

**MINUTES  
PARK TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Park Township Hall  
52 152<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Holland, MI 49418

Special Meeting  
February 13, 2018  
6:30 P.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, Terry DeHaan, Dennis Eade, Rosemary Ervine, David Kleinjans, Denise Nestel, Tom VanderKolk

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

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

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

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Kleinjans, supported by VanderKolk, to approve the January 9, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes as presented.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Ransford provided a brief overview of the 14 ordinance amendments for submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

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

No comment

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Ordinance Amendments**

Ransford explained many of the changes are based on Planning Commission discussions and subsequent recommendations in addition to overdue revisions of outdated and/or unnecessary language.

**1. Special Use Authorization Sec. 38-36**

Nestel asked if the Planning Commission should make a finding of fact on each of the 6 items in section (d).

Martin confirmed that should be done

Nestel asked about standards vs. requirements.

Martin said there is leeway, but you will want to have satisfaction of these 6 standards, using discretion whether to deny or approve. If you have the majority of the Planning Commission finding is that the standards aren't met then it is denied. You could vote on each or have consensus on each. The motion will approve or deny based on findings of all standards. It makes sense to have discussion on each standard.

DeHaan asked if there is a process to weigh a particular standard if it is found non-compliant and it means denial for a project to move forward.

Martin said the Planning Commission can impose conditions if one standard isn't completely met, but you can mitigate the adverse effect on adjoining properties for approval. A standard can't be waived for consideration but the Planning Commission can indicate the standard isn't met. In this case, therefore, a condition can be imposed mitigating an adverse effect. The Zoning Enabling Act gives you the authority to approve with a condition, or deny.

Nestel moved, supported by Ervine, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

## **2. Special Use Authorization Sec. 38-66**

This amendment reflects the change for the reference from the Zoning Administrator to the Planning Commission for authorization.

VanderKolk moved, and Kleinjans supported, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

## **3. Site Plan Standards Sec. 38-103**

Ransford said the additions are for site plan standards in the ordinance language.

Nestel asked Ransford if the Planning Commission is responsible for this list in its review.

Ransford said the Planning Commission does not review all of these. Staff does this for the convenience of its review prior to consideration.

Pfost said he would prefer that staff indicate to the Planning Commission what is important for consideration when an item gets to us. Staff should have responsibility to report the findings to us.

Ervine observed that it would be a waste of time for the Planning Commission to do this. It is staff's responsibility to do it for us. We then review the findings and vote to approve or deny.

Nestel asked if the Planning Commission is the gatekeeper. Ransford concurred.

Nestel asked if a vote is necessary for each of the 19 standards.

Martin said it isn't necessary, however, each one should be considered. If there is a denial the Planning Commission should be prepared to explain its findings on what does not meet the standard and why.

Ervine, moved, supported by Eade, to approve.

Kleinjans asked if the term “avoidance of building corners” in #13 could be clearer or could be deleted.

Ransford said this relates to site lines for safety considerations.

Nestel asked about access for emergency vehicles in #14. Will someone have looked at this beforehand? Ransford concurred.

Nestel asked about phases of development in #18.

Martin said progress can be made regarding utilities, etc. as a developer moves forward with the construction of phases. There are other aspects that are built in such as the state of the economy that can affect moving forward with development. Some levels of control can be placed in phased development, e.g. in Sec. 38-107, Expiration of approval.

Pfost said it's in the sequence of phasing.

Kleinjans asked about lighting in #17. He suggested the same language should be applied here as elsewhere for the sake of consistency. Ransford said it could be done and he will add “shielding” as referenced elsewhere.

Ervine moved, supported by Eade, to amend the motion to include the recommended language changes in items #13 and #17.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

#### **4. Site Plan Expiration of Approval Sec. 38-107 (new)**

Ransford said the language change allows for expiration and extension dates.

Nestel asked if a builder starts and doesn't finish a project how do we handle this.

Ransford said this ordinance is not about a building permit.

de Vries said there is an option to extend the permit.

Pfost clarified that the site plan expiration is separate.

Martin said the Township enforces the State Building Code and de Vries monitors this.

DeHaan moved, supported by Ervine, to approve.

Voice Vote:

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

**5. Site Plan Amendments Sec. 38-108 (new)**

Ransford reviewed this new ordinance.

Pfost said this ordinance is important because it gives the Zoning Administrator authorization to express concern when something goes awry.

VanderKolk moved, supported by Kleinjans, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**Sec. 38-109 through Sec. 38-125 (reserved)**

DeHaan moved, supported by Eade, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**6. Use Regulations Ag zone Sec. 38-214 (7)**

DeHaan moved, supported by Nestel, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**7. Area Regulations R-3 Sec. 38-276 (3), R-4 Sec. 38-306 (3), R-5 Sec. 38-336 (3)**

de Vries explained there are different standards for the flood plain. He provided some background information on the rear setback problem related to the sea wall and elevation requirements.

Kleinjans asked for clarification on several points which were answered by de Vries.

Kleinjans moved, supported by Ervine to approve these changes for all three areas: R-3, R-4 and R-5.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays, 0. Motion carried

**8. Use Regulations C-1 Sec. 38-423**

Ransford explained the problem that arose regarding residential space in C-1 commercial building. This is addressed with the ordinance change.

Eade asked if the Township plans to be aware of any resident using space above these properties as living space.

de Vries said the proper procedures will be followed to monitor this concern.

Kleinjans moved, supported by VanderKolk, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried

### **9. Building Setback Exceptions Sec. 38-483 (e)**

de Vries explained the language that was added regarding allowable exceptions from setback requirements.

Nestel asked about Zoning Board of Appeals approval in (2).

De Vries said the standards are considered by the Board of Appeals.

Kleinjans suggested removing “lines” following the term “setback” in (2). He asked about removing “or both” in c).

Martin concurred the wording should be to remove “or both” and replace “or” with “and” in c).

Kleinjans moved, supported by Ervine, to approve as amended.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Pfost suggested a break for five minutes.

The Planning Commission reconvened at 8:10 P.M.

### **10. Transition Zoning Section 38-483 (h)**

Ransford noted one change from Zoning Administrator to Planning Commission.

VanderKolk moved, supported by Eade, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**11. Use Regulations C-2 Sec. 38-452**

Ransford noted this language is designed for multi-family dwellings (16).

Kleinjans moved, supported by Ervine, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**12. Moving of Building Sec. 38-500**

Nestel moved, supported by Eade, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0.

**13. Home Occupation Sec. 38-506 (3)**

Nestel moved, supported by VanderKolk, to approve.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

**14. Single Family Dwellings Sec. 38-507**

de Vries said the terminology has changed from the older mobile home ordinance. The appropriate terms are now “manufactured dwelling” and “Manufactured Housing Commission.”

Some older language also needed to be deleted.

Eade moved, supported by Ervine, to approve as presented.

Voice Vote:

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Pfost thanked the staff for their preparation in helping this process go smoothly.

Martin suggested page numbers be included for the ordinances.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Pfost opened Public Comment at 8:37 P.M.

No comment.

Pfost closed Public Comment at 8:37 P.M.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The next meeting date is February 14, 2018.

Upcoming ordinance amendments to be discussed include signs, subdivisions, corner lots, lot width and airport overlay.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Nestel moved, supported by VanderKolk, to adjourn the Special Meeting at 8:45 P.M.

### **Voice Vote:**

Ayes 7, Nays 0. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith R. Hemwall  
Recording Secretary  
February 15, 2018

| Approved: March 14, 2018