

**MINUTES
PARK TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Park Township Hall
52 152nd Street
Holland, MI 49418

Regular Meeting
March 14, 2018
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, Dennis Eade, Rosemary Ervine, David Kleinjans, Denise Nestel, Tom VanderKolk

Absent: Terry DeHaan (excused)

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

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

Voice Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Kleinjans noted two corrections on pages 2 and 3.

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by Ervine, to approve the Special Meeting Minutes of February 13, 2018 as amended.

Ervine noted a change in wording on page 3. Kleinjans cited three changes on pages 8 and 11.

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by VanderKolk, to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of February 14, 2018 as amended.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. Special Use Request for a Home Occupation – Lindsay Hekman

Ransford provided background for this request. It is a Special Use application from Lindsay Hekman to operate an eyelash extension home occupation from her future single-family dwelling located at 255 Lakeshore Drive, parcel number 70-15-21-263-004, which is located within the R-3 Low Density One Family Residence District. We have reviewed the application and found it complete. We do not have any Park Township Zoning Ordinance (PTZO) deficiencies to note. As a result, staff believes approval is appropriate.

Application and Ordinance Provisions

Proposed Use

The applicant proposes to conduct the home occupation entirely within the single-family dwelling serving no more than one (1) client at a time within a space of approximately 288 square feet. As noted in the attached materials, the applicant intends to operate from 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and will not have any employees. He added that sufficient parking is available.

Randy Bouwkamp represented the applicant. He plans to build the home where this home occupation will be located in Lakeshore Crossing. The applicant's home will be the fifth and last home to be built in this community.

Pfost asked the Planning Commission to keep in mind this is a special use application.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pfost opened the Public Hearing at 6:40 P.M.

There was no comment.

Pfost closed the Public Hearing at 6:41 P.M.

Kleinjans asked Martin for clarification on the phrase "whether customers conduct business on the premises."

Martin said the intent of this wording is bringing customers to the site for the business to be provided.

Nestel asked Martin if this special use goes with the land.

Martin said it goes with the land but it is subject to conditions imposed by the Planning Commission. This use is appropriate in this area with these conditions.

Pfost asked if the Planning Commission can impose conditions on this special use application.

Martin said the Planning Commission has some discretion. It could be stated as a condition that this specific use is only for cosmetology purposes.

Nestel asked about this service changing to a nail salon, for example.

Martin said the standards are designed to guide the Planning Commission's decision and conditions can be imposed on a special use request.

Ervine asked about parking availability on the property.

Bouwkamp said two parking spaces are required and two will be added.

Pfost asked how additional customers would be handled, as in a wedding party.

Applicant, Lindsay Hekman, explained the service is by appointment only so there should be only one customer at a time. She will be the only person providing this service and most appointments require an hour. She added that she is required to have a specific license so anyone else owning this business at this location would have to be licensed as well.

Martin advised there are levels of regulation - both local and state. If the Planning Commission does not limit the home occupation service to eyelash extension, someone else could come in and add cosmetology services.

Nestel asked Hekman if she intended to expand her service offering. Hekman said she did not.

Ervine asked the applicant if this special use is granted would she be the only one providing this service at this location.

Hekman said yes.

Ervine asked if the applicant had to add another person what would be the requirement by the Township.

de Vries said the applicant would have to return to the Township to request approval.

Pfost reviewed the standards.

Section 38-103 Standards:

(1) The adequacy of streets, alleys, parking areas, loading zones, sidewalks, drainage, water and sewer lines, and traffic control for the proposed use, building, or structure; and

Given the findings within the Section 38-506 standards, all of the aforementioned are adequately provided for the proposed use.

(2) The adequacy of protection afforded lands and the surrounding neighborhood from adverse impact.

This is acceptable.

38-506 Standards:

a. The nature of the home occupation, including whether it is of a type that has traditionally and historically been carried on as a home occupation;

This standard has been met with the condition that the service be for eyelash extension only.

b. The nature of the surrounding neighborhood;

This standard has been met.

c. The effect of the home occupation on the surrounding neighborhood;

This standard has been met.

d. The environmental effects of the home occupation;

This standard has been met with the condition that the owner of the business maintain all necessary and appropriate licenses.

e. Whether customers conduct business on the premises;

This standard has been met.

f. Potential traffic congestion as a result of the home occupation; and

This standard has been met with the condition there should be one single patron at a time. Any appointment overlap should be limited to 15 minutes.

g. Provision for parking for traffic or clientele that may result from the operation of the home occupation (for those home occupations where customers or clientele are permitted on the premises).

This standard has been met.

Kleinjans moved, supported by Ervine, to approve the special use of the home occupation for the purpose of eyelash extensions, with conditions that; one (1) customer may be served at a time with a maximum overlap of 15 minutes between customers; maintain proper State licensing; and construct the dwelling as presented.

Ervine asked about the size of the lot.

Bouwkamp said the lot is one of the largest in the area.

Kleinjans asked if consideration of the special use should include landscaping.

VanderKolk did not think this was necessary in this case.

Pfost asked if we need screening conditions when this service is not high impact.

Roll Call Vote:

Kleinjans, aye; Ervine, aye; Pfost, aye; Nestel, aye; VanderKolk, aye; Eade, aye.

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion for special use carried.

B. Preliminary PUD Beachwalk Cottages – Doug De Haan

Ransford introduced the request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application from Douglas DeHaan of DeHaan Homes to seek preliminary plan approval for 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).

The application has been reviewed and found generally complete. We believe approval of the preliminary plan is appropriate with specific direction to the applicant to address and fulfill the considerations section at the end of the Staff Memorandum.

Findings and Relevant Ordinance Provisions

Proposed Use & Density Calculation

Section 38-452(16) of the PTZO allows for multifamily dwellings as a use-by-right. Said section is structurally broken but was recently recommended to the Park Township Board of Trustees to be corrected with a proposed text amendment. Regardless of the recommendation, given that the current language seems to suggest that the proposed shall comply with Division 7 of the PTZO, the applicant formulated their site plan based on Division 7 requirements.

Consequently, pursuant to Section 38-336 – Area Regulations of Division 7 of the PTZO, the

applicant provided density calculations within the General Notes on Sheet 2 of 4 of the site plan based on said section. As you will note, the applicant provided densities for multi-family dwellings, two-family dwellings and single-family dwellings. As you will further note, even at an equation of the least amount of density according to Section 38-336, no bonus density provisions within the PUD Division need to be utilized for the proposed

The applicant has provided 18% dedicated open space extending to Ottawa Beach Road. This area does not include perimeter landscaping.

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 has provided a draft document that is preliminarily satisfactory.

Requirements for Parking Areas of the Township ordinance requires any off-street public or private parking area for 10 or more vehicles to be screened in certain instances. While no one parking area in the proposed project contains 10 or more spaces, the project collectively meets this threshold and the western parking areas should be screened accordingly

Ransford concluded the applicant is compliant with the PUD ordinance requirement.

Pfost reminded the Planning Commission that the immediate purpose is just to review the proposal. Approval will occur at a later date when a public hearing will be held. Once the Planning Commission makes a recommendation for approval or denial it will be forwarded to the Township Board for review.

The applicant, Doug DeHaan of DeHaan Homes, introduced the project. He provided some history. He is a local builder and developed a plan and design that take into consideration other area developments. The former owner had it for 63 years. It is a C-2 district. The strategy was for a zero step design because of the high water table. There is a perimeter road which makes it an inclusive development. 1 ½ acres in the center of the development will be a natural park. The perimeter will also be a natural area. The landscape plan is not specific yet but he wants to retain most of the natural landscape. Purchase of the property was in December 2017 and spring growth will help with the identification of plants that are there so they can determine what should be kept and what should be removed.

The development is bordered by two condominium projects, a trailer park, and a long fence. The current vision is to create a medium to higher end condo development with 16 single units + four duplex units with two stall garages. Each unit will have 2200 square feet of finished living space and will be offered at \$400,000 to \$500,000. There will be a pool house with a fitness area. A pavilion will also be built by the bike path, with possible use as a trolley stop. The perimeter road will have one-way traffic and the drive will be 20' wide. The second option was to have duplexes but single buildings will have higher value and attract ownership.

He has talked with neighbors about the present bike path and improvement of it. He is interested in comments from the Planning Commission toward development of a final package.

Pfost thanked the applicant for working with Township staff on the preliminary plan.

Don DeGroot of Exxel Engineering presented the technical side of the plan. He has analyzed the site with an engineering focus in regard to utilities and grades. In the preliminary stage, he has ensured that water main and sanitary sewers are available. There is a 12" stub at the

northern end they can connect to. There is also a water main north of Lake Drive and a stub for the sewer which would be extended along the perimeter road. Hydrants will be located along the perimeter road. For storm water management best practices will be the standard. The soil conditions are excellent. There is a higher water table present on the property. He has been in communication with the Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner's office to construct a reverse under drain. Storm water catch basins will be a leaching basin and plans will be appropriate for the area to allow for minimal discharge to Lake Macatawa. There is a considerable drop from the northwest corner to Ottawa Beach Road which they will plan for with the appropriate storm sewer and drainage.

The loop road will provide good access and they will work with the Ottawa County Road Commission regarding the road.

Pfost advised the Planning Commission to look at this plan with the Master Plan in mind, especially with the preservation of the landscape on the perimeter.

Nestel asked if this plan falls within the Master Plan low density ratio.

Ransford said it does.

Nestel asked for the location of the dedicated open space.

Ransford said the area of 18% dedicated open space extends out to Ottawa Beach Road.

Nestel asked if people who are not residents of this development can access the open space in the development.

Ransford said it is not set up for the public to access the development facilities. The pavilion by the bus stop and the bike path are open to the public.

Kleinjans noted there is a perimeter drive for the public for biking and walking. The internal drive is for residents of the development.

DeHaan said people can walk the path but it is not a public park. The Condo Association will maintain the pool, building and paths. The pavilion in front of the development where the bus stop will be located will be maintained by the Association. The perimeter road is not a private drive.

Nestel asked about accessory uses.

Martin referred to the accessory uses. He noted if there is open space with a pool this wouldn't be open to the public. We should not expect the dedicated open space will be part of a public park.

Pfost explained density bonus is not applicable in this plan.

Nestel asked when the developer calculated 18% dedicated open space what was included.

DeGroot said all within the red line on the preliminary plan map includes the 18% dedicated open space. They chose a 25' setback from the buildings. He looked at the Township's open

space requirements and the bike path satisfies those requirements. This allows interaction for the residents and the public.

Pfost said the Planning Commission will have a contingency upon approval of the County Water Resources Commissioner.

Pfost has concerns for safety and the bike path as well as the deceleration lane.

DeGroot says the Road Commission requires a deceleration lane. He will work with the Road Commission and relocate the bike path.

Ransford reviewed what the plan calls for along the parkway and the bike path.

Kleinjans asked if there will be signage in front of the development. His concern is bike path safety.

DeHaan said the signage is behind the bike path.

VanderKolk said the applicant should be aware the Planning Commission will look at screening.

DeHaan said they have a plan for plantings. The intent is to screen it along the parkway areas. All lighting will have hoods.

DeHaan presented a more detailed but conceptual plan for landscaping. He will provide a proposed landscape plan with appropriate detail after clearing the lot of scrub, deceased trees, and the like for final plan submission.

Ervine said her concern was about Ottawa Beach Road and traffic since safety is an important consideration.

Nestel asked Martin if the plan is compliant.

Martin said the use is compliant.

Ransford clarified that 15% is the requirement for open space.

Martin asked what the land will be zoned. He uses R-3, Ransford uses R-4 and R-5. While this is commercial, the density will be determined by the current zoning district not the Master Plan. The current zoning is commercial. This is a conversation going forward – do we need to have the PUD approval and rezoning go hand in hand when we get to the approval point?

de Vries said the C-2 zoning allows for multi-family residential. We can use R-5 for the density calculation.

Martin said the land isn't zoned R-5 so what is the open space requirement? This is a commercial PUD used for multi-family purposes which is typically R-5.

Ransford asked if the perimeter were included for open space what the percentage would be.

DeGroot said it would go up approximately 2%.

DeGroot observed it is appropriate to use the R-5 standard.

Kleinjans pointed out Martin said this is private land so the uses don't have to be public.

All concurred it is an approvable project.

The Planning Commission was in consensus this preliminary PUD plan is an approvable project.

C. NHP Overlay Process

Howard Fink reviewed the Macatawa Park Planning Process report. The report represents the culmination of a process that lasted from eight months to one year. The intent was what would the planning process look like for Macatawa Park as part of the Master Plan package and its commitment to look at all six of the NHP areas in greater detail. It's been a challenging issue. The Planning Commission determined that Macatawa Park be the first to analyze for this process. A mediator was hired to help with the planning process. This was presented to the residents of Macatawa Park three months ago for their input. He reminded the Planning Commission this remains a work in progress.

He outlined all the key points from the historical perspective to the important objectives. As part of the process it was important to use professional facilitators, keep the process participatory, and rebuild trust with the public.

Copies of the report were shared with members of the Planning Commission for their reference.

Eade asked if this study changed any perspectives. Fink said he thought it did.

Pfost said the transparency is critical. Our charter is to consider the nonconformities. Going forward, those elements requiring public participation will require feedback in the future. We need a path forward since we have a commitment to the Master Plan to insert language that is specific for all six of the NHP areas.

VanderKolk said it looks like a reasonable alternative; it finds some middle ground, has merit and warrants implementation.

Nestel said the committee did the best it could.

Eade observed the report establishes a framework and guide moving forward. It's a good road map.

Kleinjans noted that it looks reasonable so we can come up with ordinances.

Pfost suggested a future work session to consider the report's findings.

Ervine confirmed that the Township needs to be more proactive.

Pfost asked the Planning Commission how they want to move forward.

Kleinjans asked how we can identify "sticking points."

VanderKolk suggested putting the Macatawa Park issue to rest then tackle the other NHP areas.

Eade was pleased with the presentation. He observed that Eagle Crest should perhaps be the next NHP to look at because of similar issues to Macatawa Park.

Fink said the Township Board wants the Planning Commission to propose language for the Township Board to consider. How do you want to proceed? The staff will move forward to look at other NHP areas.

Ervin suggested a prioritization of the NHP areas and generate a “to do” list.

Pfost suggested the Ottawa Beach Road area be the next NHP area to study.

VanderKolk reiterated that we should deal with Macatawa Park, be done with it, then move on.

Kleinjans wanted to see the big picture before proceeding with a decision on Macatawa Park.

Pfost asked if the Planning Commission should define some common denominators.

Ervin suggested we need to look at the larger process.

Fink suggested in the next two months, after the snow birds return, the staff provide a presentation on all the NHP areas. Staff can review the unique attributes of each area. This will help the Planning Commission see the totality of all the NHP neighborhoods then we will map out a game plan.

Pfost said there is proposed Master Plan language in the Macatawa Park packet and we can discuss this at the next meeting. This would be the language template the Planning Commission can work from.

de Vries said we can begin the discussion before the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pfost opened Public Comment at 9:33 P.M.

There was no comment.

Pfost closed Public Comment at 9:33 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nestel said the Township Board wants the sign ordinance completed.

de Vries reviewed the ordinance changes that need attention by the Planning Commission.

Pfost asked staff to determine a prioritized list of these changes.

The next meeting is April 18, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

Nestel moved, supported by VanderKolk, to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 P.M.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 6, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Hemwall
Recording Secretary
March 17, 2018

APPROVED:

DRAFT