Ordinance Provisions (Board review of highlighted items):

Section 38-363 (4) – does the plan meet the Master Plan intent for tree canopy?

VanderKolk said the applicant made a good point that the Road Commission will be determining safety requirements.

Ransford said the Township will work with the applicant and the County Road Commission.

Pfost asked what would the Township do if a safety issue occurs a year from now.

de Vries said the line of sight issue for traffic on the bike path and on Ottawa Beach Road will be discussed with the developer, Road Commission and Township who can mediate if there is a problem.

Commissioner DeHaan, asked if DeHaan has the number of trees that will remain. Will the site look like it is today.

Applicant DeHaan said most of the trees on the site will remain in place.

VanderKolk asked about imposing conditions in any motion when the Planning Commission considers the site plan.

Ransford said he provides a template for the final decision and it can include the canopy of trees and additional work with the County Road Commission.

The Planning Commission was in consensus to refer this to the County Road Commission.

Regarding adverse impact – should there be a time limit imposed on construction activity?

Pfost asked DeHaan when construction would reasonably be started.

DeHaan said by the time the engineering is completed and it goes to bid August or September could be the start time. With regard to concern about rentals, DeHaan said the condo association will handle this.

Martin advised that if the Planning Commission imposes the noise period of construction activity as a condition the Township will have to enforce it.

Pfost asked about the completion of the construction.

DeHaan estimated it will require 24 months of construction.

Kleinjans suggested hours of construction 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. as a condition.

Regarding a condition on construction, Pfost asked if a time of 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. could be suggested and how would the Township enforce this.

Martin said this would be complaint driven. The Township could issue a citation which could include a stop work order as a violation of the PUD conditions.

Pfost asked Martin if construction limits can be referred to the Township Board.

Martin said the Planning Commission can recommend conditions if it is a concern. He noted that the Township already has a noise ordinance which is 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. As an

example, he added that for the Villas construction the condition was silence between 8:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M.

There was general consensus for the construction activity time.

Item #10 under Site Plan standards:

Site drainage plan will be referred to the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner's office. There was consensus.

All Site Plan Standard items 1-19 were considered and there was general consensus to approve.

With reference to #17 Kleinjans asked about lighting opposite the condos next door. Should there be special shielding? He felt it should be a requirement. He recommended the flat bottom light fixture instead of the globe design.

Ransford said the applicant proposed these and they weren't required.

Pfost asked de Vries if he was comfortable with language regarding this issue.

Applicant DeHaan said the lighting has shielding.

DeHaan said he will change the fixture to one with a flat bottom in answer to Kleinjan's recommendation – model EHL16 LED (GCF).

Pfost reviewed the Recommendations and Considerations:

Whether the proposed meets the goals, objectives, and vision of the Master Plan -

- * Canopy street trees along Ottawa Beach Road
- Whether adequate measures are provided to appropriately shield internal drive light from adjacent properties
- Whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is necessary
- Whether a financial surety is necessary
- A condition that review and approval is required by the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner's office
- Content of the proposed Planning Commission Report

All were deemed acceptable by the Planning Commission.

Ervine moved, supported by VanderKolk, to forward to the Township Board the Planning Commission Report with the recommendations for Site Plan Standards per Section 38-103 as discussed, including the suggestion for the change in light fixture for proper shielding.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Gerald Hunsberger, Supervisor of Park Township, requested to speak to the Planning Commission.

He thanked the Planning Commission for their hard work on behalf of the Township, and addressed Tom VanderKolk in special thanks for his seven years of service as an exemplary member of the Planning Commission. VanderKolk is retiring and his wisdom and high professional standards have proved an excellent example for the Township.

B. Rezoning Request for a Conditional Zoning Map Amendment and Site Plan – Doug Geerlings of Windmill Recreation

0 – 160th Avenue, parcel number 70-15-34-482-019 from the R-3 Low Density One Family Residence Zoning District (R-3) and the R-5 Low Density Multifamily Residence Zoning District (R-5) to the C-1 Neighborhood Business Zoning District (C-1).

This is an application for a conditional zoning map amendment (rezoning) and site plan from Doug Geerlings on behalf of Windmill Recreation to rezone property located 0 – 160th Avenue, parcel number 70-15-34-482-019 from the R-3 Low Density One Family Residence Zoning District (R-3) and the R-5 Low Density Multifamily Residence Zoning District (R-5) to the C-1 Neighborhood Business Zoning District (C-1). The applicant seeks to construct a 7,392 square foot self-storage condominium building located at the northwest corner of 160th Avenue and Ottogan Street at the County line.

The entirety of the subject property is approximately two thirds (2/3) of an acre in area, half of which is currently located in the R-3 and R-5 Zoning Districts, with the remaining half located within the C-1 Zoning District. Despite this, given that the related site improvements are located within both properties, the request for conditional rezoning applies to the entire two thirds (2/3) of an acre.

The application has been reviewed and found complete. The Planner's review of the request relates to the Park Township Master Plan (PTMP) and the Park Township Zoning Ordinance (PTZO). The review of the PTMP includes the requested C-1 Zoning District, as well as the R-3 Zoning District since said district is the designation for the subject parcel within the Zoning Plan of the PTMP. Given the conditional rezoning request, the relevant provisions of the PTMP related to the site plan are addressed in the Staff Memo of May 1. These were not provided in the previous review, given that the first request was for a traditional rezoning.

The Park Township Master Plan and its Map, adopted on May 8, 2017, provide for the subject parcel to serve as the Low Density Residential Classification (LDR), which is consistent with the R-3 Zoning District identified within the related Zoning Plan (page 74) of the PTMP. Approximately one quarter (1/4) of the subject property is currently located within the R-3 Zoning District.

Lynelle Berkenpas of Holland Engineering, spoke to the request for conditional rezoning.

This historically had been the location of the Windmill Gas Station. The client has conducted an environmental study. The property consists of two properties: a rectangular parcel zoned C1 and a second parcel which is zoned R3 and R5. The client is requesting zoning to C1 for the properties not currently zoned C1. The proposal is to build an RV and boat storage facility.

Ervine asked if the entire site is contaminated.

Berkenpas stated the EPA study showed lead levels are higher than recommended in three locations of the site on both properties. This study was done in February.

DeHaan asked to see the architectural plan for the project.

Nestel asked Martin if the Planning Commission is approving the site plan and can impose conditions.

Martin said the Planning Commission is approving the site plan, and it is standard to ask for conditions related to the site plan. The applicant has offered in writing certain conditions for the rezoning request, which the Planning Commission is to review.

Nestel asked if the Township Board can make any variation on the site plan.

Martin said the applicant would have to receive the approval of the Planning Commission. That would not require rezoning. The applicant could ask for an amendment of the site plan from the Planning Commission. This would not require Township Board approval.

Nestel asked if the applicant comes back with a request such as changing the shingles on the roof would it trigger a different review of the site plan.

Martin said it would but it would not change the conditions.

Berkenpas said if this is approved, her client doesn't want a long term concern.

Pfost asked about soil vapor concerns. Are there concerns DEQ has raised? How would you facilitate ongoing remedial activity with soil problems in the future should condos be built there?

Berkenpas said the Holland Engineering Environmental Division has been involved regarding this. There will be monitoring of the site and DEQ will have to review the project. For this project they are going to try to not disturb the soil.

Pfost asked Martin if there is a future problem would it be a Township concern.

Martin said the Township will not have liability. The Township doesn't regulate the environment, rather, the State would address this. Using this site for above ground storage will have little impact on the contamination. However, the client will be subject to State laws.

Pfost asked if we should address the possibility of a future problem. Although the contamination is capped it could create other problems if it travels elsewhere.

Martin said we can't condition it regarding capping. We can either accept or reject the conditions offered in the rezoning. The DEQ should be the one responsible for what needs to be done regarding the contaminated site. This is beyond our jurisdiction and expertise. The Township does not have authority regarding this issue.

VanderKolk confirmed we cannot add any conditions to the requirements of site plan. He reviewed the Considerations of the Planning Commission:

Master Plan

- Gateway – Whether it is appropriate to increase the amount of commercially zoned property at the Gateway intersection of 160th Avenue and Ottogon Street
- * Goal 3 – Whether the gateway along 160th Avenue is diminished because of a lack of bike path
- * Goal 8 – Whether the scale of the existing 0.3025 (30%) acres of adjacent C-1 Zoning District land, which is limited by the challenges of a corner lot, is sufficient on its own to provide for a viable commercial use, particularly given that no public sanitary sewer is available
- Goal 10 – Whether the request promotes the redevelopment of property where infrastructure already exists
- Compatibility – Whether the proposed use is compatible with the surrounding zoning district and uses
- Rezoning criteria provided in Section 38-129(3)
- Conditional rezoning criteria provided in Section 38-129(4) including the 30%

Ransford said the Planning Commission can impose reasonable conditions on the site plan.

Martin agreed and said the Planning Commission can place conditions on site plan approval, not conditional rezoning.

It was agreed to handle these two separately.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pfost opened the Public Hearing at 8:17 P.M.

Marsha Davis is a neighbor to the west of this property. She would like to look at the architectural plan. Regarding the comment on “30%” - what will not exceed 30%. She is concerned about lighting since she lives west of the property and her backyard will be affected by any light illumination.

Leon Schaddelee lives south of this property. He has lived there almost 60 years. The property is contaminated and the water table is too high. The western lot is as big as the house next to it. That lot has never been tested. . There is no reason why a house can't be built on that lot. There is a gap in the pavement where the gas pumps used to be. If the pavement is removed it will release contaminants which will affect his water. He thinks the Master Plan says this is residential. Will this be an asset to the community? In his opinion, it won't enhance the community for the residents who live there.

Pfost asked Berkenpas if she would like to address the concerns raised in the public hearing.

With regard to the architectural plan, Berkenpas described the appearance of the building. There will be seven units. Regarding lighting, the photometric plan will provide shielded lighting for minimal impact. There will be no lights on the west side because of the presence of that residential community. Regarding traffic concerns, the driveway would be moved further from the intersection. Evergreens will be planted along the side of the property. A six foot wooden fence would be erected to the north and west. Six foot evergreens would be planted along this fence.

DeHann asked about timing of the lighting. Will the lighting be turned on and off by the owner?

Applicant Geerlings said the lights would have a photoelectric eye.

Pfost closed the Public Hearing at 8:35 P.M.

Ervine observed that the lighting seemed minimal and asked about traffic flow on the site.

Berkenpas said there will be two driveways. The lighting is planned to protect the residential area.

Nestel noted the history of accidents occurring at this location.

Berkenpas said they are trying for a balance.

Pfost noted the 30% reference is the proposal that the building won't exceed the footprint beyond 30%.

Pfost reviewed what is before the Planning Commission with this request. He noted this application is for conditional rezoning.

Nestel asked Martin about the C1 conditional rezoning – does this incorporate the site plan?

Martin explained that the site plan is NOT one of the offered conditions. The process is if you rezone the property with the applicant's conditions they have to come to the Planning Commission for amending the conditional rezoning and the particular use. It will be subject to the Planning Commission's review and approval. First, you approve conditional rezoning for this use. Then the Township Board approves the zoning. The Planning Commission approves the site plan and the applicant has to follow its requirements unless it's amended.

Martin said the Planning Commission cannot compel the conditions – we deal with only what the applicant has offered in writing. We either approve or reject the zoning request.

Pfost asked if the applicant would like to postpone action while specific conditions are reviewed.

Berkenpas said the conditions offered are because of the concerns how the property would be used. The client is willing to alter the site plan and the architectural plan if necessary.

Nestel asked what the Planning Commission is supposed to approve with regard to the PUD statement in the proposed bylaws.

Martin said the Planning Commission is not approving condo rules. It's not one of the applicant's conditions. By the time it comes to the Township Board the proposed bylaws for the condo association will clean up the questions about the PUD portion. He reminded the Planning Commission it is only approving rezoning for the limited use with these conditions.

Pfost recommended review of the Conditional Rezoning requirements in Chapter 4 of the Master Plan as presented by staff in the Staff Memo of May 1, 2018:

Review of Conditional Rezoning Requirements in the Master Plan:

The subject property is approximately two thirds (2/3) of an acre in area, or approximately 27,647 square feet. Given this, the existing lot area appears to be consistent with the land use classification designated for the property within the Park Township Master Plan.

Pfost noted the use may not be consistent. He advised we can't take this lightly.

Regarding the future land use designation, does the architectural plan fulfill the conceptual plan of the Southside concept.

It was agreed it does not.

VanderKolk understood the tools of the Master Plan and rezoning and noted we offer conditional rezoning because it is sometimes necessary. Is there a better use?

DeHaan asked if there is something missing that would help us to make a decision and be able to defend it.

Ervine was still troubled about some points that would help us meet the standards.

Kleinjans was concerned about the commercial side of this request.

Pfost asked for a straw poll at this point in the discussion:

Kleinjans, needs more information; what would be a better use for the property?
Nestel, still unsure; some of the language is vague;
Ervine, needs more information, problematic, safety concerns over minimal lighting;
DeHaan, concern over restrictions and monitoring of what will be stored in the units;
VanderKolk, perhaps some proposal is possible;
Pfost, we are supposed to follow the Master Plan and the zoning plan. This does not match what the applicant is requesting in this case. This request is a concern in a residential area.

Ransford asked if the applicant modified the conditions offered would that make the Planning Commission's deliberations easier.

Martin said the applicant can decide whether or not to address the Planning Commission's concerns.

Pfost asked about onsite parking. Ransford said this is more of a site plan issue.

Review of the Site Plan Standards:

It was agreed #6 needs more information for the layout plan related to topography, the character of the adjoining property and the type and size of buildings.

#7 –Landscaping, identification of trees that will remain, screening and preservation of the natural state. The applicant needs to provide information about this.

#13 – This refers to onsite parking and separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

#19 - Does this site plan meet Federal statutes? It was suggested to make it a condition for the site plan.

Review of Special Use Standards – Section 38-2:

This chapter in the Master Plan is based upon the Township Land Use Plan and is designed to:

- (1) Promote the public health, safety, morals and general welfare;
- (2) Encourage the use of land in accordance with its character and adaptability and limit the improper use of land;
- (3) Avoid the overcrowding of population;
- (4) Provide adequate light and air;
- (5) Lessen congestion on the public streets and private roads;
- (6) Reduce hazards to life and property;
- (7) Facilitate the adequate provision of a system of transportation, sewage disposal, safe and adequate water supply, education, recreation and other public requirements; and
- (8) Conserve the expenditure of funds for public improvements and services so as to obtain the most advantageous uses of land, resources and properties.

There is concern regarding #6 due to the contamination.

Regarding #7 there will be public water but no sewer. Pfof asked about restrooms. Under C1 not having facilities is a major factor but under this special use it may not be required. The Health Department may rule otherwise.

Pfof asked the Planning Commission if they wanted to review considerations for the Gateway plan.

Berkenpas said the client believes he is offering a better use for this corner and for the neighbors. He is before the Planning Commission for this particular use with restrictions. The client is trying to offer reasonable conditions for the proposed use. She has heard concerns that are site plan specific.

Nestel asked about outside storage which is not included in the conditions of the proposal.

Berkenpas said it was in the narrative portion of the proposal.

Martin said it should be a condition the applicant has to offer voluntarily in writing, not part of the narrative. It has to be in writing - that is the way the statute is written.

Pfof said the Planning Commission needs something very specific. Do we have enough information regarding the use?

All concurred there was not enough information.

Pfof asked if this prevented the Planning Commission from accepting the land use.

Pfof said we needed something very specific;
Kleinjans had a problem with storage of items;
Nestel was not satisfied with the information given;

VanderKolk said he thought it was possible to reach a decision;
DeHaan needed more specificity;
Ervine concurred with the necessity for more specificity.

Pfost offered to delay a decision for a month to allow the applicant to deliberate on more specific information.

Doug Geerlings spoke to his application. His hesitation is with returning with more specific conditions. He has worked with staff and he is as specific with the details as he can be.

Pfost explained the Planning Commission doesn't see that specificity in the proposal.

de Vries says there is confusion between conditional rezoning and site plan requirements. He felt frustrated so how does he advise the client.

Martin said that frustration comes from the statute. The Planning Commission cannot impose conditions – the client has to voluntarily offer conditions. de Vries can't give them guidance on what the Planning Commission will approve. It's based on how the statute is written. If they don't meet the conditions within the time frame the conditional rezoning returns to the former zoning. If the Planning Commission does not approve the conditional rezoning to C1 the applicant would have to apply for a variance. If you don't approve, which is your right, you have to have a rational basis for doing so. If the Township Board denies the C1 rezoning the client would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals which can grant a use variance.

Martin said with the site plan the Planning Commission can impose conditions such as no outdoor storage.

Kleinjans suggested separating the two issues for consideration.

VanderKolk agreed to limiting the use and storage of certain items.

VanderKolk moved, and Kleinjans supported, to forward to the Township Board the recommendation to approve conditional rezoning for this property.

Roll Call Vote:

Nestel, nay; VanderKolk, aye; Kleinjans, aye; Ervine, aye; DeHaan, aye; Pfost, nay.

Ayes 4, Nays 2. Motion carried.

Pfost asked for a motion for the site plan use.

Martin recommended postponing approval of the site plan until the Township Board approves the ordinance. There should be no motion until the property is rezoned.

Kleinjans asked if the applicant could change the rezoning.

Martin concurred.

The client could offer in writing certain modified conditions to the Township Board. However, these may not necessarily be the conditions that were considered by the Planning Commission.

Kleinjans moved, supported by VanderKolk, to approve the site plan as presented.

Kleinjans asked if the Planning Commission wants to add conditions to the site plan.

Martin said the Planning Commission can impose reasonable conditions on the site plan approval which can include no outside storage.

Kleinjans withdrew his motion.

Conditions:

DeHaan has issues with security regarding the lighting.
Kleinjans is satisfied with the lighting and the site plan.
Pfost said the issue of outdoor storage is significant.

Kleinjans moved, supported by VanderKolk, to approve the site plan with the condition of no outside storage and contingent on the Township Board approval of conditional rezoning.

Roll Call Vote:

Nestel, nay; Kleinjans, aye; VanderKolk, aye; Ervine, aye; DeHaan, aye; Pfost, aye.

Ayes 5, Nays 1. Motion carried.

C. Rezoning Request for a Zoning Map Amendment – Glenn Dirkse

Ransford explained the application for a zoning map amendment (rezoning) from Glenn Dirkse to rezone property located 4025 Lakeridge Drive, parcel number 70-15-28-380-020, as well as two (2) adjacent vacant properties, holding parcel numbers 70-15-28-380-022 and 70-15-28-380-042. The applicant seeks to rezone these properties from the R-2 Lakeshore Residence Zoning District (R-2) to the R-3 Low Density One Family Residence Zoning District (R-3). The property is located on the west side of Lakeridge Drive, west of South Lakeshore Drive. Each parcel contains approximately six tenths (0.6) of an acre and are collectively slightly less than two (2) acres in area.

It is important to note that the minimum lot area and width for residential uses in the R-2 Zoning District is one (1) acre and 100 feet, respectively. The minimum lot area and width for residential uses in the requested R-3 District is 15,000 square feet and 90 feet, respectively. Collectively, the three (3) lots proposed for rezoning contain approximately 467 feet of road frontage. Depending on setbacks of existing structure(s) and divisions permitted by the Michigan Land Division Act, Act 288 of 1967, as amended, the applicant may be able to create (2) additional lots.

Zoning Ordinance Map

It is important to review the existing uses adjacent to the subject property as well as the related zoning districts. As indicated by the applicant, the surrounding properties contain single family dwellings on similarly sized lots. In addition, significant open space exists to the east, owned by

the Oak Bluff Condominium Association. All of the surrounding properties are currently located in the R-2 Zoning District.

Dirkse addressed his rezoning request. He wants to build a one story house on the property. A home is already on one lot.

Kleinjans asked what the applicant's intent is for the third lot.

Dirkse said it was not a buildable lot. He just wants to rezone the three lots to R-3.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pfost opened the Public Hearing at 9:55 P.M.

There were no comments.

Pfost closed the Public Hearing at 9:56 P.M.

Nestel moved, supported by Ervine, to recommend to the Township Board adoption of the rezoning.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pfost opened Public Comment at 10:00 P.M.

There was no comment.

Pfost closed Public Comment at 10:00 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next meeting is June 13, 2018.

Ordinance amendments scheduled for the June meeting include: signs, subdivisions, corner lots, animals that are not pets in a residential zone, and the Airport overlay.

The members of the Planning Commission thanked VanderKolk for his seven years of dedicated service as a member of the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

VanderKolk moved, supported by Kleinjans, to adjourn the meeting at 10:03 P.M.

Roll Call Vote:

Nestel, aye; VanderKolk, aye; Kleinjans, aye; Ervine, aye; DeHaan, aye; Pfof, aye.

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Hemwall
Recording Secretary
May 12, 2018

APPROVED:

DRAFT