

ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
November 2, 2011

Staff Present: Tim Johnson, MainStreet Planning

1. Meeting called to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll call.

Smit, Underhill, Schut, and Sinnott

Absent.

Rozema, Zickus, and Knoper

3. For information:

A. Master Plan info that Johnson downloaded.

4. Approve the agenda.

Motion by Smit to approve the November 2, 2011 agenda with switching #9 A and B by having B as the first item.

Supported by Schut. Motion approved.

5. Receive public comments. None.

6. Public Hearings:

7. Site Plan review: None

8. Old Business:

B. Master Plan Update.

Dave Vollink, 10085 56th Avenue, asked the commission if the survey was approved by them. Vollink has some concerns on one specific question on the survey. He feels that the question is very misleading and is very confused about it, which is why he is at the meeting tonight. Vollink feels the survey was very unfairly written and unfair to the people in the area in which he lives, which is 56th Avenue. His concern is question #10. Item C. (see attached). Vollink wants to know why that particular option is on the survey. Vollink spoke to Johnson on

the phone about the survey and appreciated the time Johnson spent talking to him on the subject. Vollink would like to ask the commission a few questions.

1. Student Housing, not to be located west of 56th Avenue. Is this seriously an option? Because we know if the line is moved, which it is currently at 52nd Avenue, the “gray area” goes to 56th Avenue. If the line gets moved to 56th Avenue the “gray area” goes to 60th Avenue etc., we know that from history.
2. Why specify the 56th Avenue option when there are several options that serve the same purpose. The line could go south or north. Vollink stated that the line could go all the way to 96th Avenue. Why are you centering on 56th Avenue as an option.
3. Why was 56th Avenue an option, why was it brought up when there is a lot of land still available to the east of 52nd Avenue? That area is in the Master Plan for multifamily housing already. Vollink just feels like the 56th Avenue corridor is being very isolated as the option for expansion of multifamily housing. Vollink feels the question should have been remove all boundaries of the University Village and open the Township up to Multi Housing with certain restrictions, like what was done at Allward Terrace. Opening up the whole Township and you would get an honest response because it goes back to “not in my back yard”. Right now the issue of 52nd Avenue to 56th Avenue to someone who lives on the other side of the township, it probably doesn’t mean much because it does not directly affect them.

Vollink believes that someone had the vision enough to realize that student housing has to be contained and that is why the 52nd Avenue line is in the Master Plan now. That’s also why there are rental restrictions in the township. Someone had the vision to see the township was going to suffer if something was not put in place to deal with these items. Vollink lives on 56th Avenue and he does not feel like a second class citizen because he lives there but yet feels like it when you get something like this that specifies the area in which he lives. He has the same values as the commission as far as family, home and what he likes doing at night and he likes his acreage. Vollink just feels like he’s being thrown under the bus again with the specific question on this survey. It doesn’t generalize. Vollink is asking that in the final tally of information that the question be taken out and not taken into consideration because it is not fair to the residents in that area.

Underhill stated that there was no specific intent or to single anyone out, or to move the line of University Housing in the Master Plan. The only reason that he can see that it ended up on the survey is because of the difficulty and controversy of the recent projects that have been place in the “gray area”. One of the goals is to create and possibly put a hard line in the Master Plan to do with multifamily housing. Johnson stated that the area was chosen only because it has been the gradual way that GVSU is growing, and just to get feedback for a future land use map.

Vollink stated that you have to keep up on things and be involved. Vollink asked what can be done to get a permanent line for multifamily housing. Underhill stated to get more people to do what you are doing tonight and fill out the survey.

Underhill stated that this commission may think differently than the past planning commission and the planning commission 5 years from now might think differently than now. There is no guarantee that things won't change. But the commission is hoping that through the survey they hope to be able to determine some type of line for multifamily housing. Vollink stated that that is why he was surprised to see the question of housing again after going through it already.

Sinnott stated that if that "line" had existed Allsward Terrace would not be there but the "line" did not exist. Sinnott feels that the purpose for the question was to get support to create a line for multifamily housing.

Smit stated that anytime things are presented to the commission, it is a concern as to where projects are placed. Smit agrees that the intent of the question is to find out what residents think.

Underhill stated that the commission does care about the people in Vollinks neighborhood and they do not want to repeat the previous conflicts. The commissioners encouraged Vollink to attend the public hearing and that he encourage his neighbors to be involved also.

The Commission then had some discussion on how public comment should be taken and whether it should be responded to or just taken for information at that time. After some deliberation the chairperson will ask the commission how they want to proceed on a case by case situation.

A. Continue review of portable sign regulations.

Johnson went over his report (see attached). Discussion took place on garage sale signs and it was decided to leave those as they were. Temporary sign discussion took place on the duration the temporary sign was allowed, the type allowed, the materials allowed and the size of the signs and whether signs should be required to have a contact name and number on them. It was determined that all temporary signs need permits, that they be allowed 15 days per month but no more than 15 days in a row. One temporary sign per parcel or per business, no more that 1 every 50 feet apart. The types of signs determined were, temporary portable signs with florescent and neon letters etc. would not be allowed. Feather and/or flutter signs would be allowed. Banners and streamers, the commission would like more information on these type of signs. Large inflatable signs would only be allowed with a special permission permit. Wire frame signs would be allowed. The size for each type of sign would be 24 sq. ft. The max height for signs would be 10 ft. Wire frame signs would be 4 sq. ft. Special event signs would need a permit for each event. Only 2 events per year and only 15 days for each event. The

commission felt this was a place to start and further discussion will take place at future meetings.

9. New Business:
11. Township Board Report. (Ken) None.
12. Commissioner Comments.
13. Public Comment.
14. Meeting adjourned.