

ALLENDALE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 4, 2009

Members Present: TerHorst, Knoper, Smit, Rozema, Obetts

Members Absent: Guzicki

Staff Present: Brummel

1. Meeting called to order at 7:31PM.
2. Distribute the January 19, 2009 minutes.
3. Public Hearings: (scheduled for February 16, 2009) None
4. Site Plan review: (scheduled for February 16, 2009) None
5. New Business:

- A. Arna Larson & Bill Chapel from Driesenga & Associates are here to discuss storm water detention options, cost related and maintenance.

Arna Larson from Driesenga states that they would like to share some ideas for storm water detention, not necessarily steer in one way or the other. He is primarily in land development and with storm sewer you can get more creative with what you do. He goes over the items in the packet handed out to the Planning Commission. There are ways to do things with the disturbed areas by using what is already in place. There is an issue with high ground water in Allendale, and there is a 3ft minimum to the bottom of the retention water basin in Ottawa County. There are also areas in Allendale with poor draining soils. In design the owner is always included, and you have to keep the maintenance in mind also. With Open air retention basin systems, everything is pretty much the same as with the open air detention basin system, except that you have to incompact the bottom of the basin regularly- keeping with the maintenance plan set up by them.

With underground storage systems, when some of the maintenance issues are not taken care of the parking lot could flood or even need to be taken out and re-done. The barrier of the fabric is on the stone bed to keep the debris out of the underground storage system. There are many products out there that have ways to clean the sediment out when it does pile up. With the porous pavement, there is a polymer that was placed into it to keep the black color intact. When the rolling the porous pavement, you can do multiple rolls because it interlocks, and you don't lose the porous appeal.

Usually you want 30in of stone beneath the top- which can cost quite a bit, but you don't have to have another area to retain the water. There are some people using it in the area right now, but it is more expensive than regular asphalt. It is produced in the same place as the regular asphalt so the whole thing needs to be cleaned out to produce the porous asphalt. The normal cost is \$9/yard and the porous asphalt is \$14-\$15/yard.

William Chappel states that there are places in Lansing where porous pavement is being used. There are restrictions in place as to how many people are allowed to do it because they want to make sure it is done right, there are regulations in place to make sure that happens.

Larson states that porous pavement does not ice up as much as normal pavement because the moisture gets drawn right down. That way the Road Commission doesn't have to plow or salt as often. The road should be swept with a street sweeper twice a year. There is a life cycle of 15 years with porous pavement- about the same as traditional pavement. There will probably be more in the way of Maintenance agreements and storm water permits in the future.

Knoper wonders if the porous pavement goes bad, can it be re-surfaced?

Larson states that if the stone beneath the pavement hasn't gone bad, you can just put a 2in layer on top of the pavement, or take the bad pavement off and re-surface it. You just can't seal the surface, or the water wouldn't be able to get through.

Brummel wonders if there is a problem with retention basins becoming converted to wetlands.

Larson states that you can go through the DEQ and get a form that says that the area is working retention, not a wetland- that has worked before for some people.

Chappel states that if the basin has not been taken care of or depending on soils, the detention basin can become a wetland. There have been some changes in determination It used to be 25, and it is 100 now- with a detention basin with a smaller formula. It used to be .25CFS/acre it is now .3CFS/acre. They are also using different rainfall charts than before. They are bigger, and the water stands there longer.

Brummel asks that if the Drain office has a 3ft minimum in dry retention why not the same concerns with wet retention?

Brummel states so it's not a water quality issue, it's for design concerns.

Chappel states that the main reason the 3ft minimum is in place, is because it is so hard to measure the ground water height exactly. When you're

estimating the height of the water, it can vary significantly from year to year. If you go in and inspect your soil on the low cycle, and then the high year comes, you lose all your storm water retention. Any open area with standing water, is a potential issue with drowning. That is why a lot of places don't like standing water. If you do, we want that first 3ft of slope to be very gradual, so it is easy to get in and out of it.

Brummel wonders if the Planning Commission should include standards for storm water management if the drain office is going to require Maintenance Agreements.

Larson states that he has not seen it all that much, but it is coming in time.

B. Discuss proposed language related to Group Housing.

Brummel states that in this language, we are only dealing with R-3 and R-4 zoned property, which states that you may only have 3 people per unit. The proposal, if approved, uses a maximum number of people for the whole housing development.

Knoper states that you are allowed to put this many units on this many acres, but you can never exceed the number of people for the whole housing development.

Brummel states that the wording is cleaned up and it gives the developer the option to build more than just 3 people units. The commission requests Brummel to schedule the public hearing.

C. Rick Rediske resignation letter.

Obetts states that the resignation letter is in the packet handed out to the Commissioners.

D. Old Business:

a. 2006 Water Study Findings of Fact.

Brummel shares his Findings of Fact report of the 2006 Water Well Study.

Knoper states that Brummel should keep looking into the issue, so the Planning Commission members can look at all the information and give ideas as to what they should do.

Obetts states that we should review the information and put it on the next meeting's agenda.

E. Public concerns and comments concerning items not on the agenda.

F. Meeting adjourned at 9:04.

The next meeting is on Monday, February 16, 2009 at 7:30 PM.