

**MINUTES  
PARK TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Park Township Hall  
52 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave.  
Holland, MI 49424

Regular Meeting  
August 8, 2017  
6:30P.M.

**DRAFT-APPROVED COPY**

**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: Jeff Pfost, Dennis Eade, Rosemary Ervine, David Kleinjans and Tom VanderKolk

Staff: Howard Fink, Manager, Dan Martin, Legal Counsel, Greg Ransford, Staff Planner

Absent with notice: Eric DeBoer, Denise Nestel and Ed deVries, Community Development Director

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Pfost noted James and Tami VanHarn suspended their application for a Special Use request for a Home Occupation at 2245 Auburn Ave. to discuss their options.

Motion by Ervine, supported by VanderKolk, to approve the agenda as amended

Voice Vote:

Ayes 5, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion by VanderKolk, supported by Ervine, to approve the minutes July 11, 2017:

Voice Vote:

Ayes 5, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **James & Tami VanHarn** – Special Use request – suspended by the applicant due to concerns the Special Use was tied to the property.

**B. Benjamin's Hope, 15468 Riley St. – PUD amendment to add a greenhouse to a craft building, eliminate two craft buildings and pool. The proposed staff residence is withdrawn. Request to consider this a minor amendment (postponed from July 11, 2017)**

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by Ervine, to relieve Commissioner VanderKolk of his duties on this item due to a conflict of interest.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 4, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

Pfost stated he and de Vries discussed clarity issues with regard to the Zoning Administrator role in approving minor amendments to a PUD. de Vries felt there were borderline issues where he was not comfortable making a determination on this issue. It is the duty of the Commission for this application to:

1. Make a finding if the requested application would be of a minor nature.
2. Either an approval or rejection of the project itself

Ransford updated the Commissioners on the changes in the PUD amendment from the previous month. They have abandoned the staff residence structure and kept the greenhouse in the application. They are proposing an exchange in building reduction for the addition of the greenhouse. The minor amendment language states any reduction of buildings or if a building is moved by no more than 10 feet, it is considered a minor amendment. Similar changes of a minor nature may be made if they are deemed to not be material or significant in relation to the entire site, and not have any adverse effects to nearby or adjacent land for the public health, safety and welfare. Applicant wants to add a 1,960 square foot greenhouse to the craft building and remove from the plan items that were never built or demolition of structures, 14,748 square feet. So the exchange overall is a reduction of buildings' size. He, along with de Vries is concerned with establishing precedent with regard to minor amendments.

Brent Dykstra, Architect for Benjamin's Hope, asked for approval of the greenhouse and for information about the possibility of coming back with plans for the supervisor residence if the greenhouse is approved.

Krista Mason, Executive Director of Benjamin's Hope, stated the reason for the greenhouse is to extend the horticulture programming through the winter months. The residence for the Supervisor is a safety issue for the Board of Directors. They are staffing 24/7 but not at a management level.

Pfost stated the residence is not on the agenda tonight. It is part of the discussion in the sense that Benjamin's Hope would like to keep the project open to build and would like to make sure it is still a viable building in relation to PUD if the greenhouse is built.

Ervine would like a good definition to what is a minor amendment.

Ransford explained the proposal to exchange building sizes for a reduction but the Planning Commission needs to determine if it qualifies as a minor change. He read the scenarios of minor changes.

Martin clarified “adding additional land” is the quote from the ordinance which was misquoted in the staff memo. He stated eliminating buildings may be a minor change, no adverse effect or public health safety and welfare. He is concerned that the Commission would be setting precedent with the application being considered a minor amendment.

The Commissioners were aware and cautious of the ramifications of the application being considered a minor amendment.

Dykstra stated he wanted to make sure the reduction in buildings preserves the footprint of the buildable square footage. They would like to work on both structures together for the benefit of time and money.

Martin stated if the Commission approves this application as a minor amendment and believes it would then need to reject an application for the Supervisor residence as an additional minor amendment, the township could request the supervisor home be built by the provisions described in the Code of Ordinances section 38-375 (1)f which relates to safety.

The Commission agreed a site supervisor should be on premise 24/7 for safety reasons. They briefly discussed postponing the request and asking the applicant to return with plans for a supervisor residence. They deliberated the qualifications of this option proposed by Martin for the current application to be considered a minor amendment.

Fink asked the applicant what are the costs they are concerned about in relation to applying for a PUD amendment. He stated it might be beneficial to meet with the applicant, review the items on file from the original PUD application and decide if some of the items for a PUD amendment are met. Applying for an amendment puts the Township and Benjamin’s Hope in a better situation going forward.

Dykstra stated cost and time were an issue. He explained the items in detail including depicting neighboring properties and characteristics of the open space. Estimated costs for getting the items needed to apply for a PUD amendment would be in the area of \$10,000-\$20,000. He explained they would lose the current construction season with the time frame needed to get an amendment approved.

Fink asked about the greenhouse structure itself.

Dykstra stated it is a galvanized structure with panels and incorporated into the craft building. It has a concrete floor with footings.

Kleinjans stated he would like to approve, since the changes are not a big change in relation to the site. He is concerned about how approving the application as a minor amendment meets the section in the ordinance which cites, no more than 10 feet and changes in floor plan.

Ervine feels similar to Kleinjans. She is concerned about setting precedent. She would like to see them sit down and work through the items needed for an amendment.

Fink asked if the applicant would be willing to postpone the application and sit down with the Township.

Mason stated she would be on board and take the time to work through the process and open up options for the site. She is concerned with the loss of the construction season and possibly postpone the process for up to a year.

Pfost stated the role of the zoning administrator in this process is difficult and commended Benjamin's Hope for working with the Township through the process.

Dykstra stated they are okay with postponing but would like parameters for the process.

Pfost and Fink assured Dykstra the meeting with staff should give those parameters and give clarity to the applicant. The meeting hopefully could result in a solid recommendation to the planning commission from staff to accept the application. The entire project could benefit from the process.

Martin stated the new PUD ordinance would be stretched very thin if this application was approved as a minor amendment.

Pfost stated they will suspend action on this item. Ransford will coordinate the staff meeting.

The Commission members are not opposed to calling a special meeting in the next week or two for the purpose of revisiting an application from Benjamin's Hope regarding this issue.

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by Ervine, to suspend this item until the parties can get together to discuss their options.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 4, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

Van Der Kolk returned.

#### C. Timberline North – Final Plat Review

Ransford stated the final plat matches the preliminary plat. The Health Department confirmed the site is connected to water and sewer. Everything for the final plat approval seems to be in order

Jack Barr of Nederveld stated construction is well underway. With approval tonight the plat will be recorded by Ottawa County by the middle of November and final recording by the State of Michigan by August 2018. Lots cannot be sold until the plat is recorded by the state.

Commissioners had no questions regarding this item.

Motion by Eade, supported by Ervine to: approve the final plat and send to the Board of Trustees for approval as a recommendation from the Planning Commission

Voice Vote:

Ayes 5, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

**D.** Report on 2<sup>nd</sup> minor Amendment to The Villas of Lake Macatawa PUD

Ransford stated de Vries asked him to inform the Planning Commission the amendment was a reduction and approved as a minor change pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance.

5. Public Comment

Joel Welch 679 Bosma – he is under the understanding that Dune Dogs will be coming back with a change to their building. He wanted to address it as he will not be able to attend the meeting. He would like the Commission to review a better procedure for this area. Welch informed the Commission that de Vries stated there is no hearing needed for the site plan. He is concerned where this ends. If alteration to the structure is not open to debate he is concerned with that process. He would like the Planning Commission to send a message that enough is enough.

6. Announcements

Status of NHP Overlay for Macatawa Area

August 22 will be the community meeting for the NHP area in Macatawa Park. The team will be putting together that process with Mr. Denefeld. The stakeholder interviews are done and coming to the end of the first phase. Phase two is taking data and putting together solutions. The general sense is that this is a positive thing and putting together some good solutions. The other overlay areas will benefit from the process we have implemented with this area. The cost for the other areas will be significantly less. They will not happen until next year when residents are in the area.

The next regular meeting will be on September 12 at 6:30 P.M. at the Park Township Office.

Vanderkolk and Eade stated they will not be able to attend the meeting on September 12.

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by Ervine to: adjourn at 7:37 P.M.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 5, Nays 0. Motion Carried.

Approved: September 12, 2014

Formatted: Font: 9 pt