

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***January 04, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via GoToMeeting Software***

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call

Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore

Staff Present: Lindsey Mohr, Kevin Yeoman

3. Received for Information: Email from Brian Sikema regarding the Metro Health project

4. Motion by Schut to approve the December 21, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the January 4, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**

6. Public comments for *non-public hearing items*:

*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed the public comment section for non-public hearing items due to no comments.*

7. Public Hearings:

A. Metro Health – 4830 Becker Drive

Planner Mohr introduced the Metro Health public hearing pursuant to the direction provided by the Planning Commission at the project's December 7, 2020 site plan review, citing that the applicant followed that direction. Ms. Mohr further advised the commissioners discuss two items of concern: 1) the ambiguous information on duration and frequency of the mammogram trailer and 2) compliance of proposed sidewalks.

Following Ms. Mohr's introduction, Steve Witte, representing the developer, reiterated on the project's description before detailing site plan changes and requests for five items of note, which the Planning Commission proceeded to discuss after the public comment section. Additionally, he confirmed for Mr. Longcore the location of the fire hydrant and the approval received from the Fire Department and Township Engineer.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public hearing comment section:*

Brian Sikema, the developer, elaborated on the reasoning behind the sidewalk deferment request previously mentioned by Mr. Witte.

Bret Butler, the Metro Health Director of Facilities, explained the intent behind the mammogram trailer: a temporary, mobile fixture designed to flexibly meet demands as part of their mobile diagnostic units. He added that due to the specialized use of the units, the applicant preferred to avoid limiting the particular days the units could be on-site. Additionally, he added on to Mr. Witte's sidewalk connection

concerns by expressing concern for patient privacy, as the applicant was uncomfortable allowing any foot traffic to pass by the front of the building.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public hearing comment section due to no additional comments.*

Mr. Longcore directed the commissioner and staff discussion through the items described by Mr. Witte:

### **1) Bench and bike rack addition**

The commissioners discussed how the current proposed location of the bench and bike rack may or may not be appropriate for the use of the site and the spirit of the PUD ordinance. Mr. Schut felt the location was inadequate and expressed uncertainty about the intention behind the placement. Mr. Witte stressed that client privacy was a priority for the applicant; furthermore, he noted that the bench was added to benefit the pedestrian-oriented nature of the PUD.

Mr. Longcore and Mr. Kelley felt the placement fit their expectations, and Mr. Adams and Mr. Witte briefly discussed tying the bench to a bus stop, though this suggestion may be unlikely due to a nearby existing bus shelter. However, Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Schut that a better location for the bench should exist. Additionally, Mr. Westerling liked the bench being by a light pole, noting that the bench should be well lit.

Though the commissioners initially had a mixed reactions, the Planning Commission agreed that since the bench was added as a PUD item, the proposed bench and bike rack location would suffice as is.

### **2) Information on mammogram trailer**

Mr. Longcore discussed with Mr. Witte the optimal language for the operational duration of the trailer. Mr. Witte and Mr. Butler preferred language that provided the applicant with flexibility for when and how long the trailer occupied the site. Mr. Longcore proposed language that limits the presence of the trailer to two days per week.

The commissioners largely agreed with this proposal, with Mr. Westerling noting that two days was agreeable due to the trailer's important health services. Mr. Schut added that measures should be taken to ensure the trailer does not occupy the space for longer than permitted.

Afterward, Mr. Adams asked if screening could be required should the vehicle need to occupy the site for longer than two days. This question prompted a discussion on a mechanism for the applicant to return and request approval from the Township should the applicant find that the number of days on-site needs to increase or be altered. Ms. Mohr advised the applicant to reach out to the zoning administrator to determine that the change is a major or minor amendment through staff; if the amendment is major, then the applicant would return to the Planning Commission to amend the PUD.

The Planning Commission agreed with this language.

### **3) Sidewalk along 48th Avenue**

In his introduction, Mr. Witte had asked for a deferral of approximately two years to allow Metro Health the opportunity gain a Certificate of Occupancy

while the required sidewalk is under design. This deferral is desired, Mr. Witte explained, because of the significant hurdles involved in installing a sidewalk, which would have to contend with unfavorable natural site features.

Mr. Adams did not see a reason to defer construction of the sidewalk, observing that the area had only one significant contour difference which could be amended by constructing a small retaining wall. In response, Mr. Witte noted that he personally visited the site, sent photos to Mr. Ransford, and determined that the complexity of constructing the sidewalk would require a structural engineer. He added that the applicant wanted to start construction as soon as possible and did not want the sidewalk to hold up occupancy.

At Mr. Longcore's prompting, Mr. Butler provided March 2022 as the applicant's anticipated date of construction completion.

The commissioners began to discuss routes to accommodate the applicant's request, such as a performance bond or letter of credit. Connecting completion of the sidewalk to the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) funding was also discussed, with staff member Kevin Yeoman presenting concerns with the possibility of DDA funding falling through and the completion of the sidewalk remaining uncertain.

Mr. Longcore expressed preference for a performance bond to maintain pressure on all stakeholders regarding the sidewalk. Mr. Yeoman also described the bond as essentially an insurance policy to hold the contractor accountable for satisfactory completion of the sidewalk; should the contractor not complete the required sidewalk installation, the Township can refuse to issue a Final Certificate of Occupancy, and therefore a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy would be issued until the sidewalk installation is complete.

The Planning Commission reached a consensus on the use of a performance bond to give the developer opportunity to begin work on the project before finalizing sidewalk specifications and installation.

#### **4) Sidewalk connection concerns**

Mr. Witte, during his earlier introduction, had requested that the Planning Commission not require the sidewalk connection from 48th Avenue to the front of building despite the requirements of the zoning ordinance. This request is because the applicant feels that the sidewalk is an unnecessary expense that will see little use, in addition to natural site difficulties and privacy concerns for patients.

Mr. Zeinstra opined that the sidewalk was not critical given the use of the proposed facility but that constructing the connection is still preferred. Mr. Adams and Mr. Schut expressed shared desire for the connection.

After initial commissioner comments, Mr. Butler stated that most visitors to the facility would arrive by vehicle rather than foot.

This comment prompted discussion among the applicant and commissioners about whether or not foot traffic was an important enough consideration for the site to require the sidewalk. Mr. Longcore observed the proximity of the clinic to student housing, pointing out that students frequently walk and bike and therefore would benefit from the sidewalk connection. Mr. Butler pushed back

by referring to the on-campus Metro Health clinic, suggesting that those students are more likely to visit the on-campus clinic rather than the proposed facility.

Afterwards, Mr. Schut asked to hear the specific language of the applicable ordinance. Ms. Mohr complied: "In the commercial and office zoning district and for such uses in the PUD zoning district, a sidewalk shall be provided from the principle building to the sidewalk within any public right of way abiding the site. Such sidewalk shall be a minimum of eight feet wide in order to serve as a recognizable entrance point to the public. The Planning Commission may allow for modification to this requirement if in the opinion of the commission such sidewalk is impractical due to the type of business, the likelihood of pedestrian use, design of the building, the distance to the entrance of the sidewalk, or practical difficulty due to natural site features."

Then, Mr. Zuniga asked Mr. Witte to describe the parking lot situation to see if it would be possible to subtract spots; Mr. Witte explained that Metro Health construction requires seven spaces per one thousand feet due to previous experiences with under-parking even when meeting the ordinance specifications. Mr. Witte went on to draw attention to the last part of the ordinance, noting how the site's natural impracticalities would apply to this project.

Mr. Schut asked if one of the two entrances can be subtracted, but Mr. Witte explained that Metro Health prefers two entrances to provide visitors with options and for safety reasons to ensure a proper flow of traffic.

Mr. Kelley and Mr. Westerling opined that the current proposed sidewalk connection sufficed as is, while Mr. Adams believed there would be enough foot traffic from the university to justify the requirement.

Mr. Longcore said that they should at least meet the spirit of the ordinance. Mr. Zuniga noted that the Commission has required businesses to install a sidewalk whether it was walkable or not.

Mr. Schut agreed with Mr. Zuniga, stating that the Township wants to ensure visitors are able to walk up to each business. Mr. Witte reiterated the applicant's opposition to a sidewalk cutting through the middle of the site, particularly due to safety and that the ordinance does not specify exactly where the sidewalk must go.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the ordinance does mention following a direct route; additionally, he suggested that the sidewalk connection benefited the proposed land use, particularly if a different use is proposed at a later time.

Mr. Longcore offered the suggestion of creating a sidewalk that mirrors the east and west side of the property, though the applicant continued to disagree with the necessity regardless as Mr. Butler referred to experience with their facilities at more walkable communities still not seeing much foot traffic. Mr. Longcore asked for data to support the statement for the commissioners to consider, but Mr. Butler replied that they do not keep statistical counts and that the information came from staff observations. He went on to state that should visitors begin crossing the facilities' lawn in a way that's creating a hazard, Metro Health would add the sidewalk for the safety of its visitors.

At Mr. Butler's suggestion, Mr. Longcore prompted discussion on the feasibility of deferring the sidewalk connection dependent on need, enforcing it as necessary based on complaints. Ms. Mohr noted that such an option is available, though quantifying complaints may be tricky.

The Planning Commission agreed that such a deferment was satisfactory.

## **5) Signage details**

Mr. Witte described the ideal signage package: four wall signs—one per each four sides of the building—and three freestanding signs, one on Lake Michigan Drive, one at the corner of Becker Drive and 48th Avenue, and the last one at the western drive entrance. He then described how the sign proposals do not meet the ordinance, as 1) the western wall sign would be 240 square feet whereas the ordinance restricts size at 230 square feet and 2) three freestanding signs are proposed despite the ordinance restricting this count to one per lot. To deal with this, the applicant wants to either apply for a PUD amendment from the Planning Commission or acquire a variance—if either are possible.

Mr. Butler added to Mr. Witte's description of the request, explaining that the main purpose of Metro Health signage is not marketing but rather wayfinding. He provided an example of their facility in the City of Wyoming, which needed to expand its signage as visitors still struggled to locate the property.

The commissioners discussed an openness with reviewing the signage and asked further questions on the intent behind the excess signs.

Mr. Schut, though amenable to looking into the ordinance, would rather the applicant apply for a variance to avoid setting a precedent. Furthermore, he pointed out that marketing plays just as much a role in the signs as wayfinding.

Mr. Zuniga agreed with Mr. Schut and remarked that the amount of signage seems to be more a variance issue.

Mr. Longcore joined the two commissioners in agreement. He did not want to open the PUD to allow for such a number of many signs, especially since it may prompt other businesses to make similar requests. He told the applicant that the Planning Commission would need to look at the plans and consider the ordinance before making a determination.

After discussing the applicant's items, Mr. Longcore opened discussion to other comments.

Mr. Schut inquired about building material, confirming with the site's architect in attendance that the glass calculations apply only to the vision glass and not the spandrel glass, which is being treated as a wall. The architect went on to explain that the roof screening is not a composite but rather a standard metal panel to resemble the building. Mr. Schut requested the applicant to define the roof top screening material on the plans.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the Metro Health site plan with the following conditions:

- Note on site plan that mammogram trailer not to occupy site for more than two days per week; if additional time required, applicant must seek approval from the Township

- Sidewalk along 48th Avenue to be added by request for certification of occupancy; if not installed by such time, ~~Township will issue performance bond~~ applicant shall provide a performance bond in lieu of the Township.
- Sidewalk to east of site will be deferred pending ~~need~~ the work.
- Signage not included in this approval
- Material of rooftop screening to be noted on site plan and reviewed by staff

Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

#### 8. Site Plan Review:

##### A. Taco Bell – 4989 Lake Michigan Drive – Minor Amendment

Ms. Mohr described the Taco Bell project as a 230-square-foot walk-in freezer addition to the northwest end of the existing building. During the last meeting, the Planning Commission determined that the addition required a minor amendment to the special land use permit. Additionally, the Planning Commission had directed the planners to confer with the zoning administration in case the existing building and site required updating to be in compliance with the zoning ordinance. The Planning Commission also requested additional details regarding the proposed façade of the freezer addition, to ensure it was in compliance with the remainder of the building. It was confirmed by the zoning administration that the site and existing building were in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

Then, Mike Kurskey, representing the applicant, recalled Mr. Ransford's main concern being that the addition's exterior matched the rest of the building. Mr. Kurskey assured the commissioners that the applicant intends to match building colors and materials.

After Mr. Longcore opened commissioner and staff comments, Mr. Zeinstra asked about the location of the condenser. Mr. Kurskey explained that the old freezer equipment will be removed and replaced with new equipment that will match the current units in size.

Mr. Zuniga then queried Ms. Mohr about if it was intentional that a written inspection report from the zoning administrator was not made. Ms. Mohr explained that a report is typically only made if issues are found, then asked if she should request something in writing from PCI, the building code inspections company. Mr. Longcore responded that it would not be necessary, as the meeting's minutes will suffice. He then discussed with Ms. Mohr that, should an issue arise, a written report will be received.

Motion by Schut to approve the Taco Bell walk-in freezer addition as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 7-0.**

#### 9. Old Business: None

#### 10. New Business:

##### A. Annual Work Program – Updated

Ms. Mohr introduced the section by describing minor updates to the language since the last meeting, notably that Section 24.06J for the Maximum Glass Provision was added, and that items 7 and 9 were moved down the list.

The Planning Commission had no further discussion on the project.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the 2021 Annual Work Program as presented.

Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed the public comment section due to no public comments.*

12. Township Board Reports:

Trustee Zeinstra reported that the Township Board passed new ordinance for the water and updated construction standards.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Yeoman updated the commissioners regarding meeting changes regarding Covid-19 restrictions.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, January 18, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*January 18, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Via GoToMeeting Software*

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford
3. Received for information: no information received
4. Moved approval of January 4, 2021 meeting minutes to the first meeting in February
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the January 20, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed the public comment section for non-public hearing items due to no comments.*
7. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
8. Site Plan Review: no site plans were scheduled for review.
9. Old Business:
  - a. Metro Health Signage—4830 Becker Drive  
Planner Ransford briefed the Commission from a memo he created regarding the applicant's proposed Metro Health signage. Ransford shared that the University Park PUD does not have provisions for signage, so the general commercial provisions apply. Ransford outlined which signs complied and were prohibited.
    - The applicant is only allowed one ground sign, but they are proposing two signs.
    - Both ground mounted signs exceed the 50 square feet of maximum area and 10 feet in height: Sign A is about 150 square feet and Sign C is 75 square feet.
    - The pole sign that is proposed is prohibited.
    - The maximum area for a wall sign is 232 square feet. The proposed south sign is 343 square feet, not the 248 square feet stated previously.
    - The north and east wall signs proposed both comply.
    - The west wall sign would be prohibited by the ordinance.
    - Planner Ransford listed two options for the board to consider in reference to the applicant's proposal:
      - Option 1: an amendment to the PUD
      - Option 2: seek a variance for those signs that do not comply

Mr. Steve Witte, representative of the applicant and the developer, was joined by Mr. Brett Butler and Mr. Patrick Morrow of Metro Health, and Mr. Matt Sigma of MHP Allendale, LLC. Mr. Witte summarized their request for larger signs and their preference to seek an amendment to the PUD due to the flexibility available to the Planning Commission rather than the alternative of seeking a variance from the Zoning Board of



Appeals. He also emphasized that the purpose of the signs is for wayfinding and identification. Mr. Witte summarized the request as follows:

- Four wall signs, including the southern sign at 343 square feet.
- A primary concern for the applicant is to have more than one monument sign on the property for a few different reasons:
  1. This property effectively has three front yards with frontage on Lake Michigan Drive, 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Becker, so the applicant believes one sign is not sufficient.
  2. The purpose of the signs is more for wayfinding.
  3. There are sign limitations due to the amount of green space and the placement of the signs further from the roadways.
- The requested two signs on Becker could potentially be reduced to one sign.

Mr. Butler emphasized that they went with wayfinding signage rather than advertising signs and explained what their advertising signs look like at other locations. He further elaborated on the concern that the building and signs will be a great distance from the roadways.

Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Witte that the second sign on the west side would not be required but wanted to see a rendering of the south sign, both a smaller and larger version of the sign from an elevation view because it could probably be seen from M-45.

Mr. Schut asked if an amendment to the PUD would require another public hearing. Mr. Ransford stated that it depended on the Planning Commission's conclusion on whether it was a major or minor amendment and reiterated that the University Park PUD did not establish sign sizes.

Mr. Witte addressed the idea that the Commission could set a distinction in a PUD amendment that makes it clear that the amendment is specific to the lot terrain and its use.

Mr. Zeinstra would not be opposed to looking at the language for a potential amendment that would address the proposed larger sign on the south side.

Mr. Ransford highlighted that section 12.05a identifies seven different standards that need to be reviewed when considering flexibility in the amendments language which the applicant would need to address.

Mr. Schut raised concerns about the view from Lake Michigan Drive and the sign being disconnected from the building and a concern about raising the height of the sign to fifteen feet. He was not opposed to the larger wall sign but did not want to see other signs go beyond the ordinance.

Mr. Westerling concurred with Mr. Schut and was concerned about creating a precedent.

Mr. Witte stated that the applicant is permitted one free-standing sign which would allow them to choose whether they place it on Lake Michigan Drive or Becker. However, Mr. Witte was not aware of which they would choose if only allowed one sign.

Mr. Kelley inquired about the pole sign and where it would be located. The applicant expressed that based on the preference of the Commission they were no longer interested in the pole sign.

Mr. Longcore raised the issue that Spectrum Health in a more challenging location has never raised a request for larger signage other than directional signs other than ones indicating which way to travel to the office and that the applicant will have a larger intersection with a light in addition to a known presence in the community from their current building.

Mr. Butler explained how their current, well-established location is only roughly 30 feet off the highway rather than 300 feet in the new facility and reiterated their request for the signage to help people find the clinic as quickly and effectively as possible. He also discussed a survey that was conducted demonstrating that the second vehicle in traffic would not be able to see their sign because it would be obscured by the first vehicle going northbound, so they raised the parapet for this reason.

In response, Mr. Adams asked about a wayfinding sign structure on 48<sup>th</sup> and Becker and inquired if that was an option for a sign. Mr. Schut concurred and mentioned that there were two locations.

Mr. Witte advised that the information on the specifics of the sign structure was still being sought, but the placards that would fit the structure were small and the applicant would still like to continue with their request of larger signs.

Mr. Butler discussed how the placards for that sign are small and would not change their request if allowed to use them.

Mr. Longcore discussed the use of the placards by other businesses.

Mr. Butler asked which items are more acceptable and which were less acceptable.

Mr. Zuniga expressed his desire to see a what a rendering would look like if it met code. Mr. Kelley, Mr. Schut, and Mr. Longcore agreed.

Mr. Witte asked for clarification regarding the need for a plan that meets compliance but with two compliant ground mounted signs rather than just one.

Mr. Longcore confirmed the request of the Commission.

**b. Hidden Shores West Planned Unit Major Amendment**

Mr. Ransford reviewed his memo about the wetland that was constructed without amending the PUD and was found to be a major change, the applicant was directed to relocate the play structure and complete their trail plan through the wetland. The applicant has submitted revised plans based on direction from the Planning Commission during an August 2020 meeting. The applicant has submitted revised plans based on direction from the Planning Commission during an August 2020 meeting.

Mr. Barr explained the new location chosen for the play structure which will now be in a more central location. Some of the trails were dead ending into some backyards as well.

The homeowner's association agreed with the amended changes to the trails to correct the issue.

Motion by Mr. Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the Hidden Shores West Planned Unit Major Amendment, as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. Opposed by Mr. Adams.

**Approval 6-1**

10. New Business

a. Annual Report

- Mr. Ransford summarized the template of the annual report.
- Discussion of report

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the 2020 Annual Report, seconded Zuniga. **Approval 7-0**

b. Election of Planning Commission Officers

Motion by Westerling to retain the officers in their current positions, seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0**

11. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed public comment section due to no public comments.*

12. Township Board Reports

Mr. Zeinstra advised that they took care of some general business and also hired a new Planning Commission Recording Secretary.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Westerling thanked those serving as President, Vice President and Secretary. Mr. Adams expressed his gratitude as well.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***February 1, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via GoToMeeting Software***

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Kelli Bulthouse, Maddie Buckler, Juliet Dragos, Matt Jaworowski, Cathy, Margaret, Marie, Paul O, Sarah, Kelli McGovern, Lora Richmond, Peter Walsh, WXMI Fox 17, WOOD
3. Received for information: no information received.
4. Motion by Schut to approve the January 4, 2021 meeting minutes with revisions. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0** with the following corrections:
  - a. On page 6, in the motion by Zeinstra on the second bullet point, correction should be made to “applicant shall provide a performance bond in lieu of the township”.
  - b. Clarify bullet point below that to “the sidewalk to the east side of the parking lot will be deferred pending the work.”
5. Motion by Schut to approve the January 18, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0**
6. Motion by Longcore to approve the February 1, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 7-0**
7. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, then proceeding to participants using the web or app After all comments were finished, Chairperson Longcore thanked those who participated and closed the public comment section.*
  1. Aaron Southwick, Allendale – Streetlights on Wild Duck Lane
  2. Cathy, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  3. Maddie Buckler – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  4. Matt Jaworowski, WOOD TV – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  5. A member of the public, undisclosed name and resident information – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
8. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
9. Site Plan Review: no site plans were scheduled for review.
10. Old Business: no old business to review
11. New Business
  - a. Work Program – Tree Preservation Language  
Planner Ransford summarized an ordinance adopted by Park Township in Ottawa County which has also been reviewed by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Schut raised concerns about potentially telling an owner they might be prohibited from cutting trees on their lot.

Mr. Zeinstra agreed with Mr. Schut. He added that the quality of the tree should be considered, along with the idea of adding a tree to replace older trees with the goal of saving trees along the street without specifying certain roads.

Mr. Westerling agreed that the quality of the tree should determine if it needed to be brought down and explained that the area has differences from Waukazoo Woods.

Mr. Kelley was in general agreement and raised concerns about clear-cutting.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Ransford if an applicant would be able to come in and address the Commission to seek relief.

Planner Ransford explained that in his opinion they could do so and that there was language that the applicant “provides sufficient evidence of the deceased or dying tree.” He also explained that it was more advantageous to handle it at the Planning Commission level/site planning review level.

Chairperson Longcore agreed and explained that there were similar sections where applicants have come before the Commission with evidence that they do not necessarily need to get a traffic study, as an example, and would like the Commission to be able to allow a deviation.

Mr. Adams inquired about whether it was necessary to have language about the reforestation plan by a forester and if a landscaper would be sufficient.

Mr. Kelley concurred with Mr. Adams and asked about a management plan for an entire development and what that would look like, while agreeing that a landscaper may be able suitable to handle it.

Planner Ransford explained that the idea behind the forester was that as the trees were replaced there may be impact to the wildlife and the ecosystem.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Zeinstra for further input.

Mr. Zeinstra explained that Landscape Architecture had a wide range of different things that could be handled including wildlife, depending on the individual and what they are comfortable doing. He also explained that it was similar for a forester who may or not be in tune with wildlife and recommended changing the language to “the professional doing the determination” or similar language.

Chairperson Longcore pointed out that Allendale does not have designated wildlife corridors at this time and so adding language might complicate matters further.

Mr. Zeinstra agreed and added that they had a plan for pathways along the public drains.

Mr. Adams suggested making a distinction and clarified that he was thinking about the M-45 corridor and the businesses or developments that might occur along M-45 versus off roads of M-45 where there might be more residential areas. In the residential areas an arborist might be more suited and suggested possibly basing it on acreage.

Bruce Zeinstra agreed that the acreage idea might be a good idea while keeping in mind the difference between Park and Allendale.

Chairperson Longcore recommended that they move ahead with some tree preservation language that did not necessarily tie in with wildlife corridors, and then maybe as a future work plan item, add in consideration of wildlife corridors and where they might be located as he provided several location examples like Dewpoint.

Mr. Schut said he would like to retain verbiage of “restoring, maintaining, or building” in thinking of Trader’s View.

Chairperson Longcore raised the question of how to determine what a wildlife corridor is.

Mr. Zeinstra recommended redefining it to “existing natural areas” which is supposed to be shown on the site analysis plan. He also suggested making sure that a developer did not cut everything down before submitting plans to the Planning Commission. This would allow the Commission to decide what should be kept and what should be removed while not tying everyone’s hands as previously mentioned.

Mr. Schut stated that behind Family Farm & Home there was a significant wildlife corridor right next to the condos where people often see deer and wanted to make sure that was maintained.

Chairperson Longcore talked about the need for a better definition of a Wildlife Corridor.

Planner Ransford provided a detailed explanation of the wildlife corridor research conducted in Kent County and how they had reached the language chosen to allow a case-by-case review based on the local plant and animal population.

Chairperson Longcore requested that Planner Ransford develop a revision based on the comments provided tonight to present to the Commission.

b. Section 24.06H – Standards for Approval of Waste Disposal Facilities

Planner Ransford recapped the need to reexamine the language regarding dumpster enclosures and to have a certain width regarding whether or not it contained one or two dumpsters, as well as an aesthetic enclosure matching the building. He explained the current language requiring a drive approach of a certain length for the truck to service it

and an all-enclosure in the rear side yard. Concerns have been raised to the Commission over time and the discussion has come about to re-examine and see if any changes are necessary.

Chairperson Longcore discussed a question that has recently come up regarding maintenance or replacement since a couple of older structures have fallen apart and asked if there was any current language that would allow the Commission to ensure compliance.

Planner Ransford asked if the Chairman was referring to the current language or prior.

Chairperson Longcore asked about prior language while considering a wood structure that fell apart and had essentially resulted in a dumpster in the front yard.

Planner Ransford essentially outlined that an enclosure that is gone would technically be a violation of the approved site which would require it to be replaced, but it wouldn't necessarily have to be replaced under current language. The basis for enforcement would involve the site plan. If it were just a chain-link fence, they would only be required to replace it with a chain-link fence. The current language does not give the authority to require masonry block or some type of other wall or solid fence unless the applicant was coming in for site plan approval on something else within the site. If that were the case, they would be required to make these kinds of corrections.

Chairperson Longcore asked if they would legally be able to add language that would require that.

Planner Ransford explained that non-conformities could trigger it, and he would need to verify with Township Counsel if that was something that could be done.

Mr. Westerling asked if the Commission said they were going to enforce new standards or maintain current standards would that encourage people to maintain their current enclosure.

Chairperson Longcore agreed that it might become an incentive to maintain their current out of compliance dumpster enclosure rather than update it, but it would hinge on whether that language could be added or not.

Mr. Schut compared it to a sign being redone or replaced if it falls over. It would then need to meet the new ordinance requiring a permit to be pulled, and he recommended language that if it gets destroyed it would need to meet the current ordinance, but if it is maintained, it would not.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Schut, due to his profession, if there was anything in the current language that should be amended that might include best practices for how enclosures are designed.

Mr. Schut recommended not requiring protected bumper posts because they interfere with the gates and would like to remove the portion of Section 2c that states “and shall be protected with steel bump guard posts at the front entrance area.” He also provided possible language on pipe bollards and a minimum of 10’ clearance for gates as well as a side pedestrian gate so that individuals do not have to open the heavy gates to enter the enclosure to dispose of trash. Appropriate hardware to secure the gate when opened was also recommended to avoid the gate blowing open or closed in the wind.

Mr. Westering and Mr. Schut suggested adding “proper hardware” or “heavy duty,” sufficient to hold the gate since cables would not work for the winter.

Mr. Kelley asked about language on site planning that had previously been approved that may have fallen apart for section 2A “the material matching the principal structure.” For some older buildings an applicant might not have the exact same material, or it might look a little different. He raised the question of what do we have for language that addresses older approved site plans and bringing it up to code? Do they match it up as close as they can or does the material have to be exact?

Chairperson Longcore explained that we have a good track record currently of materials or comps. Staff would be able to approve that, and it is all contingent on whether or not that verbiage was allowed.

Mr. Zeinstra asked to expand the language to include material similar or complementary to the building and that it be made of long-lasting materials. He suggested that it may be up to Planning Commission discretion. He also suggested that if the opening to the dumpster enclosure is not visible to the public or the general public from the area, would an exception be made that gates are not necessary?

Chairperson Longcore added that the Commission had not been requiring the exact same materials for enclosures. They had allowed for similar in appearance type materials, in order to update the language to match what was being done. He remained open on whether the dumpster enclosures needed a gate or not depending on how planning for future development should be considered in the event someone builds behind a site that makes the opening visible to the public due to a new development.

Mr. Zeinstra suggested language to indicate if it is screened from view from neighboring properties and the general public area. Regarding language on materials, he encouraged the option of something that looks good and is long-lasting, citing not using wood posts that can rot out as an example.

Mr. Kelley preferred the words “complement” and “durable” for any possible change and wanted to keep gates as a requirement.

Chairperson Longcore spoke about a unique example with a specific plan and asked whether they should plan to the exception.



Mr. Zuniga thought they would be open to an exception if it spelled out what the areas were around it, how it was going to develop, and what was there.

Mr. Schut opposed the idea of exceptions.

Mr. Westerling agreed to a gate built to a standard.

Mr. Adams agreed in getting a steel guard and calling out a minimum 4" cement filled bollard. He also would like to see something more specific than "durable."

Mr. Ransford was not familiar with specific language on dumpster enclosure durability specifically but suggested it could fall under the site plan and offered to investigate what could be done regarding making the product last the same as the building.

Mr. Schut expressed concern about opening the whole thing up because chain link fence with slats were the very thing that was to hopefully be avoided, but would seem to be allowed as defined by a durable product. He liked the idea of using the same materials as used in the building, as it gave options tied to the building.

Mr. Longcore clarified that the materials needed to be similar aesthetically to the building or complementary. He cited the example of using sheet metal on awnings, but not using those on the dumpster enclosures.

Mr. Schut pointed out he was not opposed to sheet metal or vinyl siding in a residential area if it fit the site. He also asked that it be documented if the site plan would not be including an enclosure.

Consensus was reached to direct Ransford to revise the language based on comments provided and return with a draft for consideration by the Planning Commission.

c. Section 24.06 J. Standards of Approval on Building Appearance.

Mr. Ransford explained that Section 24.06J has certain minimum requirements for commercial and industrial architecture, as well as multi-family developments. The Planning Commission had made a note in months past to this work program about the maximum of 40% glass for a commercial building, which is a current provision in the zoning ordinance. Some recent site plans have used Spandrel glass or similar material that is not a genuine window that you would typically see, so the question was raised if aesthetically proper buildings could be achieved with more than 40% glass, and some clarity might be needed in how the current language reads.

Mr. Longcore asked for Mr. Schut and Mr. Westerling to start with their comments after explaining that the language was likely originally used to prevent the large sheet glass frontages seen in some commercial areas. With material and design advancements there was a need to update the language for those types of materials.

Mr. Schut did not see a need to have a maximum on glass, or if necessary, there should be a clarification of whether windows or glass, however he did not have any concern about glass. As far as any code, it would still be required to meet the stricter energy code.

Mr. Westerling spoke favorably of glass buildings and said that he would like to see 100% glass.

Mr. Longcore asked if they would be opposed to some type of language regarding the percentage of windows versus glass.

Mr. Schut did not see a need to restrict it and recommended that they leave the last sentence of item 1. Mr. Westerling concurred.

Mr. Kelley inquired if a minimum was needed to avoid having no windows.

Mr. Schut stated that they did not have the ability to have a minimum in the first paragraph. He noted an instance with a gas station that was denied because of a low-grade appearance. He reiterated that there was flexibility to get windows in the verbiage if they did not like the look without it.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Ransford to discuss the situation with the gas station having two road fronts. They were going to essentially have two store fronts on that building but had been allowed to deviate from that.

Mr. Ransford confirmed they had frontage on 48<sup>th</sup> and Lake Michigan Drive that complied with the language, but the Commissioner had found the west side to be somewhat bare of the character that is intended by Section 24.06 when is compared to Lake Michigan Drive side. Going from memory, he thought the Commission had not deviated and wanted them to have more character so the entirety of all the elevations blended.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Zeinstra agreed.

Mr. Ransford explained the minimum percentage of glass that Tallmadge Township adopted probably four or five years ago, at 20% as the minimum for commercial--a common number in the county. He also thought Jamestown Township and Grand Haven Township had the same type of language. What Tallmadge had done with the 48<sup>th</sup> and Lake Michigan Drive property--not only being a minimum of 20% glass but had followed "the secondary street side shall also contain the same amount of glass that was placed on the main street side." Mr. Ransford gave the example, that if they ended up with 30% glass on Lake Michigan Drive, they would have the same amount of glass on the other elevation as well, so it had the same type of character. It did not have to be the same location or same elevation design, so long as the percentage was the same from ground to roofline.

Chairperson Longcore asked how the number was determined.

Mr. Ransford explained that for Tallmadge there had been reviews of Grand Haven and Jamestown Townships language. The resulting buildings seemed to have the character that the community wanted. It was a slightly different number for industrial, and the glass was treated differently due to being a different type of construction.

Andrew Longcore asked if anyone objected to a 20% minimum on road front.

Mr. Ransford added that in Tallmadge's example, they required the glass on road frontage and areas that are basically adjacent to where the public would be, for example, a parking lot. So, taking the same corner for example, of whoever's parking on the north side of the building, that would also be subject to where the glass was required.

Mr. Schut raised a concern about what the Commission had already approved and stated that the gas station would not fit those parameters and would like to see others that had been approved.

Chairperson Longcore stated going forward the intention was to be able to foster better design, not necessarily fit with the current language.

Mr. Schut clarified that the question pertained to glass percentages.

Mr. Ransford offered to gather information regarding the most recent six commercial buildings with the calculation of glass percentages for each.

Mr. Schut expressed concern about requiring a minimum glass percentage on two sides due to how it might affect the floor plan for example and additionally pointed out a typo in the current language that needed correction.

Mr. Ransford asked for consensus on the "no maximum," but some type of minimum, not necessarily to draft the formal language but to provide samples to the Commission.

Chairperson Longcore confirmed Mr. Ransford's clarification and requested when working on the proposed draft that both examples be included for future review in order to streamline the process.

## 12. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments, beginning with the callers, then proceeding to participants using the web or app. After all comments were finished, Chairperson Longcore closed the second public comment section.*

1. Cathy, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
2. Cathy, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley

3. A member of the public, undisclosed name and resident information – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  4. A member of the public, undisclosed name and resident information – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
13. Township Board Reports
- Bruce Zeinstra reviewed the Township Board Reports and advised that they discussed the board member appointments to different committees and departments. They also had updates from the department heads and discussed business registration for new businesses that move into town to ensure they meet any zoning requirements, along with the fire department and water and sewer departments.
14. Commissioner and Staff Comments
- No comments were made.
15. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***February 15, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Zuniga  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Brett Butler, Kim Cannata, Betty Culbertson, Jason Howland, Kelli McGovern, Patrick Morrow, Joel Paauwe, Lora Richmond, Cathy Schmidt, Catherine Seaver, Brian Sikma, Mike Tiesma
3. Received for information: no information received.
4. Motion by Schut to approve the February 1, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Adams.  
**Approval 6-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the February 15, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. After all comments were finished, Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
  1. Brett Butler, representative of Metro Health – No comment
  2. Brian Sikma, representative of Metro Health – No comment
  3. Catherine Seaver, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  4. Jason Howland – Comments to Planning Commission regarding purpose of Public Comments
  5. Cathy Schmidt, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley and Park Statues
  6. Joel Paauwe, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
  7. Kim Cannata, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley and purpose of Public Comments
  8. Mike Tiesma, representative of Midwest Sign – No comment
  9. Patrick Morrow: No comment
7. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
8. Site Plan Review: no site plans were scheduled for review.
9. Old Business:
  - a. Metro Health Signage—4830 Becker Drive  
Planner Ransford briefed the Commission for the purpose of the public present that Metro Health medical facility had been approved for a location on the northwest corner

of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive, part of the University Park Planned Development. Discussions were ongoing and the applicant had submitted signage specifications that exceeded current zoning ordinance regulations. The Planning Commission had offered two alternatives:

- 1) Compliance with the current zoning regulations
- 2) Return with mockups from different vantage points to prove that an amendment would be appropriate.

Mr. Steve Witte of Nederveld was unavailable to present as in previous meetings. Mr. Brett Butler, a representative of Metro Health introduced Mr. Mike Tiesma, the Account Representative with Midwest Sign to present an update a package of three mock-ups to the Commission:

- **Sign A:** a large monument sign proposed for the corner of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive, drawn at their desired 150 square foot size.
- **Sign B:** second option, a scaled back version drawn 50 square feet smaller.
- **Sign X:** a version drawn following the guidelines of the ordinance.

Mr. Tiesma summarized the smaller sign was difficult to see when travelling east and west and urged Commissioners to consider the proposed 10'x15' sign as an appropriate size given the set-back location, speed of traffic, and visibility issues of the Lake Michigan Drive area.

Mr. Zeinstra reviewed the current definition of height and how the sign was measured, and Mr. Butler reiterated the visibility challenge from the east bound traffic side and the sign needing to clear the height of the guardrail. Mr. Tiesma provided some view options, again noting that the smaller sign disappeared behind the guardrail on the eastbound traffic decision point.

Planner Ransford and Mr. Zeinstra discussed where the 10' height was measured from, and Mr. Zeinstra voiced concerned that a sign on M-45 would possibly obstruct the view of drivers looking for a road or drive to turn down when looking for the building. He was not opposed to Sign B but thought that Sign A seemed too large.

Mr. Brian Sikma, also a representative of Metro Health, noted their unique situation, attributing to why the applicant was asking for larger sizes for three of the five signs. His reasoning involved: 1.) the site having three road frontages, 2.) the building front unable to be on the main road, 3.) the site topography requiring the building to be set off a substantial distance, and 4.) the location being on a high-speed road. He suggested that the PUD made it possible for the Commission to have more latitude but understood their concern about setting a precedent. He expressed significant time had been spent to make the signage fit within the guidelines and encouraged the Commission to consider the study done examining the patient base and demographics to determine their proposed and desired sizes.

Mr. Westerling agreed with Sign B being too small, but Sign A being too large.

Planner Ransford checked earlier information and clarified that both the ground mounted signs had exceeded the maximum height allowed which was also a consideration in the meeting.

It was suggested by Mr. Schut that sign height might be gained from gradual grade or berming to increase visibility. He also asked if the Metro Health building could be considered multi-tenant as a possible means to allow expanding the size of the sign.

Mr. Butler agreed to pursuing the option of elevation but noted some concerns relative to the location. He explained some communities included different types of service on their signage, but their chosen sign was not multi-tenant. He considered it a way finding sign not an advertising sign. He was open to considering the advertising type sign, so long as the signage size could stay at the proposed size and agreed to Mr. Tiesma to creating another concept for the Commission.

Mr. Tiesma gave an example of a highway billboard at 14'x48' vs. the Metro Health sign drawn at 10'x15'. By comparison, he believed the sign size to be very appropriate given the distance off the road. He noted that the renderings were also drawn close to scale and fit the space.

Mr. Schut clarified he envisioned a nicely elevated and landscaped raised grade to gain visibility. His understanding was that the only way for the Commission to allow the requested change was to amend the PUD. Planner Ransford confirmed Mr. Schut was correct in that the PUD by default simply said the signage had to meet the ordinance, and the PUD itself would have to allow for those variations. In addition, there was a short list of criteria for the applicant to consider deviations if an amendment to the PUD is pursued.

Chairperson Longcore shared his preference for the Commission to control the signage rather than the ZBA. He agreed with Mr. Westerling and Mr. Zeinstra that Sign A was too large and recommended raising Sign B through grade elevation as a sufficient solution. Mr. Adams disagreed, believing the ordinance size to be sufficient particularly with the well-recognized logo branding and that Sign B did not need increased size or elevation.

Mr. Butler responded that the logo was "unofficially" in the process of being modified and desired continued focus on the sign size not the brand for effective way finding. He acknowledged he would be willing to work with Mr. Tiesma and Mr. Witte to work on a variation and redesign of Sign B.

Mr. Adams again stated that Sign B was twice as large as the current ordinance and would not have a problem of visibility, even without landscaped elevation. Mr. Kelley agreed.

Mr. Tiesma explained that Sign B would be adequate on a normal parcel of land, however, with the building sitting a significant distance away from the sign, it necessitated the larger sign to attract patients driving in any direction to not miss the second driveway if they missed the first entrance. Mr. Butler verified the address of 4830 Becker Drive at Mr. Schut's request adding it was not a well-known road, thus the larger sign request.

Mr. Kelley inquired if patients making appointments were given address verification and location. Mr. Butler explained a protocol was followed, but patients still struggled to find locations. He explained that the city of Wyoming had made changes to their PUD and had allowed additional signage on overhead street signs and poles to increase navigation. He agreed with Mr. Kelley's assessment perfect results were impossible, but that even small changes helped. He gave the example that the number of phone calls from patients asking for directions to the Metro Health hospital decreased after the changes in Wyoming had been implemented.

Mr. Sikma again reminded the Commission that the building was a valuable entity within the community and did not feel the sign would set a precedent for future businesses. Mr. Zeinstra voiced his support for Sign B and the height, measured from the center line off the road.

There was discussion and clarification among the Commissioners, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Tiesma that the sign needed to be 72' off the edge of the road due to the right of way. The Metro Health sign measurement was compared to other signs that were typically about 25 to 30 feet off the road. Mr. Westerling voiced his support for Sign B.

Mr. Kelley asked Planner Ransford if the PUD were amended would other areas in the vicinity also be allowed similar sized signage. Planner Ransford explained it would be at the discretion of the Commission. If the applicant submitted it, they could be limited to the scope of their property. If the Commission felt it was appropriate to address the entirety of the PUD, then it could be more than just a particular parcel within the University Park PUD.

Mr. Kelley affirmed that if it were defined only for that location, he would support Sign B, while Mr. Schut said he was not opposed to Sign B. Mr. Zeinstra said that a review of the PUD indicated that this was the only area that the ravine and extra right of way would impact, applying only to that parcel.

Mr. Adams remained opposed due to the large size of the building and sign, stating that the ordinance requirements provided sufficient visibility. Chairperson Longcore suggested discussing the building sign rendering visibility from Lake Michigan Drive.

Mr. Butler explained it would be seen more quickly by westbound travelers as all obstruction had been removed on the northeast corner of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive. The heavily wooded ravine in front would exclude visibility until much closer to the intersection of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The intent was for the sign to be visible early enough to make the roundabout turn, entering through University Parkway rather than going past 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Boulevard turn, coming back to 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and back to the building.

Mr. Adams concluded he could still not justify the larger sign per Mr. Butler's explanation. Mr. Butler explained travelling from an east bound direction would require almost being on top of the site and passing 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue before seeing building signage. In either direction, the goal was to allow enough time for drivers to slow down and prepare to turn without congesting the boulevard turn and impacting traffic efficiency,



safety, and patient appointment/treatment timing. Mr. Adams expressed that any delay in that instance would be minute.

Mr. Sikma commented that the monument sign was important to connecting it to the building. Mr. Tiesma added it had been challenging simply to get an unblocked photo for their renderings because of the heavier traffic, and Mr. Butler affirmed their desire to decrease the amount of turns for the safety of their patients based on their past successful experiences of opening facilities.

Both Mr. Sikma and Mr. Butler reiterated they had a wide scope of patients, but that the goal for all was patient safety. Mr. Butler cited their Cascade location being moved one-half block from the highway for safer transmission entering and exiting. Mr. Butler acknowledged he was supportive of making compromises to improve safety and way finding while still maintaining the standards and process of the Commission.

During the discussion, Mr. Schut identified an error in the calculations for the dimensions of the south sign. He referred to Sleep Inn and asked if that project had set any precedent that would help with the current Metro Health project but still felt that an exception should not be permitted.

Chairperson Longcore and Mr. Schut briefly discussed whether Family Fare was a precedent and considered that it was larger, multi-tenant, but were somewhat uncertain, as it preceded their time on the Commission.

Planner Ransford then verified he had found a discrepancy in one of the site plan numbers and worked to verify the floor plan.

Mr. Westerling asked which of the Metro Health wall signs were compliant with the ordinance, and Mr. Butler confirmed that their north and east signs on the building were compliant. Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Westerling if he was referring to Sign X being compliant, and Mr. Westerling mentioned that by the 232 sq. ft measurement it was but would not be based on the new calculation.

Planner Ransford said that his calculation was 171 ½ square feet to Mr. Schut's rounded up calculation of 173 square feet. With calculation changes, Mr. Westerling asked if that meant all three wall signs were compliant. Mr. Schut said he believed the north wall to be compliant and the east wall to be slightly over but close. He also questioned if the blueprint showing future expansion would change the calculations. Planner Ransford confirmed it would allow for another 22 square feet on the south and north sides.

Mr. Tiesma asked for clarification on the 173 square feet being allowable on the north and south sides of the building and Planner Ransford confirmed.

Mr. Sikma asked if the additional square footage not being used on the north side might be able to be utilized on the opposite side of the building on the south elevation, but Mr. Schut was concerned it would mean changing the ordinance or amending the PUD. Chairperson Longcore acknowledged the PUD could be amended, and according to Planner Ransford the parcel could be site specific. Planner Ransford confirmed to the Commission that if the PUD were amended it would require a public hearing following the same process for a new PUD.

Mr. Adams asked for clarification stating that he believed the south sign on the building was larger than what the ordinance allowed and based on the current information he could not support the change.

Mr. Butler then asked if amending the request to go with Sign B on M-45, the less than compliant sign shown on the north side, the compliant sign on the east side of the building, the larger sign on the south side of the building and dropping the size of the monument sign on the Becker side to the ordinance size or slightly smaller, would be an adequate compromise.

Mr. Zeinstra, Chairperson Longcore, Mr. Westerling, and Mr. Kelley agreed to the options given by Mr. Butler. Mr. Schut remained opposed and proposed Metro Health build the structure first with temporary signage, then amend the PUD for the Commission to first see the structure in relation to the size of the sign. Both Mr. Tiesma and Mr. Sikma expressed concern about the timing issue of the whole process and avoiding the look of any temporary signage. Mr. Tiesma reiterated the sign renderings on the building were precise, drawn-to-scale, and an accurate depiction of the final product, however, Mr. Schut remained apprehensive about future exceptions. Mr. Butler affirmed he understood their position, but that the location had been chosen due to proximity of the university and the bus line and asked for additional consideration.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the Commission had not yet seen the monument sign rendering in compliance with the ordinance and preferred to see one before finalizing a decision. In response, Mr. Butler reminded the Commission they had been working somewhat within the parameters of incorrect information.

Chairperson Longcore explained that while several of the Commissioners were supportive of some of the aspects of their suggested compromises, the Commission still needed to see renderings drawn according to ordinance requirements.

Mr. Butler thanked Chairperson Longcore and asked for an overview of the process for the PUD amendment to the Planning Commission. Planner Ransford detailed the steps and the Commission asked Planner Ransford to proceed with setting up a public hearing. Mr. Butler, Mr. Sikma, and Mr. Tiesma thanked the Commission for their time and listening to their request. In closing, Planner Ransford sought clarification that once corrections were made to the south façade and materials updated, the hearing would be scheduled. Chairperson Longcore confirmed that was correct.

#### 10. Work Program – Tree Preservation Language

Planner Ransford summarized for the public an ordinance adopted by Park Township in Ottawa County. He reiterated nothing had been scheduled for a public hearing and the Commission was reviewing revisions made in the last meeting to the language for Allendale Township.

Mr. Schut raised concerns about some of the language restricting any tree cutting prior to submitting a plan. Mr. Ransford provided an explanation and court case example.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed language, how to address non-compliance, and language on tree stands and tree canopies being preserved “to the extent possible.”

Additional discussion involved possible setting a percentage of trees that must remain, and how to address trees removed years prior without the new owner's knowledge.

Mr. Zeinstra agreed clear cutting the site was not the answer, but rather incorporating them into their design where possible with proof if the argument were that none could be saved. Chairperson Longcore agreed the goal was not to prevent property owners from doing work on their property, but not clear cutting their property in preparation for development, then having to re-forest and re-plant.

Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided.

#### 11. Section 24.06H – Standards for Approval of Waste Disposal Facilities

Planner Ransford recapped the need to reexamine the language regarding dumpster enclosures to have a certain width whether, or not, it contained one or two dumpsters, as well as an aesthetic enclosure matching the building. He explained the current language requiring a drive approach of a certain length for the truck to service it and requiring an all-enclosure. Concerns have been raised to the Commission over time and the discussion has come about to re-examine and see if any changes are necessary.

Mr. Zeinstra raised a question about the language including an exception for storage building areas on commercial and industrial properties which are fenced and screened not requiring a separate enclosure. Mr. Westerling agreed. Mr. Schutt added that the existing storage fencing would need to include the concrete reinforced 6" bollards and other items consistent with the language already proposed.

Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided.

#### 12. Section 24.06 J. Standards of Approval on Building Appearance.

Mr. Ransford explained that Section 24.06J had certain minimum requirements for commercial and industrial architecture, as well as multi-family developments. The Planning Commission had made a note in months past to this work program about the maximum of 40% glass for a commercial building, a current provision in the zoning ordinance. Recent site plans had used Spandrel glass or similar material that is not a genuine window that one would typically see, so the question was raised if aesthetically proper buildings could be achieved with more than 40% glass, and that some clarity might be needed in how the current language reads.

Chairperson Longcore recommended language indicating at least a minimum of 10% glass, not windows on building frontage. Mr. Westerling, Mr. Schut, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Kelly agreed.

Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided.

13. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments, beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. After all comments were finished, Chairperson Longcore closed the second public comment section.*

1. Catherine Seaver, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
2. Cathy, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
3. Joel Paauwe, Allendale – Comments regarding Commissioner Kelley
4. Kim Cannata, Allendale – Comments regarding the Metro Health Signage

14. Township Board Reports

Bruce Zeinstra reported that they had a Sheriff's update regarding community policing and assigned liaisons to the various boards and committees.

15. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Planner Ransford reminded the Commission of Allendale Baptist Church and the requirements they had been asked to meet one year ago. He asked if the Commission would prefer to schedule a hearing or have a meeting prior to the hearing. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Zeinstra, it was decided to schedule a public hearing, but to review the applicant information prior to the public hearing.

16. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, March 1, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***March 1, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Miles Ulberg, Jack Barr, Matt DeYoung, Kelli McGovern, Lora Richmond, Bob Sullivan, Josh Vruggink
3. Received for information: Several emails were received referencing mining operations on 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bliss Street relative to JMM Development agenda discussion.
4. Motion by Schut to approve the February 15, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Kelley.  
**Approval 7-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the March 1, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
7. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
8. Site Plan Review:
  - a. JMM Developers Mining Application  
Planner Ransford briefed the Commission that JMM Developers had received approval in the fall of 2019 for a mining operation of 280,000 cubic yards. They are requesting to expand their excavation to approximately 774,00 cubic yards resulting in a body of water with a surface area of about 18 ½ acres. Their intent was to complete the project in eight years. Current mining permits expire after five years, but certain review standards could allow a one-time five-year extension, covering the eight-year time frame. He noted that the Commission would first review this before scheduling a public hearing where comments could be received for the proposed site plan.

Chairperson Longcore announced that Bob Sullivan, Counsel for Allendale Township was present to clarify and answer any legal questions. Mr. Jack Barr, Mr. Miles Ulberg, and Mr. Matt DeYoung with JMM Developers were also present. Mr. Barr explained their proposal to expand their operation and to make the present pond larger. He noted with the initial smaller pond size the original permit was sufficient, but that expansion would now require an EGLE permit and a hydrogeological study to be conducted. He also clarified that the current project was not proposing de-watering, so surrounding wells would not be affected.

Chairperson Longcore noted the Commission had received several complaints about road conditions on 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bliss Street, as well as neighborhood complaints about the mining operation. Mr. Barr commented he was not aware of any complaints received. Mr. DeYoung stated he had indirectly heard about some complaints, and the roads had been smoothed as feasibly possible given the freezing and thawing weather conditions. He noted complaints received regarding Bliss Street were unrelated to the JMM mining operation but affirmed they would do their best to work with the Road Commission, possibly reinforcing the roads if necessary. Chairperson Longcore thanked them for their cooperation and asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Zeinstra asked if any consideration had been given to creating a vegetative berm behind the neighborhood. Mr. DeYoung explained that had been the initial plan, but there were conflicting statements from the neighbors. It was suggested by Mr. Zeinstra that a temporary berm to block construction noise might be advisable but was not overly concerned so long as JMM Developers were willing to work with the neighbors and notify them when a public hearing was scheduled. Chairperson Longcore concurred.

Mr. Schut described his recent observations of the rough road condition with Mr. Josh Vrugink, part of the excavation team, discussing recent heavy traffic leading to the road conditions and his desire to attend to the road. Mr. Schut felt a solution was needed to avoid this in the future. In relation to the permit, he offered the option of completing the work in approval phases of three years, and Mr. DeYoung explained they were on target complete their project in four years but had factored in a market slowdown as well. He felt if the project time frame was unacceptable, they might modify the plan and add a private drive on the south. If the market were to collapse, they would change course to 10-12 acres with a road on the south headed east and add lots. He added the goal was to complete the project within a five-year time frame for the EGLE permit.

Planner Ransford responded to Chairperson Longcore's clarification of issuing five-year permits with the right to renewal stating the only extension was the option of a five-year period.

Based on additional comments relating to the pond shape from the Commissioners, Mr. Barr agreed to create and present a new drawing of the pond before the public hearing.

Mr. Kelley asked about potential berms, and Mr. DeYoung reiterated there were conflicting requests with one resident requesting a berm and another not wanting one. Surrounding areas were industrial, so the consensus was to leave the area open but gently sloped.

Mr. Sullivan suggested voluntarily working with the entities as well as checking to see if the zoning ordinance had been violated, allowing for enforcement with that language potentially being added to the resolution.

Mr. DeYoung agreed to be proactive and to maintain the road without the need for legal enforcement and requested to be notified of any complaints. He also agreed with Mr.

Zeinstra's suggestions to work with the Road Commission finding a solution to rebuilding and reinforcing the road.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Sullivan whether they should wait for the EGLE permit or base the renewal on conditions. Mr. Sullivan felt either way would be satisfactory. Mr. Barr explained the process to obtain an EGLE permit could take several weeks to months. Mr. DeYoung added that by spring or early summer the applicant might need a determination by the Commission depending on how things progress over the next several weeks.

The consensus of the Commission was getting preliminary approval would be accepted. Mr. Westerling noted he wanted to be sure there would not be any issues between the two mining operations and the road conditions. Mr. DeYoung assured him that would not be the case.

Chairperson Longcore questioned Mr. Sullivan if language could be added to grant a temporary permit.

Planner Ransford was confident they could draft a resolution for the public hearing.

Chairperson Longcore asked Commissioners if the suggested 50 feet of crushed concrete to maintain the road was sufficient. The consensus was any amount needed to maintain the roads would be appropriate. Fencing around the site and deferring the site around 46<sup>th</sup> avenue was addressed, and the Commissioners agreed to both points. The Commissioners also agreed to renew the permit, and reiterated a plan was needed for road maintenance. Mr. DeYoung again agreed to contact the Road Commission and create an action plan for standard maintenance before the public hearing.

The Commission agreed with modifications to plans discussed and confirmed with Planner Ransford that a public hearing should be scheduled following updated plans and a submission of a plan for road maintenance from the applicant. Mr. Schut also asked Planner Ransford to confirm that zoning would inspect the site checking on proper signage and road conditions, to which Planner Ransford confirmed he would do so.

Chairperson Longcore again thanked JMM Developers for their cooperation.

9. Old Business:

a. Work Program – Tree Preservation Language

Planner Ransford summarized for the public an ordinance adopted by Park Township in Ottawa County, and the Commission was reviewing second draft revisions on five points made in the last meeting to the language for Allendale Township.

The Commissioners deferred to Mr. Sullivan regarding the language and explained that while he understood the intent behind flexible language, he felt it might create extra work for the Commission due to reviewing and making the decisions for applicants. Ultimately, he felt the choice could be left to the Commission.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed language and how to incorporate flexibility within the language and deferred to Mr. Sullivan to address “practical vs. possible.” He did not see distinction, but rather preference. Planner Ransford added that if the Commission chose flexibility in the language, it would be likely applicants would seek exceptions in various situations.

Mr. Zeinstra recommended consistent language of reforestation, clear cutting, and tree canopy by creating a standard percentage for any type of project. The Commission agreed that would be a good solution and that 25% tree canopy coverage would be a good starting point after reviewing previous plans as a reference point.

Additional discussion involved the health analysis language with Planner Ransford confirming the language could be streamlined. Under site plan approval and landscaping, the consensus of the Commission was to ensure that site plans were somehow identified with the certification of a qualified professional.

Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on the comments provided.

b. Section 24.06H – Standards for Approval of Waste Disposal Facilities

Planner Ransford recapped the previous discussion for the bollards to be filled completely with concrete and for the ability of someone with outdoor storage to utilize the area essentially with the same type of screening installing a dumpster and the general approach area to be defined with bollards.

Mr. Zeinstra commented that he had communicated with a local garbage service. They had explained to Mr. Zeinstra they felt the 10’ width was too small with the hinges inside and asked to increase the measurement to 11’. They also suggested that gates be 6” ground clearance and whether dumpster lids needed to be required if already in enclosures.

Mr. Schut agreed with most points but felt the 10’ was sufficient. He also addressed his suggested revisions including moving language involving slats in fencing being moved to the applicable section; also, allowing a small opening to be allowed without needing to open a gate. He recommended removing language requiring steel bump posts in front of the enclosure and suggested that the interior bump posts should be 1’ from the interior wall and should be a minimum of 3’ apart rather than 3’ on center. He also recommended that truck access way should also be present for the storage areas that contain dumpsters to prevent trucks from having to back into a roadway.

The Commissioners discussed the various measurements and wording and agreed the gates should hang on the 6” posts, protecting the front wall. They consented to add language that clarified that hinges should be on the outside of the gates to ensure the width was a true 10’ unobstructed with a 2’ clearance around each dumpster, 1’ on either side.



Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided.

c. Section 24.06 J. - Standards of Approval on Building Appearance.

Mr. Ransford explained the Planning Commission had made a note in months past to this work program about the maximum of 40% glass for a commercial building, a current provision in the zoning ordinance. Commissioners had decided to change the language to a minimum of 10% for commercial buildings and including the provision that the use of Spandrel glass or similar material was acceptable, rather than requiring a genuine window.

Mr. Schut questioned whether 10% glass toward residential district was necessary. Mr. Zeinstra agreed. Chairperson Longcore cited examples of business butting up to residential, and not necessarily needing 10% glass on the backside. Further discussion involved concerns of parking being limited and the intent of trying to utilize parking in the back behind the building, thus deciding what amount of glass would be necessary.

Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided.

10. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

11. Township Board Reports

Mr. Zeinstra reported at the last meeting a presentation had been made by the Statue Committee for the Garden of Honor with updates to solutions and approval for five additional meetings. A PUD Public Hearing was held for Hidden Shores West.

12. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

No comments were made.

13. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, March 15, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***March 15, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Sara-Moring Hilt, Curtis Moran, Kelli McGovern, Kelly Kuiper, Miles Ulberg, Lora Richmond
3. Received for information: No information received.
4. Motion by Kelley to approve the March 1, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Westerling.  
**Approval 7-0**
5. Motion by Longcore recommending switching the order of new business and old business and to approve the March 15, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra.  
**Approval 7-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no public comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
7. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
8. New Business:
  - a. 5015 Warner – Mining Application – 70-09-13-200-006  
Kelly Kuiper with Nederveld, on behalf of operator, Mr. Curtis Moran, briefed the Commission regarding the project of two small ponds, each 4.9 acres with a total sand volume of over 250,000 cubic yards mined through traditional methods. The proposed time frame and request for the project is five years. Ms. Kuiper also reiterated that the haul route was as close as possible to the proposed truck haul route.

Ms. Kuiper stated they would be addressing some clerical errors from a previous Township memo and brought two items before the Commission needing approval:

- Proposal of 50 ft of crushed concrete vs. asphalt at the construction access road.
- Deferment on a sidewalk until the road is paved.

In addition, Ms. Kuiper referred to the Road Commission letter of credit or performance bond previously recommended by Mr. Jody Carter for a performance bond in the amount of \$40,000 per mile. Ms. Kuiper noted there would be 1-1/4 miles until they reached the pavement. She stated that Mr. Moran and Mr. Carter were currently working on a permitting mechanism concerning mining operations on dirt roads to ensure there would be a way to satisfactorily maintain the road.

Mr. Adams inquired about the ground water being managed during excavation, and Mr. Moran explained the water shed sloping downward and water running into the bayou, as well as the clay layer with the moorings. He assured the Commission that they would have adequate means to excavate and provide ample soil for future construction. In addition, he addressed how the County was working with the applicant. He also addressed the miscommunication that led to noise concerns of starting up equipment too early along the road and explained they have requested the trucks not to line up until 7:10 a.m. on weekdays and 8:10a.m. on weekends. He also agreed to amend the posted sign indicating to call the specified number for dispatch to handle any complaints immediately.

Ms. Kuiper addressed Ms. Vandenberg's letter discussing that the rear and behind the lots was not accessible unless a private drive was provided along the easement in addition to the access at the road, which was something that could be completed.

Mr. Schut maintained his concern about the layout of the development and the splits of the lots and opposed setting a public hearing,

Chairperson Longcore recommended scheduling a public hearing barring there were no anticipated major changes to the site plans. Ms. Kuiper confirmed any possible changes would be minor.

Discussion occurred among the Commissioners regarding methods of public notice, and it was determined that there was ample notification to the public according to the Township ordinances. Commissioners agreed a public hearing could be set, and Chairperson Longcore thanked the applicants.

9. Old Business:

A. Work Program

1. Section 3.19 – Tree Preservation Language

Planner Ransford summarized for the public an ordinance adopted by Park Township in Ottawa County that the Commission was reviewing for third draft revisions on five points made in the last meeting to the language for Allendale Township. He mentioned that a tree canopy analysis was in the process of being completed for the purpose of determining what percentage to maintain as a minimum canopy coverage within the revision.

Mr. Schut questioned the definition of tree size being 6" or greater in diameter, and the Commissioners agreed that the language adopted by Park Township was sufficient. He also recommended to the Commissioners that the tree canopy language apply to all projects. The initial consensus was that the clear cutting and tree canopy language should be drafted to be applied to any project prior to site plan approval.

Chairperson Longcore recommended adding language to section three to potentially include "further, the cutting of any tree within a project prior to a site plan approval." The Commissioners discussed whether the language should keep the 25% canopy coverage or create a range with Mr. Schut voicing concern that 25% was not enough.

Planner Ransford explained that he had reviewed three recent site plans and hoped to have example site plans for a point of comparison in the coming weeks, and the Commissioners agreed they would review those when received.

Mr. Zeinstra suggested replacing the first part entirely with “the Planning Commission may require an inventory” which was agreed upon by the Commissioners.

Planner Ransford agreed to make the updates and added that he was also waiting to hear from Mr. Sullivan regarding the recent proposed language and would review any changes.

## 2. Section 24.06H – Standards for Approval of Waste Disposal Facilities

Planner Ransford recapped the previous discussion of the changes for the third draft revisions.

Mr. Schut pointed out that item 2d should indicate “no more than” rather than “at least three feet apart.” Planner Ransford agreed to prepare revisions to the language for the Commission to review based on comments provided. Mr. Schut also requested dropping the “13 feet” space requirement. Mr. Zeinstra concurred, and consensus was reached with direction provided to Ransford.

## 3. Section 24.06 J. - Standards for Approval on Building Appearance.

Planner Ransford summarized the two items of revision from the prior review: to not apply the minimal glass requirement adjacent to residential areas and to parking areas except for customer parking.

The Commissioners agreed the revisions had progressed and although Counsel Sullivan would still be reviewing the revisions, they did not anticipate there would be significant changes, thus a Public Hearing could be set.

## B. Master Plan – Map

Planner Ransford recapped the work on the existing base map and the six changes the Commission had requested. Relative to the November 2020 meeting, he had worked on clarification to the master plan classification and zoning ordinance district table. He concluded this could only be done through amending the zoning district names which would prove difficult. He explained once the Master Plan was finalized, the plan and supporting documents could be reviewed and a decision made to make those amendments if necessary.

The Commissioners agreed that the map met the overall expectations. Mr. Zuniga noted some areas with possible re-zoning changes. The Commissioners discussed these and clarified the changes needing to be updated. Direction was provided to Ransford to revise the map accordingly and proceed with the next step in the process. Ransford indicated that he would bundle all of the text together with the maps and return the entire draft document to the Planning Commission for further review.

10. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no public comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

11. Township Board Reports

Mr. Zeinstra reported updates to Department Heads in Assessing, Finance, and Human Resources. The Board also approved a new Township Business Registration for maintaining all new businesses and contact information, as well as the PUD Amendment for Hidden Shores West.

12. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Zuniga asked for clarification about the use of decorative blocks for sidewalks per the Township ordinance, and Planner Ransford confirmed it was permissible.

13. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, April 5, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***April 5, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Zuniga, Adams, Kelley, Longcore  
Absent: Schut, Zeinstra  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Aaron Biler, Jim Christopolaus, Peter Christopolaus, Connor Galligan, Joe Grochowalski, Mark Green, Lora Richmond, Brian Sinnut, Steve Vandyken, Greg Yaklin,
3. Received for information: Georgetown Charter Township Planning Commission Master Plan Amendment Notice and a letter from Fleis & VandenBrink regarding the Mr. Burger Application being discussed by the Planning Commission.
4. Motion by Kelley to approve the March 15, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Adams.  
**Approval 5-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the April 5, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 5-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Connor Galligan facilitated the public comments beginning with callers and proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no public comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
7. Public Hearings: no public hearings were scheduled.
8. Old Business:
  - A. Allendale Baptist Church – Planned Unit Development Site Plan  
Mr. Brian Sinnott with Fleis & VandenBrink, explained the project had been turned over to Pinnacle Construction. Mr. Mark Green and Mr. Greg Yaklin, representing Allendale Baptist Church were present. Mr. Yaklin explained they had revised their site plan and had resolved previous questions by the Commission and further explained they were seeking a phased approach due to cost increases.  
  
Planner Ransford recapped the memo stating the public hearing had been set for April 19, 2021 based on previous discussion at the February 15, 2020 Commission meeting. The current discussion was to update the Commissioners on the project in preparation for the public hearing. He indicated a few changes had been made since the prior approval, namely to the dumpster enclosure appearance, the removal of the cross structure on Lake Michigan drive, the elevation sheet possibly changing from precast concrete to an insulated metal panel, which they are reviewing as an option, and having wheel barrier stops rather than a landscaped island.

Chairperson Longcore inquired about the decision date regarding the elevation sheet materials, and Mr. Yaklin clarified the change was being considered in case of future expansion. Among the Commissioners, the consensus was that a final decision should be made before the next meeting.

Mr. Sinnut addressed Chairperson Longcore's inquiry about the change to the grass wheel stops and explained the original plan included two dog-bone shaped landscaped islands, changed to one larger island with parking spaces connected to each other without wheel stops. Mr. Adams asked if there would be a curb, and Mr. Sinnut clarified that the dog-bone island would have a mountable curb, along with curbs in appropriate areas. The Commissioners agreed what was presented as sufficient.

Chairperson Longcore mentioned the last revision of the resident screening and reduced landscaping, and Mr. Biler with Pinnacle Construction, explained that new drawings had been made, but that any reduction was not intentional and agreed to Chairperson Longcore's request to review whether anything needed to be added back. Mr. Biler also referred to the cross structure, inquiring what the process might be if in the future they desired to build it, and if it should be included in the current drawings or removed.

Chairperson Longcore suggested it would follow the same process for a building project with Planner Ransford confirming if it were a structure rather than a sign, it would become part of the PUD process--unless made a provision of the current approval. Chairperson Longcore asked if it were included, but not built, what the outcome would be, and Planner Ransford clarified there would no issue, so consensus was reached that the structure should be included in the drawings.

Mr. Yaklin clarified the cross structure would be in addition to the sign, not a replacement. Planner Ransford pointed out initially the Commission had been concerned with the photo metrics, and if the cross structure were added to the current drawings, photo metrics would need to be included. Mr. Yaklin and Mr. Biler agreed.

Mr. Green asked the Commission if they could begin clearing the land before the public hearing. Planner Ransford responded that preparing the site to build without beginning construction was currently permitted, although there could be some risk, dependent on whether the public expressed concern over any issues.

Chairperson Longcore thanked the applicants, noting their next meeting would be the public hearing.

9. New Business:

A. Allendale Christian School Building Addition– Minor vs. Major Determination

Becky Page with Holland Engineering explained the proposal of an amendment for special land use for a building addition of 12,878 square feet and whether it would be a major or minor revision for special land use. The existing parking was believed to be adequate for the needs of the special addition, with current use being about 40 of the 110 parking spaces on the property, excluding special events. Current arrangements with Family Fare provide extra parking for special events, which typically occur only a couple of times per year. Ms. Page noted they were close to receiving approval from Ottawa County Water Resources for storm water drainage.

Planner Ransford summarized a memo indicating Allendale Christian School was a special use site, and the Planning Commission needed to determine if a change were major or minor. In anticipation the proposed addition might be a major change, Planner Ransford had requested the applicant prepare a narrative. The resulting narrative addressed the existing exterior lighting, the exterior dumpster enclosure, existing landscaping, and irrigation. Further, the Commission had the authority to determine what attributes of a site required updating based on certain review criteria provided by Section 24.11, provided in the memo for reference.

Chairperson Longcore asked about the increase in number of students and daily trips to the site. Ms. Page explained there would be approximately 100 more students for a total of roughly 500 students; however, many current and new students would be part-time. She also noted that many students use the public bus system, therefore a significant increase in family pickup and drop-offs was not expected, except for times the busses did not operate. She indicated that the drop-off and pick-up overflow primarily occurred only on Henry Street cul-de-sac area, to which Mr. Langford disagreed based on his experience driving through the area frequently.

Mr. Westerling raised a question relating to whether the increase would primarily involve an increase to middle-school student population potentially increasing vehicle traffic entering and exiting the property for pick-up and drop-offs. Mr. Zuniga suggested that some drop-offs might simply include more children per vehicle, but the increase in middle-school classrooms could indicate an increase in family units arriving daily.

The Commissioners agreed the proposed addition would be a major change. Planner Ransford provided additional information to the applicant about traffic study requirements involving daily peak trips and total daily trips, and possibly a third threshold. The applicant asked about the proposed landscaping being compliant and whether a hedge barrier was still necessary near the roadway since Family Fare on the opposing site has an existing hedge barrier preventing direct view from their property.

Chairperson Longcore explained that the commissioners would review the details and make considerations where possible at the point of the hearing.

#### B. Mr. Burger – Walgreens Planned Unit Development Amendment & Site Plan

Mr. Steve Witte with Nederveld, briefed the Commission that approximately a year prior, full site approval for the Raymond building had been completed, but the developer had changed course and now had a purchase agreement for the Mr. Burger site. The proposed Mr. Burger construction in the Walgreen's PUD would be a 5,414 sq. ft. restaurant with plans depicting room for a possible future office building on the south side of the property. This would be considered a second phase to the property, with a future proposal to the Commission for site plan approval and review. He pointed out there was already existing access, so new driveways were not being proposed. In addition, there were sufficient parking spaces per the ordinance and the planned landscaping meets the ordinance requirements for privacy. He also addressed the following items for consideration by the Commission: the dumpster area recommended bollards considering the exclusive drive to it; whether a traffic study was necessary;



recommended curbing southeast of the drive-thru entrance; possible compromise on the parapet wall requirements.

Planner Ransford added the previous Raymond building was specific in terms of the previously approved amendment through the PUD process, thus due to the generality of the drive-thru would need to go back through the previous process. If the office building were added later, they would need to come back before the Commission under site review a second time. Mr. Witte confirmed the intent would be to come back before the Committee in the future at the time of construction, for architectural reasons, but not for the purpose of a second public hearing.

Chairperson Longcore asked for clarification on why the PUD would need amending if they were already in compliance, and Planner Ransford explained the original Walgreen's PUD had a building allocated with exact specifications for the property. Because of the general changes, the amendment needed to be made to allow for Mr. Burger and the future building. However, if the Commission accepted the proposed changes, a revision could be made for just a site plan review in the future, and not a public hearing.

Chairperson Longcore asked Planner Ransford to provide Mr. Witte with the updated dumpster enclosure specifications and then inquired about the original PUD drawings and the intent that there would be no drive thru. Mr. Longcore recalled the Commission making an amendment based on the assumption that the original plan would be a business that had an occasional drive-thru and voiced concerned Mr. Burger would be busier.

Mr. Witte mentioned Covid had increased their drive thru traffic, but Mr. Burger was not a fast-food establishment, and asked for further comment from Mr. Burger owners, Mr. Peter Christopoulos, and Mr. Jimmy Christopoulos. They explained that drive-thru service had been busier at existing stores due to Covid but was expected to decrease somewhat as indoor capacity increased, and that pre-covid it had been mainly indoor dining.

Chairperson Longcore pointed out that due to covid more people were now aware Mr. Burger offered drive-thru service, and the numbers might not decrease. Peter Christopoulos reiterated that they did not receive the quantity of people as a standard fast-food chain. Mr. Westerling asked if the drive-thru menu was a full or limited menu. They confirmed it was limited, to which Mr. Westerling surmised more people would return to eating inside. Mr. Steve Vandyken also responded due to covid, inside and drive-through business was a 50/50 percentage, but they were seeing a growing trend more to inside business, and that they received about 150 visits per day.

Mr. Adams asked about the potential for a higher density business to move into the property in the future and what mechanism would be in place to address further increase in density due to the planned drive thru under discussion.

Mr. Zuniga raised the idea of additional landscaping around the speaker and possibly adjusting the angle to ensure that the speaker is not heard off property.

There was discussion among the Commissioners as to specifications due to the potential of another business replacing Mr. Burger in the future. Mr. Joe Grochowalski, with Omega Construction, pointed out that no Mr. Burger has been torn down or replaced aside from one that was replaced by a larger Mr. Burger adjacent to the one torn down, and

Chairperson Longcore reminded him the Commission needed to plan for any potential, unexpected future events.

Chairperson Longcore asked about a sidewalk that dead ended into the property from Walgreens, and Mr. Witte explained that it did not connect to 68<sup>th</sup> Street on the other end and would likely be tied together with a later project unrelated to the proposed building.

Mr. Zuniga mentioned wanting to see the sidewalk that dead ended into the site being extended and tied into the future office building and suggested to see potential options. Chairperson Longcore concurred, and Mr. Witte agreed to provide them.

Regarding the top of the building, Mr. Witte provided Google Street Views showing a higher view than what the public would see from a standing position. Mr. Grochowalski explained the roof sloping and suggested taking photos of the Hudsonville store to help determine if they could use 8" or 24" block parapet walls rather than 48" due to impacts from snow drift and other weight considerations, and whether they could screen the area with less than 48" of other type of screening. Mr. Zuniga cited McDonalds being required to increase their screening due to an adjacent building. Mr. Grochowalski said screening similar with McDonald's could be accomplished, and Chairperson Longcore reiterated the intention of screening being the primary concern.

Chairperson Longcore concurred a traffic analysis should not be necessary as there was already a turn lane on Lake Michigan Drive and the plan is in line with what was previously approved.

Planner Ransford clarified that his observation on the steel bump guard posts was that they were simply outside of the curb, not that they conflicted with the ordinance. He also mentioned that the striped island in the southeast area across from the order board will fade over time, and that the Commission could require a raised island. The Commissioners had no concerns with the current plan.

10. Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Connor Galligan facilitated the public comments beginning with the callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized, but no public comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

11. Township Board Reports

Due to Mr. Zeinstra's absence, no board reports were presented.

12. Commissioner and Staff Comments

13. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, April 18, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***April 19, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Kelley  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Bill Amstutz, Jack Barr, Mindy Beck, Megan Beltman, Jeff Brinks, Aaron Byler, Gloria and Robert Curtis, Bruce DeVrue, Matt DeYoung, Mary and David Esther, Randy Feenstra, Jay Knoper, James Gerakinis, Mark Green, Curtis Moran, Kelli McGovern, Lora Richmond, Brian Sinnott, Dave Van Enk, Greg Yaklin
- 3) Received for information: An email regarding concerns received regarding mining applications set for public hearing.
- 4) Motion by Adams to approve the April 5, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Zuniga.  
**Approval 6-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the April 15, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern facilitated the public comments beginning with callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized and comments made were regarding the public hearings. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
- 7) Public Hearings:
  - A. JMM Developers Mining Application  
Planner Ransford summarized his memorandum regarding the application to issue a special use permit to mine approximately 774,196 cubic yards of sand from the property on 46th Avenue. The applicant was seeking to expand construction for approximately 11 lots for future parcels and a larger body of water. At the conclusion of the excavation, modification could be sought under appropriate application processes if desired. The Commission met with the applicant in a prior Commission meeting, giving directions for making the necessary adjustments. A sample resolution for the project had been drafted. The Township had received complaints and concerns from neighbors about the road conditions for this site and a separate mining operation in the area. The Township attorney was present in the last meeting to help discuss those issues with the applicant and to strengthen the resolutions if they are adopted--to provide and make sure that road maintenance occurs and the problems do not persist, which was reflected in the draft resolution subject to the process and public hearing prior to consideration for possible adoption during the meeting.  
  
Mr. Jack Barr, with Nederveld, described the proposed change at the request of the Commission to add more character to the lake resulting in a kidney bean shape, as well as the berm on the north property line. Subsequent after the meeting, there was discussion with the Township, Road Commission, the excavator, and the applicant coming to an

agreement for road maintenance and who would finance it. Mr. Barr also mentioned much of the concern for the poor road condition was due to snow melt and that there was a plan moving forward to maintain it.

*Kelli McGovern opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. There were no comments made during the hearing. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

Mr. Longcore discussed an emailed complaint involving a separate property asking if there had been any complaints about hours of operation or dust. Mr. Matt DeYoung, representing the contractor, stated he was unaware of any complaints about hours of operation, per the ordinance, or dust the site has generated. With permission from the Road Commission, ditches and swales were created for drainage to protect the road and are prepared to add slag to fill in potholes as needed. Additionally, a bond up to \$100,000 was in place to ensure meeting their obligations. The loader/operator would be present and observant for any road needs. In addition, a 25 MPH speed limit sign had been posted, and they would monitor and enforce speeds of the trucks to protect the road.

The Commissioners spoke favorably of the changes made to the proposed plan. Planner Ransford added that a minor change had been made to the language of the resolution to strengthen the Commissions ability to enforce it.

Mr. Zeinstra recommended a larger, separate temporary sign be added to make it easier to read from the roadway when the gate is open, and Mr. DeYoung clarified there were two separate signs, one on the gate and a larger one closer to the road.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the resolution as presented for the proposed plan, seconded by Westerling. **Approved: 6-0**

#### B. 5015 Warner Mining Application

Planner Ransford summarized for the public that Mr. Curtis Moran was seeking to excavate about 252,006 cubic yards of sand at the rate of 50,000 cubic yards annually to complete the mining operation in a five-year period. This would result in two ponds and the proposal is generally similar with other mining operations. Due to smaller bodies of water, there would not be a hydrological study, but it was an option the Commission could require.

Mr. Curtis Moran addressed the road maintenance issues, explaining that after meeting with the public, the Road Commission, he believed they had a satisfactory solution. There were now daily checks on the road by the loader/operator to complete road maintenance as necessary to help avoid complaints. He added they had increased signage information for the public and have clear communication to the residents.

*Kelli McGovern opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. Participants and callers were recognized, and comments were made. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

- 1) Jay Knoper: Concern regarding lots being landlocked and the private existing easement.
- 2) Bruce De Vrou: Concern regarding truck traffic using 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and requested a hydrological study be completed.
- 3) Megan Beltman: Concern about the drainage tile and requested a hydrological study be completed.

- 4) Deanna: Opposed the original current mining operation being approved but asked since approved the operation be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Moran addressed the comments, explaining one of the mining operations would be completed this summer. Regarding the water concerns, he explained many of the previous water issues were related to the Marshall Aquifer, and this mining operation was related to the Glacial Aquifer, which had no issues. Once the clay layer was reached, the digging stopped, and the ponds act as settling ponds for the storm water burden. The haul route was east to 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Lake Michigan Drive, thus dividing the traffic to help with the concentration of trucks. Regarding the easement, he clarified it was a county easement with public service, and an easement would be created to access the lots on the north side of the pond.

Mr. Schut raised concerns about the smaller size of the easement and general layout deficiencies involving the parcel splits and landlocked areas due to the two ponds. He also questioned the property's sales history relating to the insufficient size of the easement. Planner Ransford provided further background, explaining the proposal was shared with the Zoning Administrator and Assessor with the same concerns, and some communities prohibited property being bisected by water, however, Allendale's ordinances did not. Both the Zoning Administrator and Assessor indicated that the end use lots are compliant.

Mr. Longcore and Mr. Schut spoke about the private road ordinance in relation to the development and how the easement could potentially tie into it. In response, Mr. Moran discussed how they arrived at the current plan exceeding the 1:4 ratios with land division splits by having 8 in the plan.

Mr. Zeinstra referenced Item #6 in the Private Road Standards concerned that although they are not providing entry, they would still be providing access to two lots, as well as the County property behind the two houses which would likely require a private road. Planner Ransford agreed to verify with Ottawa County Road Commission about the property. Mr. Westerling mentioned that trespassing due to ice fishing could be a concern.

The Commissioners discussed concerns about not knowing enough about the use of the existing easement, whether it would be legal or not at the current size, its current purpose, and how Lots B, E, F, & G would have access to the rear of their properties. Direction was provided to Ransford to investigate the history of the area parcels and consult with the Township Attorney regarding construction of a private road.

Motion made by Zeinstra to table the proposal, seconded by Westerling.

**Approved 6 to 0.**

Responding to the Commission's decision, Mr. Moran asked if part of the future resolution could be the created easement with approval from both sides. In addition, he inquired about the properties being split and a more feasible way to develop the property. Mr. Zeinstra responded that his concern was how the existing easement would be used, whether it was legal or would need upgrading, and how residents would access the back of their properties. It was noted by Planner Ransford that legal counsel had not been asked to review the plans regarding this.

#### C. Allendale Baptist Church – Planned Unit Development Site Plan

Planner Ransford outlined a church building construction proposal by Allendale Baptist Church located on the south side of Lake Michigan Drive, east of Family Fare. The proposal came through the PUD process and included a concept for a possible future building without specific details on the site plan. It would be accessed by WJ Presley

Parkway connecting to Henry Street on the southwest toward Allendale Christian School. The plan included a parking lot for the church building, landscaping, utilities, water detention, a civic space near the front of the Lake Michigan property, and pathways connecting to the Lake Michigan Drive sidewalk. The Planning Commission was the reviewing body before making recommendation to the Board of Trustees because it was a PUD, as a requirement of the zoning ordinance, and the Township Board would also hold a public hearing as a requirement of statute.

The Planning Commission initially reviewed the site plan in February 2020 and provided the applicant direction. The Commission recently reviewed the site plan and discussed the cross structure along Lake Michigan Drive and having it lighted. Previously, the church considered abandoning the cross structure but desired the option to keep it included. The Commission had requested the photometrics for the lighting around the cross structure, but the applicant had encountered difficulties in producing the photometrics without ordering the structure or having it constructed. They planned to limit the light illumination, and to ensure it did not trespass into the right of way or adjacent properties. The way the resolution was proposed, the future building would not require a full PUD amendment rather just site plan approval if the current PUD process recognized something would go in the location, and the Commission agreed it to be appropriate for general commercial spaces similar with other site plans. The church hoped this could be the process for the future building addition. This would be a recommendation to the Board of Trustees if the Commission is ready after the public hearing.

Mr. Jeff Brinks with Venture Engineering discussed their efforts to try to obtain a photometric for the cross structure which could be produced later, prior to seeking approval and expressed his interest in answering any further questions.

*Kelli McGovern opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. Participants and callers were recognized, and a comment was made. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

- 1) Aaron Byler – Pinnacle Construction, General Contractor for Allendale Baptist Church, requested the Commission consider approval for both Phase 1 and Phase II.

Mr. Longcore asked for any questions or comments, and Mr. Schut addressed the phasing of the project, having no issues with approving both phases of the church building now. The Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Adams sought clarification about increased parking spaces on the site plan, and Mr. Brinks explained the parking was sufficient for both the building as proposed and with the addition in the next phase. He also added for the Commissioner's reference, the Storm Water Management Facilities had been designed with future parking and building additions.

In response to Mr. Adams inquiry regarding an emergency overflow, Mr. Brinks explained it would not overflow on any public areas and was designed to hold overflow two times, 100-year storm events based on Ottawa County standards.

The Commissioners discussed the site plans for the cross structure and the lighting and agreeing they would like to review the plan again when more information was available. Planner Ransford mentioned that the cross structure could be authorized through the PUD process to allow it to remain where it was shown, but Mr. Schut preferred not to approve its location at the current time, with several Commissioners in agreement.

Planner Ransford followed-up by asking the Commission if they considered this structure a major or minor amendment, and how the applicant could better prepare for the future or whether it could be approved based on coming back to the Commission at a future time when ready to construct it.

There was discussion about the cross and whether another public hearing would be necessary. Mr. Schut recommended documentation for the future, and in response, Mr. Zeinstra advised more information was needed, including height, setback location, and the fall zone. The consensus among the Commissioners was standard site plan approval would be satisfactory for future construction.

Mr. Schut expressed concern that the rooftop equipment proposed renderings did not follow the standard parapets per the ordinance and questioned the consistency for future building approvals. Referring to previous notes, Planner Ransford pointed out the Commission had offered some flexibility, and the church had proceeded based on that flexibility. Mr. Schut and Mr. Adams suggested that perhaps having 3-D renderings might be helpful to presenting a clear presentation to the final sight lines of the building.

Mr. Brinks reiterated that comments and concerns from the February 2020 meeting had been addressed and felt they had submitted a final presentation accommodating those requirements and was able to locate some previous renderings to screenshare with the Commission. Viewing these, the Commissioners asked for clarification on the colors of the rooftop enclosures, and Mr. Byler confirmed the rooftop enclosures would match the look of the building allowing for a unified architectural presence.

The Commissioners discussed whether the applicant had met the special PUD requirements initially requested, with Mr. Schut expressing concern over the sight line and parapet wall. Mr. Zeinstra was not opposed to the renderings, but suggested future ordinance revisions regarding roof screenings, and that the renderings would need to be updated to say Phase I and Phase II as opposed to future site plans.

Motion was made by Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the Allendale Baptist Church with the following exceptions:

- The cross structure would be presented for site plan approval before construction.
- The proposed building and future building addition be changed to Phase I and Phase II.
- The metal paneling to color match the background on the renderings.
- The future addition would not be required to come back for site plan approval.

Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**

D. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

- Section 3.19 – Tree Preservation
- Section 24.06H – Waste Disposal
- Section 24.06J – Building Appearance

Planner Ransford recapped proposed new language to three sections which have been available for public review. Section 3.19 involves tree preservation. Section 24.06H includes amendments to an existing section involving waste disposal areas and enclosures. Section 24.06J involves building appearance for commercial building façade which currently limits buildings to a maximum of 40% glass and proposes to have a 10% minimum of glass instead. Also, a canopy analysis was done on three properties involving approximately 8%, 15% and 33.5% canopy coverage at maturity.

*Kelli McGovern opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. There were no comments made during the hearing. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Longcore discussed the removal of the phrase “exclusive of that required by article 21A” under item 3 for tree canopy to simply require 25% canopy coverage for the property not including the right of way.

Motion was made by Schut to recommend to the Board the text amendments to add 3.19, revise 24.06H, and revise 24.06J to be approved with changes and the removal of the phrase “exclusive of that required by 21A”. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 6-0.**

8) New Business

A. Kennedy Lake Site Condominium - Phase II and Private Road

Mr. Ransford explained that Kennedy Lake was applying for their second and final phase of the authorized PUD from 2016. In 2017, Phase I was approved as a site condominium and private road application. Since that time, there were private road modifications to the ordinance, different from the time the road was originally constructed. Township Legal Counsel believed the Commission could grant permission to reduce the road requirements for phase 2 based on phase 1 construction as part of the PUD process, dependent on it if were determined as a major or minor change or hold the applicant to the current language. Planner Ransford noted a traffic assessment was provided by the applicant and had been submitted to the Township Engineer.

Mr. Randy Feenstra, the applicant confirmed there were no changes to the submission but expressed concern about the difference in the road ordinance language and requested that they could continue with their original design.

The consensus of the Commission was that to maintain the design and keep the continuity of the construction would be satisfactory. Mr. Longcore asked about requiring a cul-de-sac and Planner Ransford confirmed the Commission could require it. After discussion, the Commission felt it would not be necessary.

Planner Ransford confirmed the applicant was aware of the documents needed to prepare for a future public hearing. Mr. Feenstra was unable to respond due to technology issues, and Mr. Longcore moved ahead to the Public Comments.

9) Second Public Comment

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kelli McGovern announced there were no participants. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

10) Township Board Reports

An intern was hired to help in the office and be the Community Coordinator, and another individual was hired to complete codification of the Township ordinances.

11) Commissioner and Staff Comments:

No comments were made.

12) Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, May 3, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*



**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**May 3, 2021**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Via Zoom Software**

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Westerling  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Leonard Beck, Megan Beltman, Brett Butler, Jimmy Christopoulos, Greg DeYoung, Steve Holub, Jay Knoper, Patrick Marks, Curtis Moran, Patrick Morrow, Lora Richmond, Matt Sikma, Mike Tiesma, Katelyn Wallace, Steve Witte, Kevin Yeomans
- 3) Received for information: Received emails of concern regarding the Warner site mining application and Mr. Burger, as well as Commissioners receiving an updated version of the text amendments approved last month.
- 4) Motion by Schut to approve the April 19, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Adams.  
**Approved: 6-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the May 3, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved: 6-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kevin Yeomans facilitated the public comments beginning with callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized and comments made were regarding the public hearings. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
  1. Jay Knoper - Expressed concerns regarding Warner site mining application with access and easements and requested a hydrogeological study.
  2. Megan Beltman - Expressed concerns regarding road conditions at Warner site mining and requested a hydrogeological study.
  3. Patrick Marks - Questions regarding Mr. Burger application, including landscaping, hours of operation, and drive through.
- 7) Public Hearings:
  - A. Walgreens Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – Mr. Burger  
Planner Ransford summarized that Mr. Burger was proposing to amend the Walgreens PUD for similar reasons the prior applicant at the same address proposed. The current PUD does not permit for drive-through use, so an amendment was required. Mr. Burger has their site plan prepared which proposes a future building at the south end with an unknown occupant, subject to site plan review in the future. Commissioners reviewed and provided feedback on elimination of some parking spaces near the menu order board allowing for a clear designated access or path for pedestrians possibly coming to the property from 68<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The applicant proposed to construct a concrete sidewalk in front of the future building on the south end and to connect on the west side of the building at the sidewalk around the building. They also provided two alternative paths to get to the building. The drive through peninsula was also lengthened since last review.

Additionally, the Township Attorney had been consulted and the Planning Commission would need to address the drive through re-design because the Planning Commission cannot condition the drive-thru design specific to Mr. Burger.

Mr. Steve Witte, with Nederveld and representing Mr. Burger, explained the application proposed a 5,514 square foot restaurant and a future office building (at a later unknown date, understanding site approval would be needed). Other inclusions were proposing a total of 97 parking spaces and providing a 30' greenbelt and a berm to shield adjacent property on the west. On the south they would maintain existing landscape to meet ordinance requirements. The building would be the same Mr. Burger structure as the current one in Hudsonville. Since the last meeting, modifications had also been made to the sign. In addition, the sidewalk would go south of the parking area, then north to the building for optimal access and then set up for a future building. Elevations were modified and parapet walls were added to the south.

*Kevin Yeomans opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. Callers and participants were recognized, and comments were made during the hearing. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

1. Patrick Marks – Expressed concern regarding the berm height and trash control, as well as the extended hours of business.

Mr. Schut asked Mr. Witte about the berm, with Mr. Witte clarified the proposal was more robust than the ordinance required, by providing larger trees and shrubs. He further explained Mr. Burger wanted the ability to have a drive through and did not want to eliminate that option. Mr. Longcore asked if drive through hours were limited, would it impact any potential future users, to which Planner Ransford confirmed was the case.

The Commissioners discussed whether hours should be limited or moved to 10:00 pm. Mr. Schut and Mr. Zeinstra did not want to reduce the business hours from the hours approved for the prior applicant, but also suggested adding fencing if the hours were kept to midnight. Mr. Zuniga and Mr. Adams both voiced concern that midnight was too late. Mr. Christopoulos agreed to the fence if that would allow the hours to remain at midnight. Ultimately, the compromise of 11:00 p.m. was decided upon.

The Commissioners discussed the sidewalk plans and agreed the new modifications tying it to the future office building were satisfactory.

After discussion, the Commission agreed that the proposed screening on the rooftop of the Mr. Burger should remain in the plan rather than addressing it when the later south building site plan is reviewed.

There were no comments to the proposed resolution presented by Planner Ransford.

Motion was made by Schut to recommend to the Board of Trustees the approval of the Walgreens PUD resolution with a modification to the hours of operation to be limited to 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Seconded by Zuniga. Opposed by Mr. Adams. **Approved: 5-1**

B. University Park Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – Metro Health Signage  
Planner Ransford summarized his memo indicating that Metro Health was recently approved for a medical facility building on the property, a use that is permitted by the PUD which went through the ordinary site plan review with the Planning Commission. The applicant inquired about the signage limitations of the zoning ordinances regarding the property being a corner lot and a through lot having three sides along right of way: 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Becker Drive and Lake Michigan Drive. The applicant had provided various

types of elevations for signage that comply along with non-compliant signage they were seeking through a request to amend the PUD regarding this specific site but would not affect the rest of the PUD.

Steve Witte with Nederveld addressed the additional signage request for Metro Health and MHP Allandale LLC, 1<sup>st</sup> request was more than one freestanding sign by including a second sign along Lake Michigan Drive in addition to the one along Becker Drive. The second request is to allow a larger than required ground mounted sign along Lake Michigan Drive. The third request was that the wall sign be increased to 234 square feet.

*Kevin Yeomans opened the public hearing for comments and provided instructions for how to be recognized to make a comment. Participants and callers were recognized, and comments were made. Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section and moved to Commissioner and Staff comments.*

1. Brett Butler – Reiterated the reasoning for the expanded signage and wayfinding, particularly due to the higher speed of traffic on Lake Michigan Drive.

The Commissioners commented on their appreciation seeing a side-by-side comparison, but the majority felt the ordinance size was appropriate rather than the expanded signage. Mr. Zeinstra voiced concern about Lake Michigan Drive Sign, and that it would be misleading about where to turn. The other Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Witte explained the sign on Becker Drive was a more directional sign and that the Lake Michigan was to help serve as a warning to slow down.

Mr. Schut wondered what recommendations might be for entrances and directional commercial signage mentioning he would not be opposed to amending the PUD but preferred not to go that route.

The Commissioners and applicant ultimately agreed to removing the free-standing sign on Lake Michigan Drive to allow for a larger sign on the south facing wall that exceeded the ordinance requirements as depicted in the plan. All other signs will remain compliant. The exception for the south facing wall sign was made due to the great distance from the roadway and in exchange for eliminating a free-standing sign on Lake Michigan Drive.

Motion made by Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the University Park PUD Resolution prohibiting the ground mounted sign along Lake Michigan Drive and to allow for the larger sign on the south facing wall. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved: 6-0.**

## 8) Site Plan Review

## 9) Old Business

### A. 5015 Warner – Mining Application – 70-09-13-200-006

Planner Ransford summarized changes to the proposal, now including two separate entrances on each side of the previously discussed 33' easement leading to the north two properties. The Township Attorney was apprised of the concerns of the easement and the idea of improving it as a road. He responded that the access to the rear lot, as presented, meets the end use for the district because the Zoning Administrator and Assessor would authorize those lots if they existed today. His opinion was that the applicant had satisfied that provision of the ordinance. The applicant modified the plan since the last meeting with two entrances, two gates, two crushed concrete mattes.

Mr. Curtis Moran addressed the Commission about the amended plan to provide access to the rear properties, while still looking at taking their use by rights splits. For the road frontage, they preferred to provide a maintenance easement around each of the proposed ponds to provide foot and vehicle access to the back of the property. Mr. Moran also

addressed comments about the condition of Warner Street, explaining they had not been hauling from the site yet, so the current condition of the road would improve going forward and they would be responsible to maintain it going forward; also, they had greater resources available than the county to maintain that road.

Mr. Longcore asked about the well issue in the Bliss Street area, water quality, and whether the pond water would be stagnant. Mr. Moran was not aware of the Bliss Street area well specifically but expounded on the Lakeshore Environmental hydrogeological study on the 20-acre expansion on JMM and how the draw down was very minimal. He also explained the Health Department required shallow wells be greater than 30 feet deep and all borings that JMM and Mr. Moran have conducted showing that the clay layer is less than 25 feet from surface. Anything in that glacial aquifer would be hard to point toward the work affecting any of those wells that historically had issues which the County and Michigan State had both spoken about. Regarding the stagnant ponds, Mr. Moran referred to the engineer specifications showing a 10' minimum height, preventing sunlight to reach the bottom to create algae bloom and overgrowth. Additionally, with the fields not being farmed, it would reduce the fertilizer possibly causing some of it.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Zuniga raised the idea of having a bigger body of water that looked more natural, rather than the two proposed ponds. Mr. Longcore asked for clarification on how close the water comes to the easement between the two ponds and expressed concern about the driveway that has been in place for many years. Mr. Moran explained that they would place stakes to prevent over-excavation and agreed to have a plan to repair the driveway if it was damaged. Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Adams concurred that the slope was quite flat at 1:10.

A motion was made by Zeinstra to approve the resolution for the 5015 Warner Street Sand Pit with the additional language to Item #20: "The developer shall make sure the construction does not interfere with the existing driveway; all damage that occurs to the existing driveway will be repaired immediately." Seconded by Kelley. Opposed by Mr. Schut. **Approved: 5-1**

10) New Business

11) Public Comments

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kevin Yeomans facilitated the public comments beginning with callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. Callers and participants were recognized and comments made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

1. Megan Beltman – Thanked the Commission for adding easements.
2. Leonard Beck – Expressed concern about damage to Warner Street and asked the Commission to address equipment storage. Thanked the Commission for adding easements.
3. Kevin Yeomans – Reminded the public to contact the Township with any concerns.

12) Township Board Reports

Staff Department Reports and discussed the IT Assessments.

13) Commissioner and Staff Comments

The Commissioners discussed the likelihood of meeting in person after May.

14) Adjourn – Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, May 17, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***May 17, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

***Via Zoom Software***

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Westerling, Longcore  
Absent: Zeinstra  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Lynelle Berkenpas, Marcel VanderLaan, Lora Richmond, Kevin Yeomans
- 3) Received for information
- 4) Motion by Schut to approve the May 3, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Kelley.  
**Approved: 6-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the May 17, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Adams.  
**Approved: 6-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kevin Yeomans facilitated the public comments beginning with callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. No comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*
- 7) Public Hearings
- 8) Site Plan Review:
  - A. Allendale Christian School – Building Addition  

Planner Ransford summarized the request for minor versus major amendment for special use. The Commission had determined there was a major change. Since that time, the applicant has revised the plans for improvement for the dumpster, a buffer along the south and southeast property lines, and rooftop equipment on the gym. Upon Planning Commission approval, it would be scheduled for public hearing.

Lynelle Berkenpas, with Holland Engineering provided an overview of the expansion plan and the impacts expected, including several existing conditions. She explained the school was originally constructed in 2007, with an addition in 2017. Both site plans were reviewed by the state at the township's direction and approved at that time—so some of what was seen on the site currently, may not have met the zoning ordinances at the time. The initial construction at 64<sup>th</sup> and Henry Street involved about 37,000 square feet, with a 2017 addition of 5,700 square feet. The current proposal was for an additional 12,000 to 13,000 square feet with four to five more classrooms. The current student body count was less than 400 students, and the plan would provide capacity for 500 students. No additional parking had been included, and there were no planned changes outside of the site itself. In addition, there had been moderate storm water improvements and preliminary feedback from the Water Resources Commission indicated that they would likely be approved.

Chairperson Longcore opened the session for Commissioners questions or comments.

Mr. Adams asked Planner Ransford for clarification about parking during athletic events and whether they occur during regular school operations. Marcel VanderLaan, with Lakewood Construction, explained athletic events historically occurred after school operations. Additional conversation led Mr. Longcore to ask a future project to be removed from the drawings, as it was not intended to be submitted by the applicant at this time.

The Commissioners agreed that they did not have any concerns with the proposed lighting plan, pending any concerns that may be raised by the public. They asked several clarifying questions about the storm water improvements. Ms. Berkenpas explained the plan further regarding the shallow depth of the retention areas and described the existing storm water ponds throughout the site.

Mr. Schut expressed that he was okay with the ground equipment as long as it was screened per the Ordinance. Commissioners found the dumpster enclosure as acceptable to remain, pending comments at the public hearing.

Mr. Longcore raised concerns about the current traffic issues and any applicable traffic studies. Ms. Berkenpas said that the school was considering a couple of things to reduce traffic at the site and has taken some steps to improve the amount of queuing.

It was suggested by Mr. Adams to consider an “incoming” direction from 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue and exiting onto Henry Street, allowing a more controllable circulation flow. Ms. Berkenpas somewhat disagreed due to the proximity to the intersection at Henry Street, across from the Family Fare exit, and crossing a left turn lane. She did however, state she was willing to investigate it further. Mr. Kelley also agreed with Ms. Berkenpas, that it was not a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Schut voiced concern about the growth of the school without additional parking. Ms. Berkenpas reiterated the school was aware that the issue would need to be addressed, and there were discussions about the potential options however, until the gymnasium expansion moved forward, those plans were in a holding phase, unless the ordinance required them. Mr. Schut responded that it would be helpful for the Commission to see those plans as it related to the current project and future expansion.

Regarding the traffic concerns, Mr. VanderLaan noted the potential for cars to turn into Henry Street, proceeding to the east lot to reverse the traffic flow there, allowing them to stack more cars for the carpool process. Because of the good relationship with Allendale Baptist Church, there had also been conversation for the potential of shared parking for special events.

Mr. Adams asked if there had been any conversations about relocating the existing driveway on 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue to make it a one-way street and make circulation clearer. Mr. VanderLaan responded there had not, and relocation would displace athletic fields, which were somewhat landlocked, unless there were a future land acquisition.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Longcore remarked about the parent drop-off and bus areas being swapped. Mr. VanderLaan expressed being open to suggestions.

The Commission agreed unanimously to allow Planner Ransford to schedule a public hearing for June 7, 2021.

9) Old Business

10) New Business

#### A. Work Program

Planner Ransford brought before the Commission the 2021 list of completed business, as well as upcoming business and requested the Commissioners to provide input for priority of future planning items.

The Commission reviewed the list, with comments regarding ground water quality and major developments connecting to sewer. Mr. Longcore also mentioned the non-motorized path. Kevin Yeomans, Project Coordinator for Allendale Township, spoke to the Commission regarding the non-motorized path. He mentioned that the project had been detained for another year, but he would work on gathering information to bring before the Commission.

The Commission agreed on three items for Planner Ransford to prepare for future business.

#### 11) Public Comments

*Chairperson Longcore opened the second public comment section for non-public hearing items. Kevin Yeomans facilitated the public comments beginning with callers, proceeding to participants using the web or app. No comments were made. Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

#### 12) Township Board Reports

#### 13) Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Longcore discussed the BP Station fencing. The requirement was to be a retaining wall and then additional fencing turning north to 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue. They had requested to use either chain link fence or ornamental fencing. The Commissioners discussed options as Planner Ransford shared the site plans. The consensus was a wood fencing option, with Planner Ransford agreeing to relay the decision.

Planner Ransford noted that the applicant for 5015 Warner Street Mining Site desired to screen the topsoil separating the stone from the sand. Planner Ransford had advised the applicant this request would possibly require re-application or an amendment to the recently issued special use permit. He asked the Commission whether they preferred to speak with the applicant first, or if it could be scheduled for public hearing as a major change. The Commissioners agreed, given the neighborhood concern and the change of special use, it would be best to speak with the applicant first before deciding whether re-application would be required, or a public hearing could be scheduled. Planner Ransford agreed to follow-up with the applicant.

Mr. Westerling asked the Commission regarding a question he had been asked about dividing a parcel of land. Kevin Yeomans stated he would follow-up to provide a definitive answer.

#### 14) Adjourn – Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, June 7, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*June 7, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Westerling  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Lynnelle Berkenpas, Chad Demers, Don De Groot, Merwyn Koster, Mitch Koster, Curtis Moran, Lora Richmond, Steve Witte
- 3) Received for information: Email received from the Township Engineer regarding traffic study for Allendale Christian School
- 4) Motion by Schut to approve the May 17, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Seconded by Adams. **Approved: 6-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the June 7, 2021, Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved: 6-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. After comments were made, he closed the public comment section.*
  1. Curtis Moran – Spoke regarding the mining location at Warner Street, requesting permission to screen topsoil like other locations in Allendale, due to finding more stone than anticipated. For noise reduction, stone would not be crushed. The Bliss Street operation would not be included, as the operation was almost complete, but requested consideration for Warner Street. Mr. Longcore indicated to Mr. Moran that this would likely require a major amendment due to an increased use involving increased noise. The Planning Commission agreed.
- 7) Public Hearings:
  - A. Allendale Christian School - Building Addition  
Mr. Zeinstra recused himself from the hearing because he has been involved in the plans and the project. There were no objections from the other Commissioners.  
  
Planner Ransford referred to a memo he had prepared explaining the Allendale Christian School proposed building addition of 12,870 square feet to include additional classrooms, office spaces and storage. The applicant met with the Commission in May to receive direction and feedback on their site plan. The Commission asked the applicant to screen some ground equipment on the north side of the property, remove some planned notes about future planned additions, and finalize a traffic assessment with the Township Traffic Engineer. That correspondence was received from the engineer, who was satisfied with the traffic study if the school followed what was agreed upon. The Commission also considered the dumpster remaining as is, and the light fixtures satisfactory as well. They discussed some deviation requests for the Commission pursuant to section 23.11 of the zoning ordinance.



Ms. Lynnelle Berkenpas, with Holland Engineering, representing Allendale Christian School explained plans to expand their building off their west wing, allowing them to expand to approximately 500 students from the prior plan of 400 students. Current enrollment is about 360 students, 270 are from the young 5 to 8<sup>th</sup> grade age range. The new addition would essentially add about 5 classrooms for their middle school.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the floor to public comments. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section and opened for Commissioner and Staff comments.*

Mr. Schut asked for clarification about whether the new set of plans had been available to the public and then confirmed availability in the Allendale office.

Mr. Kelley sought confirmation of the removal of a comment regarding future building plans not under current review, and Mr. Ransford referenced the more current revision on Google Drive that was visible, along with the version referenced by Mr. Kelley.

Seeking clarification, Mr. Longcore asked about the anticipated height of the holly bush used for screening, which the applicant explained should roughly match the height of the equipment being screened.

When Mr. Schut questioned the email from the traffic engineer, Commissioner Ransford quoted from the email that stated, that they have reviewed the study and “there will be adequate queue in theory. It will be the school’s responsibility to ensure that this operation is implemented in practice.” Planner Ransford essentially indicated that having the plan in writing would allow for enforcement.

Mr. Schut further inquired about steps being taken to alleviate traffic. Ms. Berkenpas discussed two sets of double-lanes on the property where the traffic study indicated utilizing one lane. The recommendation for the north lot was utilizing the busses after the older students went to personal vehicles, starting in the afternoon hours. This would essentially flip the current plan of where the busses were utilized. Additionally, loading up a group of vehicles 10 at a time, prior to releasing vehicles and lining up students for the next group of vehicles, allowed for two lanes to run concurrently, since cars would not be moving until all 10 vehicles are loaded. Busses would be used in both lots, with busses going first in the west lot and last in the north lot.

The Commissioners discussed concerns about busses turning left onto 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the possible need for signs restricting a left turn by busses. Mr. Adams asked about pedestrian traffic along 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the school and if any discussion had occurred about extending the existing sidewalk to the 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue portion of the property. Ms. Berkenpas was not aware of any conversations relating to it, indicating foot traffic was thought to be light from that direction.

Regarding questions from the Commissioners if the applicant did not follow the proposed traffic plan, Planner Ransford stated the Commission’s ability to advise any applicant not in compliance, notification of non-compliance, and the special use permit would be subject to revocation if not brought into compliance.

Mr. Schut made a recommendation to approve the special use amendment as presented with a condition that Allendale Christian School will be responsible to implement policies and procedures to provide a safe and uncongested circulation of traffic entering and exiting the property; should it fail to do so, and traffic circulation does experience congestion backing up onto 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the site plan shall be modified to correct these circulation issues.” Any modification of the plan is required to return to the Planning

Commission for review and authorization. Seconded by Adams. **Approved 4-1, with Mr. Zuniga-Kelley opposed.**

B. Kennedy Lake Site Condominium - Phase II and Private Road

Planner Ransford explained that Kennedy Lake was present for their second and final phase approval from their 2016 planned development, now including a modification the Commission approved to include a private street rather than public roadways discussed initially. This also included the site condominium application to create the sites. On the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting the Commission determined permitting the private road second phase to match the first phase was a minor change to the PUD after the private road standards changed during the interim of the phases. There were no concerns raised by the Commission about traffic based on the 2016 during that approval, and all the master deed and private road documents were in order.

*Commissioner Longcore opened the floor to public comments. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section and opened for Commissioner and Staff comments.*

Mr. Adams pointed out an area around the gutter that allowed too much standing water which needed to be addressed. Mr. Schut also noted a small gap on the south side where a sign interfered with the proposed sidewalk creating a small gap. The applicant agreed to resolve the issue.

Mr. Zeinstra made a motion to approve the Resolution as presented for Kennedy Lake Site Condominium Phase II and Private Road. Seconded by Schut. **Approved 6-0.**

8) No Site Plans to Review

9) Old Business

A. Master Plan - Complete Draft - Koster Classification Inquiry

Planner Ransford explained that the applicant is seeking a classification of moderate density residential similar with the R2 Zoning District within the Zoning Ordinance. In addition to narrower lots, there would be a little variation in the amount of potential density.

Mr. Don De Groot, with Exxel Engineering, addressed the Commission about the proposed future development of the property. Displaying the map of 57 acres for proposed development, he explained the location was at the west side of 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and north of Pierce Street. Approximately 43 acres are currently owned by the Kesters, with the option to purchase an additional 14 acres. The majority of surrounding existing development was designated either R1 or PUD with all of the single-family homes developed with minimum 80' wide lots and 10,000 square feet in total lot size. Due to the efforts of Allendale Township to amend their Master Plan, Mr. De Groot reiterated this plan and hoped the Township would view this particular property and the master plan appropriate to have the moderate density residential designation of 2.9 units per acre. He further explained the sites would need to be elevated due to the water table, thus there would be a water feature, both to fill and elevate the streets and serve as an amenity. Additionally, because of existing power lines and a county drain, they would be in the range of 2 units per acre. Ultimately more than the density per acre, the plan considered how the lots would be developed and their affordability. The recommendation to the Commission was a phased approach, mainly due to the sanitary sewer available for only a portion of the property, with about 2/3 of the property being able to be developed currently. Mr. De Groot noted larger parcels along the front of 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue with

recommendation for land divisions, as well as larger parcels on the north side, along 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, buffered by a church site, and designated for the medium density designation.

Mr. Longcore asked Planner Ransford what other potential development could happen if it were medium density. Planner Ransford explained from a development standpoint, they could be allowing more intense use if the applicant decided to sell. Current language of the master plan would not allow duplexes, but based on the current designations, he did not see any potential conflict.

Mr. Zeinstra recommended that all the R1 zoning areas, that no longer meet the current R1 zoning requirements because they have been approved at R-2 densities, be included as Moderate Density as well during the Master Plan update, and the Commissioners discussed points of this, as well as the process of updating the Master Plan and Zoning map. Planner Ransford agreeing from a visual perspective it would be beneficial. The consensus of the Commission was to update the draft Master Plan map in this regard as well as the Koster properties presented.

## 10) New Business

### A. Lighthouse Community Church – Major v. Minor Determination

Mr. Steve Witte, with Nederveld, Inc. representing Lighthouse Community Church presented a brief history of the property, explaining it was zoned agricultural and covered 9.4 acres. The existing church building was approved in 2014, with Phase Two approval in 2017. The 2017 plans depicted a future addition (Phase Three) of approximately 21,460 square feet, and the parking area of Phase Two had been proposed and constructed. The total area of all phases had slightly decreased from 2017 to its current proposal, with the main difference being the addition being built on the north side. Mr. Witte explained the proposed addition was 10,877 square feet serving primarily as a gymnasium, with an additional four classrooms, and smaller storage area. No new parking was being proposed. Two sidewalks would be constructed on the north and west side of the building. The lighting specification sheets would match the lights on the existing building, and he hoped the Commission would approve the specification sheets as opposed to a creating a photo metric plan. He expressed concern that since the approval of the 2017 Phase Two plans, the updated ordinance required concrete curbing around the parking area. The current site does not have curbing, and Mr. Witte requested exemption from adding it. Lastly, he addressed the landscaping, noting previous plans had shown shrubbery in front of Lake Michigan Drive. The ordinance had been updated, and the church was willing to update any ornamental planting necessary but preferred to keep the east side as it was currently.

Mr. Longcore clarified that the Commission was essentially looking at a minor versus a major change, confirmed by Planner Ransford. The Commission discussed whether it was a major amendment, comparison of the size of the buildings and square footage, and the purpose of the building and how it related to parking needs. The consensus was it would be considered a minor change.

Regarding lighting, Mr. Schut and the Commission requested the photometric plans from 2017 for comparison, and Mr. Witte agreed to the request.

The consensus of the Commission was no additional parking was needed and installing concrete curbing would not be necessary on the existing parking lot. They were also in agreement with Mr. Witte that landscaping in front of the building was sufficient, with Mr. Schut requesting they meet the landscape buffer requirements.

Mr. Schut inquired about rooftop equipment, and Mr. Demers, a member of Lighthouse Community Church, informed the Commission there were two rooftop units, one hidden behind an existing screen, and the other one screened similar with the other building.

The question was posed by Mr. Schut regarding the previous traffic analysis on the site as a whole and not just the addition. Planner Ransford and Mr. Witte both confirmed they would gather further information.

11) Public Comments

*Chairperson Longcore opened the second public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

12) Township Board Reports

Trustee Zeinstra gave reports on the Sheriff's Department, Human Resources, and Safety. They completed Allendale Baptist Church Resolutions and Ordinances, and new hires were introduced. Concerts in the Park were also discussed and approved.

13) Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Zuniga addressed workmanship concerns regarding the Taco Bell, and Planner Ransford agreed inquire about inspection.

Planner Ransford received an inquiry from Mr. Moran asking if the Commission could schedule a public hearing. The Commission agreed to scheduling a hearing if all parameters had been met.

14) Adjourn – Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, June 21, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***June 21, 2021***

***7:00 p.m.***

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Chad Demers, Lora Richmond
- 3) Received for information: Allendale Township Supervisor, Adam Elenbaas was present to update the Planning Commission on the financials and timelines of the Fire Station project. Email received from Lighthouse Community Church of discussion items.
- 4) Motion by Zuniga to approve the June 7, 1021, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes based on a correction being made to Section 7, regarding Allendale Christian School; requesting the incorrect opposed vote naming Mr. Zuniga be changed to Mr. Kelley. Seconded by Adams.  
**Approved: 7-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the June 21, 2021, Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Kelley. **Approved: 7-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*
- 7) Public Hearings
- 8) Site Plans to Review
  - A. Lighthouse Community Church – Building Addition  

Mr. Chad Demers, a representative of Lighthouse Community Church briefed the Commission regarding the proposed Phase Three, which includes a multi-purpose room, four classrooms, and a storage room. He reiterated the space would not be used as worship space. He indicated he had not been able to obtain any photometrics from the previous or current plans to share with the Commission.

Mr. Longcore inquired about the parapet screens, and Mr. Demers explained there currently two different screens, one 78 inches tall from the roof deck to the top. The other screen was eight feet tall and would not be added to, but rather they one of the RTU's would be placed behind it, thus only one screened rooftop unit would be added and would match the existing unit. The Commissioners discussed and agreed it was satisfactory.

Other items discussed were the greenbelt on the west side and the traffic study. The Commission noted some trees that would need to be transplanted near the parking lot to the greenbelt area, and Mr. Demers agreed that would be completed. Mr. Demers addressed the traffic study explaining there had been no traffic issues, and if a future parking lot were to be added, there would need to be an additional study. Planner Ransford confirmed the future parking lot was not part of the current plans for approval.

Mr. Longcore asked for clarification regarding the approval being for a minor amendment. Planner Ransford confirmed that to be the case and indicated the Commission would be approving the minor amendment, due to Phase Three differing slightly from previous approval in 2015.

Mr. Zeinstra made the motion to approve Phase Three as minor amendment to the special use and the Phase Three site plan. Seconded by Westerling. **Approved: 7-0**

10) Old Business

11) New Business

12) Public Comments

*Chairperson Longcore opened the second public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

13) Township Board Reports

Trustee Zeinstra updated the Commission stating the park statue had been voted on and would remain in the park.

14) Commissioner and Staff Comments

15) Adjourn – Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, July 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Lora Richmond*

ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
July 19, 2021 7:00 p.m.

1. Meeting Called to Order

2. Roll Call

Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore

Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Larry Haveman

Other Guests Present: Don Bump, Jana Bump, Mark Bushard

3. Received for information: No Information Received

4. Motion by Schut to approve the June 21, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approved: 7-0**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the July 19, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved: 7-0**

6. Public Comments for non-public hearing items:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

7. Public Hearings:

A. Dewpointe West

- Tentative Preliminary Plat Phase 4

Mr. Ransford introduced the project for review and explained that the Road Commission does not want trees in the road right of way and some tree placements have been altered as a result of the Road Commission's review. The applicant is also requesting a street tree modification for multiple lots. Mr. Ransford noted that the Township Facilities Supervisor, Larry Haveman, inquired in his review about the pathway between lot 172 and 173, he would like a condition in the approval that the pathway be constructed at the same time as the road in order to avoid grading issues that arisen in previous phase due to the delayed construction of the pathway.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for the public hearing.*

Several commenters inquired about drainage concerns and the amount of homes going in. The public also inquired about the entrance and whether or not there would be another entrance to the development. Other concerns expressed were regarding traffic and the stress on the existing water and sewer system. Residents also inquired about a possible bike path.

There was discussion between Zack Vought, representing the applicant, the Commission and a resident regarding the current situation where the pathway was built after a house was constructed and there is a need for a retaining wall due to the grading.

Common consensus between the Commissioners was to build the pathway between lots 172 and 173 at the same time as the street is constructed in order to avoid the issues that are being dealt with now.

Mr. Zeinstra asked for clarification on if they have to approve the trees and Mr. Ransford agreed that the Commission could or just approve the plans that are presented. Motion by Schut to recommend approval to the Township Board of Dewpointe West 4 Preliminary Plat with the following conditions:

- adding contours to pond number 3,
- pending Road Commission review and approval of the required entrances and exits to the entire PUD,
- relief from the number of trees as requested,
- and that the path between lots 172 and 173 be constructed at the time of road construction.

Seconded by Adams. **Approved 7-0**

8. Site Plans to Review:

1. M&S Storage - 5280 & 5240 Edgeway Drive

- Eight mini-storage buildings

Owner introduces the project about adding additional self-storage buildings to the three existing self-storage buildings on the property.

Mr. Ransford reviewed his memo with the Commission concerning parking, traffic and materials labeled on the elevations. And suggests that when the applicant returns with final plans that the elevation materials are labeled.

Mr. Schut raised concern about the photometrics and light spilling over onto the neighboring property. The applicant replied that the lights will be pointing down and a building will be in the way so there will not be light spilling onto the neighboring property. Mr. Schut also inquired of Mr. Ransford what the setback for parking was in the Industrial District against the Residential District.

There was discussion between the applicant and Commissioners regarding curbing and drainage.

The applicant was directed to verify the height of the building, setback requirements, lighting, contours in the southwest corner by building G, and the maintenance agreement with the Public Utilities Department.

9. Old Business

10. New Business

11. Public Comments

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

12. Township Board Reports:

Mr. Zeinstra reported that there were a few more budget amendments dealing with the new fire department and that the Township is hiring Rehman to start doing the IT work for the Township.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Happy Birthday to Commissioner Schut.

There was a brief discussion regarding the siding of the self-storage facility that is currently being constructed and if it was what was approved by the Commission.

14. Adjourn - Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Next meeting Monday, August 2, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Kelli McGovern*



**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***August 02, 2021 7:00 p.m.***

- 1) Meeting called to order
- 2) Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford  
Other Guests Present: Abel and Lola Vanderwoude, Keith and Brenda Dosenberry, Mick McGraw, Brian Papke, Megan Beltman, Mindy Beck, Alan and Kathy Helbling, Bea McKenney, Nancy and Ren Brouwer, Jay Knoper, Ellens, Kelly Kuiper, Carlo DiLeonardo, Wade Rosted, Carol Hansen, Madeline Taylor
- 3) Received for information: Letter regarding Allendale Meadows Planning Unit Development Major Amendment as well as an email regarding the site plan review on the agenda; will discuss these items when they come up.
- 4) Motion by Schut to approve the July 19, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Kelley. **Approved: 7-0**
- 5) Motion by Longcore to approve the July 19, 2021, Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approved: 7-0**
- 6) Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*
- 7) Public Hearings
  - A. **5015 Warner Special Use Application Amendment**  
Chairperson Longcore requested that Planner Ransford inform the public on the Special Use application to amend the current approved Special Land Use Permit. Planner Ransford explained that the applicant decided it would be beneficial to screen the materials onsite. The only change would be the shape of the stockpile areas and they established the location for the proposed processing.  
  
Chairperson Longcore gave the floor to Kelly Kuiper, representing the applicant. Ms. Kuiper agreed with Planner Ransford's introduction of the project and reiterated that the only change was the screening of the material onsite.  
  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for the public hearing.*  
  
Jay Knoper expressed concerns with the noise and the construction trucks not sticking to the truck route.  
  
Megan Beltman expressed her family member has health issues and is worried about the amount of dust and debris. Also voiced concerns about the snow fence.  
  
Bea McKinney also expressed concerns about the noise and snow fence.  
  
*Chairperson Longcore asked if there were any more questions or concerns. There were none, he then closed public comments section of the public hearing.*  
  
The applicant then answered residents' concerns. They informed the public that the noise would be within the allowed decibel levels. That the truck route is local and allows the trucks to take the shortest allowable paths. Ms. Kuiper also ensured the public that they would water the area more

for less dust and debris. They also stated they would check the snow fence weekly and were open to other ideas for the snow fence from the public.

Mr. Schut suggested conditions regarding the noise and dust levels. He also recommended looking into better snow fence options prior to snow fall.

Planner Ransford checked the Ordinance to verify allowable decibel levels, and acknowledged there is not a noted range in the Ordinance regarding noise. Ms. Kuiper stated that the average decibel level for construction equipment is between 70-100 decibels and the applicant's equipment is in accordance with those levels.

Chairman Longcore asked for clarification from Planner Ransford that they were approving an amendment to the current resolution or a new resolution and Planner Ransford stated that it would replace the current resolution.

Motion by Zeinstra, seconded by Westerling to approve the resolution with three additional conditions:

- Noise level of the screeners to be less than 80 decibels at the property lines;
- Dust shall be controlled as necessary;
- Snow fence shall be adjusted to reduce snow drifts on the driveway;

**Approved 6-1** Opposed by Schut.

**B. Allendale Meadows Planned Unit Development Major Amendment - Peppinos Parking Lot**

Planner Ransford addressed the public as to the reconstruction, repaving and construction of an additional parking lot at Peppinos. He also informed the public that more exterior parking lights will be added, along with dumpster placement and rain sensor for the irrigation system.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for the public hearing.*

The applicant expressed wanting to re-pave and reconstruct the Peppinos parking lot with different materials than what has been used in the past. He expressed how he had contacted the bank and was informed per the bank, that he must use the same material as the existing parking lot. Applicant expressed that he would prefer the parking lot to be asphalt to withstand more wear and tear.

Wade Rosted of Sun Communities voiced concerns with headlights shining into residents' homes.

*Chairperson Longcore asked if there were any more questions or concerns. There were none he then closed public comments section of the public hearing.*

Chairperson Longcore opened the floor to the Commission for comments.

Chairperson Longcore addressed the question the applicant asked regarding what the bank told him ~~him~~ *the applicant* and stated that would be a matter between them and not under the Township's control.

Commissioners expressed the following concerns:

- a. Lighting of the parking lot accuracy
- b. Placement of the dumpster and gates on it
- c. Extending the fence all the way to the west
- d. Drainage/water concerns
- e. Setbacks

Motion by Schut, seconded by Adams to *Table* the Allendale Meadows Planned Unit Development Major Amendment pending more information. **Approved 7-0**

8) Site Plan Review:

**A. Site Plan Review: 6138 LMD PUD-Preliminary Plan**

Mick McGraw and Brian Papke presented the project and how they came to the plan that they are presenting to the Commission. The original development plan had around 240 units and has been scaled back to 100 single family homes with a 4.9-acre pond. They discussed their latest ideas and developmental plans. They acknowledged the housing to the east of the property and creating a buffer/do not disturb zone with a 25 foot range from the property line. They also placed the idea of a tree/hedges as a buffer zone. Mr. McGraw and Mr. Papke spoke with Tony Dolce from the Fire Department, and he agreed with the proposed layout. The applicant also voiced their preference of putting one larger 6 ft. sidewalk on one side of the road instead of the typical 5 ft. sidewalk one on each side of the road. The applicant explained the design process for the homes that would be built in the development. As they were planning out the property they realized they will have to remove some trees but informed the public that they will save as many as possible. They are very willing to accommodate to everyone's needs.

Planner Ransford reviewed his memo.

Commissioners discussed open space and access to it. Consensus was that open space should be more than just water and communal access to that space. Mr. Kelley asked about keeping the natural vegetation and would home owners be able to put in beaches to the pond or would that be discouraged. Mr. McGraw reassured Mr. Kelley that they would keep vegetation where they can save it, but if the home owners would like to put in a beach they would be able to do so. They will save as much as they can but will plan to be adding new trees at customer request.

Emergency access to the new development from Timber Dr. would have locked gates to get in and out of the development.

Commissioners discussed the possibility of the single sidewalk versus sidewalk being on both sides. Consensus between the Commissioners was that the sidewalk on both sides of the road would be preferred.

Headlights were brought to the attention of the applicant about going into the neighbor's home across from the entrance and would need to be adjusted.

9) Old Business - *None*

10) New Business - *None*

11) Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section.*

Carol Hansen expressed concerns with the size of the parcels and would like to see the 100 ft. frontage.

Residents expressed concern with the amount of homes proposed in the area, traffic from the single entrance, water levels and street lights.

Planner Ransford, at the request of Chairperson Longcore, explained the difference between metes and bounds splits, site condos or platting, and a PUD.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

12) Township Board Reports

Trustee Zeinstra reported that there were department head reports received, and that the Township is re-establishing the library.

13) Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Chairperson Longcore inquired of Planner Ransford regarding an email chain that he had been involved in regarding a possible development going in without approval. Planner Ransford stated that he would check with staff to figure out what was going on.

14) Adjourn – Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, August 16, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by Natasha Shepard

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*August 16, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1) Meeting called to order

2) Roll Call

Present: Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore

Absent: Westerling

Staff Present: Greg Ransford

Other Guests Present: Merwyn Koster, Don De Groot

3) Received for information: No information received

4) Motion by Mr. Zuniga to approve the August 02, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes with the correction to clarify under item 7B that Chairman Longcore did not speak to the bank, that it was the applicant who had spoken to the bank. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved: 6-0**

5) Motion by Mr. Longcore to switch items 9 and 10 on the agenda for the convenience of those present and approve the August 02, 2021, Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Mr. Schut. **Approved: 6-0**

6) Public Comments for non-public hearing items:

*Mr. Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

7) Public Hearings - None

8) Site Plans to Review - None

9) New Business

A. Biltmore LLC/ 52<sup>nd</sup> and 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue Map Amendment Request- Seeking to rezone 70-09-25-300-050 & 70-09-25-300-060 from R-1 to R2

Mr. De Groot introduced the request to rezone the property located at 10460 56<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 10681 52<sup>nd</sup> from an R1 to R2.

Mr. De Groot acknowledged that the developments to the North and South of the subject parcel have been developed with lot sizes and lot widths similar to the R-2 zone, impact to neighboring properties will be compatible.

Mr. Ransford, for the record, briefly explained where they were at in this process. He expressed that it is not illegal to recommend something contrary to the Master Plan, of course there is more to it than just the map that comes into play. Mr. Ransford proceeded to say they have noted in their first memorandum and highlighted a couple bullet points for low density that corresponds for the R1 zone, and the moderate residential density corresponds with the requested R2 zone. The applicant has already responded to the rezoning criteria.

Mr. Longcore asked what are the densities of the properties to the North and South and what the proposed density of this plan is. Mr. De Groot replied that it looks to be about the same. That he had put together a conceptual plan and is less than 2 units per acre, moderate density has a max of 2.9 so they are under the allowed space. It is very comparable to the surrounding areas. Mr. Ransford clarified that Medium Density has a maximum density of 4.35 units per acre and low density has a maximum of 2.9. Consensus of the Commissioners was that this request makes sense and would fit with the surrounding area. The Commission directed Mr. Ransford to schedule the public hearing upon receipt of the density revisions from Mr. De Groot.

## 10) Old Business

### A. Master Plan

Mr. Ransford reviewed some of the changes that had been made to the Master Plan Documents and Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Longcore brought up on the map the southeast corner of LMD and 60<sup>th</sup>. He expressed how there is already a bank, auto zone and dentist office and that area should be red for General Commercial. Country View Dr. should remain consistent with residential all along the street. 68<sup>th</sup> and LMD to the West Walgreens and the soon to be Mr. Burger should also be commercial.

Commissioners discussed adding more Moderate Density to the Future Land Use Map to align with neighboring properties. They also stated that in order to do this they would need to confer with DPW regarding future plans for water and sewer. Specifically, consensus was that from Valley View to 74<sup>th</sup> Ave could be Moderate Density.

Commissioners would like to see the Rural Estate zone along 78<sup>th</sup> south of Lake Michigan Dr. connected along 78<sup>th</sup> to the Rural Estate zone north of Buchannan.

Mr. Zeinstra spoke on the mobile home park at the end of Pingree and how part of it has been turned into moderate density and suggested to keep it all yellow for Medium Density. Mr. Zuniga brought up wanting to also change the Future addition of the mobile home park to yellow as well, Mr. Zeinstra agreed. Mr. Ransford then expressed wanting to double check the dash line does in fact represent the expansion of the park, and if it does not then he will keep it white designating the Agricultural Zone, Commissioners agreed with that statement.

Mr. Adams asked Mr. Ransford if there was a percentage overall, based on this version of the map, of each one of the zonings or classifications in the Township. Mr. Ransford replied that we don't have that right now, but the county can run that and get the numbers. Mr. Adams then asked Mr. Ransford about planning tools, where should the township be at for percentages, etc. Mr. Ransford answered that there used to be that mindset but with technology changing and growing it is not really desired or as necessary as once thought. What you shape your community into is up to you. Commissioners would like to know the percentages of commercial, residential and industrial, etc.

Rich Street was pointed out in the Industrial Zone to connect the zone from 56<sup>th</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> and having them all designated gray. It was also brought up on how to designate the pump station and the Waste Water Treatment Plant as they are, at the moment located in residentially zoned districts.

Mr. Zeinstra inquired about a bike trail map and asked on whether or not it would be included in the Master Plan.

Direction was provided to Planner Ransford to update the master plan map according to the suggestions provided by the Commissioners.

#### 11) Public Comments

*Mr. Longcore opened the second public comments section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and Mr. Longcore closed the public comments section.*

#### 12) Township Board Reports

Mr. Zeinstra reported that the Board received information from the Human Resources Department, Safety Department and the DPW. The Board approved the request to modify the job description for the project coordinator to an assistant administrator and the Tentative Preliminary Plat for Dewpointe West.

#### 13) Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Ransford reported on the question of a development going in without approval and had received an email from Steve Kushion that is was excavation of a pond for grandkids to fish out of, and that there were no alarms for this project.

Mr. Schut had a question about Kennedy Lake sidewalk in the wrong spot and if they looked into that yet and Mr. Ransford responded that he has reached out to the Zoning Administrator, but has not heard back yet.

#### 14) Adjourn

Mr. Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

**Next meeting Tuesday, September 07, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Natasha Shepard

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*September 7, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Adams, Westerling, Schut, Zuniga, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Kelley  
Staff Present: Planner Greg Ransford
3. Received for Information: No information received
4. Motion by Schut to approve the August 16, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Adams. **Approved 6-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the September 7, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented.  
Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 6-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*
7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review:
  - A. M&S Storage – 5280 & 5240 Edgeway Dr.
    - Eight mini-storage buildings

Planner Ransford and the applicant introduced the project consisting of adding eight mini-storage buildings to the three-existing mini-storage buildings.

Mr. Schut brought up concerns regarding the fencing materials on the east side of the property that backs up to residential property and other Commissioners agreed that they would prefer that it would be vinyl for future appearances.

Mr. Zeinstra would like to see more evergreen trees to help screen the outdoor storage from the residential property next door.

Consensus between the applicant and the Commissioners is that the applicant will put vinyl fencing on the east side and chain link on the south side without slats and that all fencing will be 6 feet tall and well-maintained. Consensus was reached that east elevation of Building F was acceptable. In addition, the fence between the new and existing buildings should be removed from the plans; Building H setback should be changed from 10 feet to 15 feet from the north property line; the buildings' layouts should match between the site plan and the landscape plan and all tables should be updated accordingly; landscaping should be increased at the southeast corner; Black Hill Spruce or a similar evergreen should replace those proposed along the east property line so their mature height and width is not too great, and the evergreen trees should be grouped in three by each building light on the east side of Building F, shifting the maples accordingly; and a plan note that new electrical and phone lines shall be buried underground.



There was discussion between Planner Ransford and the Commissioners regarding the setback requirements.

Motion by Schut to postpone action for Site Plan Approval for M&S Storage pending the corrections to the site plan in regards to what was discussed. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approved 6-0**

9. Old Business:

A. Work Program – Items #2 and #9

Discussion amongst Commissioners regarding Item #2 on the Work Program - Draft language requiring major development to be located within the township sanitary sewer district. This is in response to a request from the Public Utilities Department. Consensus was reached that this is satisfied and can be removed from the Work Program.

Discussion regarding Item #9 on the Work Program - Allow General Commercial uses within the Industrial District. Direction was provided to Ransford to schedule a text amendment at the next appropriate meeting.

The Commission directed Planner Ransford to include open space developments and mining operations on the Work Program.

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

12. Township Board Reports:

Mr. Zeinstra reported that the Board approved a new cost recovery ordinance for emergency services, approved some property for a 10-year farmland preservation, and set a public hearing for Truth in Taxation.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Planner Ransford informed the Commissioners that Metro Health tried to put a sign in an island on Becker Dr. in the right-of-way, but Zoning Administrator Steve Kushion saw the plans and checked with Planner Ransford to see if that was approved, which it wasn't, so he did not approve the sign application.

14. Adjourn

Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:14 p.m.

**Next meeting September 20, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.**



**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*September 20, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call: Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore,  
Staff Present: Mr. Ransford  
Public: Greg DeJong, Mitch Koster, Joel Mitchell, Susan & Brian Martin, Cynthia & David Perks
3. Received for information: Planning Commission received a letter from Georgetown Township notifying the Township of their draft Master Plan, Mr. Ransford has no information on that at this time.
4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 7, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes.  
Seconded by Westerling. **Approved 7-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the September 20, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda.  
Seconded by Zeinstra **Approved: 7-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items.*  
  
Greg DeJong, owner of industrial property on 84<sup>th</sup> and Lake Michigan Drive has been discussing with Kevin Yeomans from the township in concepts of displaying mini sheds and barns on his property. Mr. DeJong reassured this would be display only and expressed wanting direction in following the research of the legal ordinances and was looking into the site plan approval for display. Mr. Ransford briefly expressed that the Planning Commission needed to determine if shed sales was a similar use to other uses within the Industrial District, such as mobile home sales, and if found to be similar then the applicant could proceed with site plan approval. Commission members concluded the similarities and there were no objections.  
  
*Chairperson Longcore then closed the public comments section.*
7. Public Hearings:
  - A. Biltmore LLC / 52nd and 56th Avenue Map Amendment Request – Seeking to rezone 70-09-25-300-050 & 70-09-25-300-060 from R-1 to R-2  
  
Todd Stuive represented the applicant and discussed the rezoning of locations at 10681 52<sup>nd</sup> and 10460 56<sup>th</sup> approximately 57 acers total from R1 to R2. Properties to the North are zoned as R1 and R2 involving Dewpoint Estates and Meadow Lake, with lot sizes which roughly match R2 lot sizing. Properties to the South include Springfield West and further to the south include Mystic Woods which is also a mixture of the smaller lot zones and multi-family. Adjacent to the two properties discussed would be compatible with R2 use, and sewer and water is already available in the area. Mr. Stuive explained anticipating a pond or lake to buffer out parcels along 52<sup>nd</sup> for separation.

Mr. Ransford went over the memorandum. Noting rezoning evaluation factors. This is the first application since the factors were moved out of the Master Plan and now are located within the zoning ordinance. The Planning Commission would recommend to the Board of Trustees a zoning district change based on those factors.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section of the public hearing.*

Joel Mitchell expressed concern that the images are substantially different, he would like to see it remain the same.

Cynthia Perks is concerned with the difference between 1 or 2 family residence homes, condos, Duplex- how will it affect the Windfield area.

Susan Martin questioned the increase of entrances and exits that would be required to meet code and where would they be located.

Mrs. Martin is concerned about noise ordinance with the increase of homes.

David Perks is concerned with smaller lots and homes not fitting with the zoning change.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section of the public hearing.*

Mr. Ransford reiterated the uses for the R2 zoning. All special uses need to go thru the Planning Commission for approval. Clarity from Mr. Longcore included since there is nonexistent duplexes on the property the only thing they have the right to build is single family homes, multifamily housing and duplexes are prohibited. Mr. Ransford clarified the district application is only for the rezoning, the applicant has shown what they intend to do there but nothing is binding if there is a recommendation to adopt the R2 district to the board there is a separate application. A residential application needs approval by the Fire Department for a development and will express how many entries, hydrants and accesses everything related to fire safety as well as filtered thru Road Commission and township staff prior to reaching the Planning Commission level.

Applicant described lots on 56<sup>th</sup> being traditional land division, not part of the subdivision itself, and would be larger and more in line with existing lots. Max density in R1 is close to 3 units per lot, R2 is 4 per unit. The applicant is at 1.7.

Mr. Ransford clarified the differences between site condominium and conventional condominiums. Future applications with details will require public hearings and notices will be sent

**Noted:** If approved it is not conditioned to anything on the current drawing. The condition is the zoning ordinance.

Motion by Kelley Seconded by Schut to recommend changing the listed zoning parcels listed from R1 to R2 **Approved** 7-0

8. Site Plan Review- *None*

9. Old Business

A. M&S Storage – 5280 & 5240 Edgeway Drive

Eight mini-storage buildings

The applicant Dave Hanko made the following changes.

A. Installed vinyl fence on the East property line and chain link fence up to the industrial district on the south.

B. Moved Building H another 5 feet to the South to allow the required 15 feet side yard.

C. Landscape changes as requested.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the site plans as submitted for the M&S Storage at 5280 & 5240 Edgeway Drive, seconded by Kelley **Approved 7-0**

B. Work Program – Item #10

Mr. Ransford reintroduced the investigation further into the Non-Motorized Pathway 2015 Amendment to Section 24.06C1. Nothing in the law says you cannot wait several years for another reading. Suggested another hearing for the process since so many years have passed. Language is in the zoning ordinance already just not approved plan also relevant with upcoming county long trail coming thru if they can meet up. Mr. Zuniga will bring to attention at the DDA meeting for funding Tuesday September 21, 2021. Waiting for a couple board members to confirm interest to pursue and get the information they need to move forward.

10. New Business – *None*

11. Public Comments- *None*

12. Township Board Reports- Mr. Zeinstra noted that there were updates to staff titles for a couple of Township employees.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments – *None*

14. Adjourn – *Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.*

**Next meeting Monday, October 04, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by Natasha Shepard

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*October 4, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call: Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Mr. Ransford  
Public: Resident
3. Received for information: *None*
4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 20, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Adams. **Approved 6-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the October 4, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra **Approved: 6-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items.*  
Resident concerned with the gravel pits, trucks traveling and ruining the roads.  
*Chairperson Longcore then closed the public comments section.*
7. Public Hearings: *None*
8. Site Plan Review- *None*
9. Old Business
  - A. Master Plan-

Mr. Ransford went over modifications for finalizing the revised Master Plan map. Some of these modifications included, property revisions on the map, more consistent sized road labeling of names and their locations, also a wetland overlay on a separate master plan map. A table containing the land mass of the master plan classifications in the current 2013 map and the draft 2022 map. Was not able to put together the neighborhood density changes to LDR and MOD to ensure appropriate classification in time but did want everything else to move forward with the modification they could. Will continue to work on the verifications as time permits.

Mr. Ransford had also reached out to various departments including water and sewer, public utilities, and the fire department for feedback. Heard back from the departments and there were two words added to the utility chapter about plats from Mr. Doornbos finalizing the text from department staff.

Mr. Schut inquired about the Bike path. DDA will meet and discuss since they agreed to the funding. Mr. Ransford suggested pausing until Recreation Committee meets to look over the context of the text and the map. Ransford will wait for the Committee to get back with their suggested revisions and show the Planning Commission to continue forward.

B. Work Program –

Board members touched base on a few numbers on the list including 5, 12 and 16 and discussed reaching out to a couple owners on rezoning properties.

10. New Business – *None*

11. Public Comments -

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items.*

*Chairperson Longcore then closed the public comments section.*

12. Township Board Reports -

- A. Community coordinator staff updated and business registration
- B. Updates 2022 budget
- C. First Reading on Rental house registration revisions

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments –

~~Discussion of residents non-public hearing concern with restrictions with the travel of gravel trucks on the roads. Ordinances being looked into.~~ Discussion of residents' concerns with the enforcement and issues with the mining operation.

14. Adjourn – *Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 7:59 p.m.*

**Next meeting Monday, October 18, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by Natasha Shepard

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*October 18, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call: Present: Westerling, Adams, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Mr. Ransford  
Public: Delmer & Diana Cable, Dan Achterhof, Kevin DeVrou
3. Received for information: Planning Commission received a letter regarding the Ottawa County water issues, will receive more information from the Supervisor for an idea of what is coming down the line.
4. Motion by Schut with the recommendation to modify number 13 to clarify the concern with enforcement and issues with the mining operations to approve the October 4, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes. Seconded by Zeinstra **Approved: 6-0**
5. Motion by Chairperson Longcore to approve the September 20, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Seconded by Adams **Approved: 6-0**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items.*  
*Chairperson Longcore then closed the public comments section.*
7. Public Hearings:
  - A. Map Amendment & Site Plan- 6138 LMD Planned Unit Development – Final Plan  
Mick McGraw with Eastbrook Homes proposed 99 unit single family 2 story, ranch style detached homes. Mr. McGraw will submit to consumers for appropriate lighting and in accordance with the township ordinances. Willing to compromise on the sidewalks. They prefer the one larger sidewalk on one side of the street but willing to accommodate to the Board's opinions on sidewalks on both sides. Open space, tree preservation and buffering space will be maintained.  
Mr. Ransford reiterated Mr. McGraw's above statements and added a traffic study was also completed and data collected by the township engineer concluded that no improvements were necessary to accommodate the 99 lots. Items noted include, deviations from the front, side yard setbacks, lot width requirements of the R3 district and lastly density appropriateness.  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section of the public hearing.*  
Steve and Kim Vanderhelm concerned with affecting water levels in their well, where traffic will be diverted on 60<sup>th</sup>, and smaller lots then current lots on 60<sup>th</sup>.  
Kevin DeVrou concerned with surveys/plot lines prior to construction, smaller lots and will traffic be able to enter and exit from 60<sup>th</sup> to 64<sup>th</sup>.  
Diana Cable concerned with traffic speed.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section of the public hearing.*

Mr. Longcore addressed some of the public comments that were made, stating that speed is set by the Road Commission, the new development will be city water and should not affect surrounding areas well water levels. Per the fire department less than 100 units on a private road, met requirements, Road Commission said 75 units on a private road.

Mr. McGraw explained that the traffic study process is as follows, looked into dates, times of day, current traffic volume, model that development and what that could do to traffic as well and the impact with the assumption with traffic in and out one entrance. Traffic would not be that significant to require another entrance or exit. The Road Commission will make the final judgment on needing another entrance/exit area. Mr. McGraw ensured setting up precautionary safety measures to signal construction areas. Mr. McGraw ensured buffering area would be enforced and would not be touched.

Mr. Adams voiced concern regarding the minimum 10-foot distance between the proposed homes, and that consideration might be given to 16 feet to 20 feet. Mr. Schut concurred with the possibility of providing additional distance between the proposed homes, and also questioned the lot widths of approximately 55 feet. Mr. Schut stated that he would like to see the lots meet the minimum standards for the MDR district and not be less than that. After some discussion the majority of the Commissioners were agreeable to the proposed distances between houses.

Motion by Kelley to approve the PUD as presented with the condition that the sidewalk lots have a front yard setback of 24 feet, and the non-sidewalk side can stay 20-foot setbacks.

Seconded by Zeinstra **Approved 4-2**

**Approved- Westerling, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore**

**Opposed- Schut and Adams**

B. Text Amendment • Section 16.02A – Permitted Uses

Mr. Ransford reiterated the Revisions to Section 16.02A permitting ordinance to allow commercial uses within the Industrial Zoning District.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section of the public hearing.*

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment staff section of the public hearing.*

Motion by Schut to recommend the approval of Text Amendment as presented Section 16.02A

Seconded by Kelley **Approved 6-0**

8. Site Plan Review- *None*

9. Old Business- *None*

10. New Business – *None*

11. Public Comments- 6138 LMD Planned Unit Development small lots were mentioned again along with speedbumps.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

12. Township Board Reports- Budget work and first reading on the Biltmore LLC rezone



13. Commissioner and Staff Comments – Mr. Schut informed the public these projects go to the Board and are not final. PUD clean up and adding onto the 2022 work list to add open space for single family home details.

14. Adjourn – *Chairperson Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.*

**Next meeting Monday, November 01, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by Natasha Shepard

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*November 1, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

1. Meeting called to order
2. Roll Call  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Absent: Kelley  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford
3. Received for information: No information received
4. Motion by Adams to table approval of the October 18, 2021 meeting minutes pending revision regarding the 6138 PUD discussion providing more information on the discussion leading to the two (2) dissenting votes. Seconded by Schut. **Approved 6-0**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the November 1, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 6-0**
6. Public Comments for non-public hearing items:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*
7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review: None
9. Old Business: None
10. New Business

A. DeJong Leasing, LLC

- Retail Shed Display – 11185 84<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Mr. DeJong introduced the project of displaying sheds on his property for retail. Explaining that the sheds will only be displayed at this location along with information regarding how to purchase the sheds. There would be no office on site to purchase the sheds.

Planner Ransford reviewed his memo noting the current use of the property and the information provided as items to be considered by the Planning Commission, including whether the proposed retail shed display together with the existing retail use is one principal use pursuant to the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Adams and Mr. Zuniga had concerns about the current use of the property and if the added display would constitute a 2<sup>nd</sup> use on one parcel, which is not allowed in Allendale Charter Township. It was concluded that since there would be no sales conducted on the property this would align with the current retail use of the property.

Commissioners also discussed the site lighting, parking and sidewalks and consensus was that lighting and parking were adequate and that the sidewalks were not necessary as the applicant would like to display the sheds so they could be viewed as if they were in a yard. There was concern regarding the submitted drawings as they were not to scale and were illegible.

Motions by Schut, to approve the request for a retail shed display at 11185 84<sup>th</sup> Ave. with the conditions that the site plan is updated with:

1. legible dimensions and size to meet minimum requirements of site plan approval,
2. indicate the display area is for the portable mobile sheds of approximately 10-15 barns, displayed as owner pleases in the designated area on the site plan.

Conditions to be verified by Planner Ransford.

Seconded by Westerling. **Approved 6-0**

Mr. DeJong indicated he will have the survey updated by Nederveld and will show the barns on the "displayed area."

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

12. Township Board Reports:

Mr. Zeinstra reported that the Biltmore rezoning was approved by the Board, the Township hired two new employees and that the Board is still working on next year's budget.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Schut questioned Mr. Zeinstra regarding the new driveway at the Township Hall and when it would be completed, but Mr. Zeinstra did not have any information.

14. Adjourn:

Mr. Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, November 15, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Kelli McGovern

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*November 15, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Call the Meeting to Order
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Longcore, Westerling, Schut, Adams, Kelley  
Absent: Zuniga, Zeinstra  
Staff Present: Planner Greg Ransford
3. Received for Information: Email regarding Township Staff looking into mining operations.
4. Motion by Adams to approve the revised October 18, 2021, Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Schut. **Approved 5-0**
5. Motion by Schut to approve the November 1, 2021, Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approved 5-0**
6. Motion by Longcore to approve the November 15, 2021, Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approved 5-0**
7. Public Comments for *non-public hearing item*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*
8. Public Hearings: None
9. Site Plan Review: None
10. Old Business:
  - A. Text Amendments  
These Text Amendments were brought to the Township Board and were returned to the Planning Commission for some modifications.
    - Section 3.19 – Tree Preservation  
Commissioners discussed the changes and would like more direction and context from the Board regarding how they would like to see this amendment modified.
    - Section 24.06H – Waste Disposal Facilities  
Commissioners discussed non-conforming enclosures, updates to clarify replacement of these enclosures and instructed Planner Ransford to make changes to the amendment.
    - Section 24.06J – Building Appearance  
The Board would like a clarifying statement added to the amendment, stating that it does not apply to residential developments. The Planning Commission agrees and directed Ransford to revise accordingly for their consideration.
11. New Business:
  - A. Work Program
    - Industrial setbacks – zero yard

Commissioners discussed the option of applying this to the Commercial Zoning Districts also and consensus among the Commissioners was that yes it could be applied to those districts also.

Mr. Schut inquired on whether this was in practice in any other townships that Planner Ransford serves and wants to make sure that building codes are followed for fire separation.

Commissioners discussed using zero-yard setbacks when a shared design is proposed, and the complications involved in that. The Commissioners suggested potential language and directed Planner Ransford to discuss with PCI what the building code would require of zero-yard setbacks for buildings.

- Article 8 – R-2 Medium Density Single- and Two-Family Residential District – title change

This change removes the Two-Family distinction out of the title. The Planning Commission directed Ransford to schedule the amendment for public hearing at a future meeting with additional amendments.

12. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items. No comments were made, and he closed the public comment section.*

13. Township Board Reports: None

14. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Planner Ransford informed the Commission that there is not much on the agenda for the next meeting, and it could possibly be canceled.

15. Adjourn:

Mr. Longcore adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

**Next meeting December 6, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

*Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Kelli McGovern*

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*December 20, 2021*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Call the Meeting to Order

2. Roll Call:

Present: Longcore, Westerling, Schut, Adams, Chapla, Zuniga, Zeinstra

Staff Present: Planner Greg Ransford

Public: Jack Barr, Merwyn Koster, Doug Lindeman, Chris Adamson, Sam Sterk, Todd Stuve

3. Received for Information:

Letter from Georgetown Township's Zoning Administrator and an email from Chris Adamson for Commissioner review.

4. Motion by Schut to approve the November 15, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Adams. **Approved 7-0**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the December 20, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Schut. **Approved 7-0**

6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing item*:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section for non-public hearing items.*

A. Merwyn Koster – Solar energy inquiry

Mr. Koster has had an inquiry regarding installing a solar farm on one of his properties and would like the Planning Commission's input on if that would be a "similar use" or if the Commission would need to revise the Zoning Ordinance and if this would be allowed on that property.

Commissioners discussed screening and fencing and whether it would be better suited in the agricultural zoning district versus the industrial zoning district.

Consensus among the Commissioners was that it would be better to develop the language and amend the Zoning Ordinance to have specific standards. Direction was provided to Ransford to present language for the Commissioners to consider, including wind turbines, bio-digesters, and ethanol facilities.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

7. Public Hearings: None

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Annual Mining Reports

- Placid Waters

Consensus from the Commissioners was that they were satisfied with the report.

- Hidden Shores

Consensus from the Commissioners was that they were satisfied with the report.

#### B. Map Amendment Request

- 5380 Lake Michigan Drive – 70-09-25-100-102 PT
- 5316 Lake Michigan Drive – 70-09-25-100-072
  - Requesting rezoning from R-2 to GC

Todd Stuive with Exxel Engineering introduced the project.

Planner Ransford reviewed his memo for the Commissioners and pointed out that the property is Master Planned as GC.

Consensus from the Commissioners was that GC would be a good fit for the subject properties and directed Planner Ransford to schedule the public hearing.

#### C. Site Condominium Application

- 5380 Lake Michigan Drive – 70-09-25-100-102 PT
  - Centennial Farm – Cursory Review

Todd Stuive with Exxel Engineering introduced the Site Condominium project.

Planner Ransford pointed out that this is a cursory review, brought to the Planning Commission at this time without all the comments from Township staff because of delays in obtaining those comments. Planner Ransford's main comment would be regarding a trip generation analysis.

Commissioners opined that the plan was a good fit for the proposed area. Commissioners then directed Planner Ransford to schedule the public hearing when the applicant responds to the staff comments if it does not significantly change the plan.

#### 11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section.*

Planner Ransford presented the Commission with the proposed meeting schedule for 2022.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section.*

#### 12. Township Board Reports:

Mr. Zeinstra reported that:

1. The Board had the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading for the PUD ordinance for 6138 Lake Michigan Dr.
2. Had the Final Preliminary Plat Review for DewPointe West 4.
3. Is trying to change the speed limit on 64<sup>th</sup> Ave. North of Lake Michigan Dr. to 45 mph.
4. Has appointed a committee to look at adding a one-room schoolhouse to the park or library property.

#### 13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Goodbyes and thank you to Mr. Schut for his 11 years of service on the Planning Commission.

Chairman Longcore asked if there were any objections to the proposed meeting dates for 2022.

Consensus was to tentatively cancel the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

14. Adjourn:

Chairman Longcore adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

**Next meeting January 3, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.**

Planning Commission Minutes respectfully submitted by Kelli McGovern