

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*January 6, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff present: Planner Ransford

3. Received for Information: A letter from Dave and Karri Rozema in regards to the kennel language.

4. Motion by Schut to approve the December 16, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes. Seconded by Adams.

**Approved 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the January 6, 2020 Agenda with the change of moving New Business ahead of Old Business. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 7-0.**

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

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment period.*

Laurie VanderBroek of 10733 Douglas was concerned with the Meadow Lake application. She was concerned with the water table and the flooding behind her home. She feels that the elevation is not high enough to support new homes being built behind her home. She feels that the drainage plan will not completely protect her home from any runoff.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment period due to no further comments.*

7. Public Hearings: None

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. New Business:

A. Meadow Lake Site Condominium – Seeking 23 single-family residential units

Don De Groot with Exxel Engineering was on behalf of the applicant, Bill Aukeman. He stated that the development contains about 20 acres and is located to the east of 56<sup>th</sup> Ave and to the west of the existing Dewpointe East. Mr. De Groot explained the details of this proposed development. The applicant is seeking the preliminary approvals so that they may begin construction plans.

Mr. Ransford explained his memo to the public, including the zoning history of this property. He also informed the public that for site condominiums, the Planning Commission will need to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for review. Mr. Ransford stated that the Planning Commission would like to see the placement of the streetlights on the site plan and the fixture specification sheet. He also stated that a copy of the Master Deed should be given when the final plan is submitted.

Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Ransford to clarify the drainage requirements. Planner Ransford stated that the development is required to maintain the drainage on site. They cannot build anything that would allow drainage onto a neighbor's property.

Mr. Longcore addressed the applicant in regards to lots one through three and eight through ten. He stated that they appear to be following the building envelope and setback requirements, but the lots seem narrow. The applicant addressed Mr. Longcore's concerns and stated that many of the lots on the adjacent subdivision are of similar widths.

Mr. De Groot addressed the Commission's questions about the water main loops, the possibility of constructing in phases, and sidewalk requirements. Mr. Longcore asked about lot 23 in relation to the condo association. Mr. De Groot stated that there would be language explaining that lot 23 would not have obligations to an association that they do not receive benefit from. Mr. Zeinstra asked about the grading of the pond and potential sand removal. Mr. De Groot stated that the applicant has no plans of removing sand at this time, but if he would like to in the future, he will apply for a mining permit and use 56<sup>th</sup> Ave for access.

Mr. Adams asked about the depth of the ground water. Mr. De Groot stated that the water is about 5 feet below existing grade, or elevation 751. Mr. Aukeman has taken fill from the future pond in order to prep the land divisions. The streets will be elevated so that the homes are high enough to accommodate for the sewer. He then discussed the elevation of the finished floor of the homes in relation to the existing ground.

Mr. Kelley asked where the home will be built on lot 12, and Mr. De Groot stated that it is up to the discretion of the future property owner. Mr. Adams asked about the contours of lot 17 on the south end of the property. Mr. De Groot replied that the contours are a ditch.

Township staff will schedule a public hearing at a future Planning Commission meeting pending the finalization of the Township Planner and Township Engineer comments. Mr. Longcore informed the public that was present that they will receive a notification in the mail of the date of the public hearing.

#### B. Election of Officers

Motion by Westerling to keep Mr. Longcore as Chairperson, Mr. Schut as Vice Chairperson, and Mr. Zuniga as Secretary for the Planning Commission in the year of 2020. Seconded by Zeinstra.

**Approved 7-0.**

#### 10. Old Business:

##### A. Kennel language

Mr. Ransford recapped the changes and details of the previous Planning Commission meeting in regards to the kennel language. The Township legal counsel has approved of this language, and the Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Schut asked if there was a link to the Ottawa County website in regards to their kennel language. Mr. Ransford stated that a reference to their ordinance may be added to the Township's language. Mr. Longcore is concerned that if the Planning Commission chooses to add a hyperlink, the Township will need to update their ordinance every time that Ottawa County changes their website.

The Commission discussed the hours in which dogs may be let outdoors. They discussed the possibility of making the window of quiet time the same as the existing Township noise ordinance: 11pm to 7am. Mr. Adams suggested putting this information in the kennel language so that a future applicant will have the full information without the need to read the full ordinance. Both Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Kelley agreed to add the time frame into the language. The Commission discussed where to add the quiet time hours in the language and the details and process of the annual review. Direction was provided to Ransford to review and return with a draft at the next meeting.

##### B. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments – Chad Doornbos

Chad Doornbos was not present at the meeting. This will be reviewed at a future meeting when Mr. Doornbos is present.

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment period.*

Marcia Hoekstra of 9916 84<sup>th</sup> Ave. stated that they have lived in multiple areas of Allendale and both have been around kennels. While they are not officially living at a particular address yet, every time they are at the address, they can hear barking from the nearby kennel. She is wondering what materials will be used to contain the noise from the dogs. She said that people do live close to one another in the agricultural district and dogs are not protected under the Right to Farm Act.

Shelly Holstege of 9773 84<sup>th</sup> Ave thanked the Planning Commission for their time. She acknowledges that they are probably the closest neighbors of the kennel on 84<sup>th</sup> Ave and the neighbors that have complained the most. She noted that she has visited the Rozema's kennel on Pierce St. and the dogs are not barking. She has never been chased by a dog at the Rozema's kennel. She is hoping that the noise ordinance will help with her complaints.

Karri Rozema of 7897 Pierce St. stated that she does the best she can do to keep her animals in control. She owns both dogs and livestock. She is concerned about the quiet time hours, her right to breed animals, the annual review, and complaints.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment period due to no further comments.*

12. Township Board Reports: None.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Zeinstra questioned the need for a sidewalk in a site condominium.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:15pm.

**Next meeting January 20, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**



# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*January 20, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff present: Planner Ransford

3. Received for Information: None.

4. Motion by Schut to approve the January 6, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approved 6-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the January 20, 2020 Agenda. Seconded by Adams. **Approved 6-0.**

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

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

7. Public Hearings: None.

8. Site Plan Review: None.

9. Old Business:

A. Kennel language

Planner Ransford recapped the information that changed regarding the kennel language from the last Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Schut suggested that under Section 23.19fvi, the language reference sound control rather than sound proofing the building as it may be difficult to sound proof. The Commission discussed what the sound control may entail. Mr. Schut wondered who would complete the inspection for a new or reestablished kennel to make sure that they meet the requirements. The Commission discussed that the Zoning Administrator may complete these inspections.

Township staff will schedule a public hearing at a future Planning Commission meeting with the change noted to Section 23.19fvi.

10. New Business:

A. Allendale Charter Township – Maintenance Building

Tim Vande Zande from The Architectural Group was present. He stated that this is a two-phase project. The existing maintenance building will move further south on the property and a new fire station will be built. He discussed the zoning of the site and the building materials.

Planner Ransford discussed the memo that Lindsay Mohr created. Mr. Zuniga expressed concern over the potential lack of parking with the new maintenance building, and Mr. Adams requested Mr. Ransford clarify the Planning Commission's role in the process of reviewing this building. Ransford stated that the Michigan Enabling Act requires the Planning Commission to review and provide recommendation regarding the proposed building. Although Allendale Township does not need to comply with the zoning

ordinance, the Township Board asked that the building is completed as closely as possible to the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Longcore replied to Mr. Adam's earlier question regarding the Commission's role. Mr. Longcore stated that the Township has a right to do what they wish with their property. While the Commission may voice their opinion on the proposed building, they are being asked if it is in compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Longcore wondered how this maintenance building would look in comparison to the fire station. Mr. Vande Zande described how the fire station will look in appearance including the adjacent parking spots, how the site was chosen, and the timeline of the proposed building.

The Commission expressed concern over the limited parking spots and green space of the proposed maintenance building. This green space was suggested to be used as overflow parking. They also expressed a desire for continuity of both the proposed fire station and proposed maintenance building. Mr. Zuniga requested to see a Master Plan of the park. Consensus was reached that the appearance of the building is acceptable, but Mr. Vande Zande will connect with Mr. Ransford and address the concerns of the Planning Commission for a second review.

#### B. 2020 Work Program

Mr. Ransford recapped his memo for the 2020 Work Program. He stated that there are two new matters for the Planning Commission: the suggestion by Mr. Zeinstra to require condominium developments to create sidewalks along private streets and remove the rezoning factors from the Master Plan and move them to the ACTZO.

Mr. Longcore explained for the new commissioners that every year the Planning Commission looks at their list of projects for the entire year. During this meeting, the Commission is able to remove or add matters to this list. Consensus was reached that numbers 3, 8, 10, 11, and 12 of the 2020 Work Program Draft be moved to the top five numbers of the program.

#### C. 2019 Annual Report

Mr. Ransford recapped the 2019 Annual Report and asked the Planning Commission to review it for errors or omissions.

Motion by Schut to approve the 2019 Annual Report as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approved 6-0.**

#### D. Master Plan – Introduction and Agricultural Chapters

Planner Ransford explained the agricultural chapters of the Master Plan. He stated that many individuals enjoy the rural character and the open space that may achieve this character. This is not limited to agriculture, but rather also includes woodlands, open spaces, etc., and could be extended onto the residential chapter. Ransford suggested that creating wildlife corridors may be popular. These corridors would connect open spaces between developments for the benefits of both the rural character and wildlife.

The Commission discussed the Master Plan results, including their control of alcohol use at events, pedestrian bridges, and the definition and different aspects of rural character. The Commissioners also discussed the expressed threat of large-scale commercial development by residents.

Mr. Ransford asked the Commission if they had any interest in limiting land divisions in order to preserve agricultural land. The Commission discussed their thoughts regarding the rights of property owners and the growth of the Township. Direction was provided to Ransford for revisions and to continue with the Master Plan Framework.

#### 11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment period.*

Karri Rozema asked about the kennel inspection in regards to Mr. Schut's earlier question about the inspections. She stated that Ottawa County presently does their own inspection. She stated that they have guidelines for kennel owners.

Mr. Schut responded to Mrs. Rozema stating that his question was in regards to the enforcement of the Special Use Permit. He felt that the best way to enforce the regulations is by inspecting the business, and that the Township duplicates many of the Ottawa County regulations. He clarified that this applies to new or reestablished kennels.

Mr. Kelley asked Mrs. Rozema who comes from Ottawa County to inspect her business, and she replied that someone from Animal Control inspects every year. She explained the process that she completes every year for Ottawa County in order to be inspected and receive her license. Mr. Longcore explained to Mrs. Rozema that this ordinance is in place in order to respond to potential complaints received about kennels.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment period due to no further comments.*

12. Township Board Reports: None.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Ransford stated that Mr. Doornbos was unavailable for this meeting, but he is available for the meeting on February 3, 2020. He also clarified that existing kennels are grandfathered in and are not subject to this new ordinance unless they were to expand. They will receive a letter from the Township stating this information.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:37.

**Next meeting February 3, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**



# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*February 3, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff present: Lindsay Mohr

3. Received for Information: None.

4. Motion by Schut to approve the January 20, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approved 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the February 3, 2020 agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 7-0.**

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

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

7. Public Hearings:

A. Meadow Lake Sit Condominium – Seeking 23 single-family residential units

Don DeGroot was present on behalf of Exxel Engineering. He recapped the details of the project for the Planning Commission and public. Ms. Mohr stated that the details of the project from the January 6, 2020 meeting all meet their standards except the environmental considerations. The Township engineer has discovered many issues that need to be addressed before this project is brought before the Township Board.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment period.*

Steve Woodworth of 10945 56<sup>th</sup> Ave was concerned over the drainage. He stated that when he first moved to Allendale, he felt that the drainage was not handled properly. He would like to be assured that there will be proper drainage for this development.

Norman Webb of 10975 Lance Ave was concerned over the traffic flow in the development and the speed limit on 56<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Karen Hordyk of 10915 56<sup>th</sup> Ave was concerned over the speed of traffic on 56<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Caleb Jonker of 10881 56<sup>th</sup> Ave stated that he asked for plans of the project at the first Planning Commission meeting for this project but was not given them. He expressed concern over 56<sup>th</sup> Ave, the driveways of lots on 56<sup>th</sup> Ave, the fact that these proposed units are called site-condominiums, the ownership of the site, if the units will be rental properties, and the drainage of his pond.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment period.*

Mr. Longcore addressed the concerns of the public. He stated that all control of 56<sup>th</sup> Ave is placed on Ottawa County Road Commission. Longcore asked Ms. Mohr to confirm that a traffic study would not be conducted on this road because of a lack of certain triggers. The lots along 56<sup>th</sup> with the exception of lot 23 were split R-1 lots. Lot 23 will potentially be another split if another split is available. Either way, these homes on 56<sup>th</sup> Ave will have driveways onto 56<sup>th</sup> Ave. The remaining homes will go into the development.

Mr. DeGroot stated that a site-condominium is a way to divide property and is very similar to a plat. This development will look just like a plat, and the homes are single family, owner-occupied homes.

Shawn Bates of Fleis and VandenBrink addressed the drainage comments. He stated that proper drainage is a high priority in order to protect the home owners and surrounding neighbors. The size of the pond is one of their concerns and how it will affect the size of the lots. He confirmed that the drainage needs to be self-contained and cannot affect the levels of surrounding properties.

Mr. DeGroot addressed the drainage concerns of the public and stated that they are at this meeting for a preliminary review – this is why they do not yet have the full details of every aspect of the site. He stated that right now there is an emphasis on receiving approval for the lots rather than the engineering of the property. He stated that there is a process that they need to go through for proper drainage and they will go through every step in the process. The ditches are designed for a 100-year event, and the water table could lower slightly because of the pond.

Mr. Schut asked Mr. DeGroot to discuss the elevation of the basements. Mr. DeGroot stated that the lowest elevation of the basement is about 3 or 4 feet above the pond and the minimum opening for a window in the basement is 658 feet. Elevations for the adjacent developments have been collected and they will be consistently similar to that of this new development. The 100-year elevations will be lower than the elevations of the basement.

The Commission and Mr. DeGroot discussed the grading easement, the permanent cul-de-sac, and the applicant would apply for a mining permit if necessary.

Mr. DeGroot suggested that the Planning Commission approve the layout with the condition that the storm water management be addressed with appropriate agencies, such as the Ottawa County Water Resource Commissioner.

Motion by Schut to make a recommendation to the Township Board to approve Meadows Lake Site Condominium preliminary site plan with the conditions that the Township Engineer and Township Superintendent of Water and Sewer must be satisfied with the contents of the plan, Township Engineer verify that the traffic study requirements do not meet the minimum standards of the Zoning Ordinance to address concerns of the neighboring properties, and drainage of the site must be approved by the appropriate agencies. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 7-0.**

#### 8. Site Plan Review: None.

#### 9. Old Business:

##### A. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments – Chad Doornbos

Mr. Doornbos explained the Capital Improvement Plan and the updated water systems map. He stated that they are currently planning to execute this plan of extending the water mains in 2024. He is inquiring if the Township will require water connection for a property that would like to do a metes-and-bounds split with a private road.

The Commission and Mr. Doornbos discussed the effect of requiring metes-and-bounds splits to connect to Township water and the 500- and 1000-foot radiuses of water mains. Mr. Kelley asked to see which parcels would be affected by this amendment.

##### B. 2020 Work Program

Motion by Schut to approve the 2020 Work Program as drafted. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 7-0.**

Planner Ransford will draft text amendments and schedule a public hearing for tasks one and two.

#### 10. New Business:



A. Countryside Greenhouse Mining Application – 9141 Pierce Street

Dale Buist was present on behalf of his application. The Commission asked how this application was received and questioned if it would be exempt from the mining requirements detailed in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Mohr provided background of how they received the application and confirmed that legal counsel was sought to verify that a special use is required for the proposal. Mr. Buist explained what he would like to do in regards to mining and the stripping of topsoil. The Commission discussed the impact this may have on the road when the applicant moves the sand to the other location. The Commission asked Ms. Mohr to confirm with the Township Attorney that the exemption provisions detailed in Section 23.08D of the Zoning Ordinance do not apply to this application. If not, Township staff will schedule a public hearing at a future Planning Commission meeting.

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Zuniga asked Mr. Zeinstra for information on the proposed new maintenance building, park changes, and proposed new fire station.

Ms. Mohr found the traffic study information and provided it to the Planning Commission.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:41pm.

**Next meeting February 17, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**



# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*February 17, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff present: Greg Ransford

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Schut to approve the February 3, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Adams. **Approved 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the February 17, 2020 Planning Commission agenda.  
Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**

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

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

7. Public Hearings:

A. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Section 23.19 – Kennels

Planner Ransford recapped the proposed amendment's previous hearing, purpose for reconducting the hearing, and the main location of revision. He added that other related ordinances will not have a public hearing today because no changes were made in those sections. Mr. Longcore clarified for the public that no significant changes were made and being discussed today.

*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed the public and commissioner comment period due to no further comments.*

Motion by Schut to recommend to the Board the adoption of Section 23.19 and the related ordinance sections within the Zoning Text Amendment Ordinance as presented.  
Seconded by Adams. **Approval 7-0.**

8. Site Plan Review: None.

9. Old Business:

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

The applicant, Pastor Mark Green of Allendale Baptist Church, introduced Brian to give the presentation. The applicant recapped issues presented during previous meetings and addressed each in detail. The applicant is seeking a public hearing to move forward with the project.

Regarding Presley Parkway, Mr. Ransford explained that the township attorney previously stated that the Planning Commission can require accommodation of an easement for the extension of the road; however, the supervisor is waiting for further discussion. Applicant confirmed willingness to accommodate easement and take ownership of road. Mr. Schut expressed concern regarding travel for property to the south if Presley Parkway becomes a private road; the Commission determined the road should terminate in a cul de sac. Mr. Ransford noted that the fire department has not yet commented and may have concerns.

Mr. Schut explained that the cross access into Family Fare's parking lot is unfavorable and reiterated that the purpose of cross access is to allow cars travel between stores. He would prefer the cross access to be removed to redirect access onto Henry and M-45.

Mr. Kelley requested a time frame for the construction on the property's front parcel. The applicant explained construction will ideally begin in two to three years after building the church but may instead be 20 years. Mr. Longcore expressed concern over the image of the front lawn in the interim between now and then, and he proposed adding landscaping to hide the parking lot. The applicant agreed with having plans for front lawn screening. Mr. Schut added concern with having a garden right next to M-45, as the garden can appear unattractive without proper upkeep.

Mr. Schut complimented the landscaping, but he would like to see at least three trees planted by M-45. He suggests adding a berm to block view and elevate landscaping. The applicant is willing to add berm if necessary. Mr. Longcore explained that the Commission will need to be pre-emptive on shielding parking lots to establish a precedent for future applicants.

The Commission agreed upon a wash out curb so long as gutters are included.

Mr. Westerling noted that churches can accumulate an abundance of trash. The applicant assured the Commission that the church is not interested in starting ministries such as a day care or Christian school. Mr. Longcore questioned accessibility to the dumpster, and Mr. Zeinstra remarked that the ordinance currently requires three feet on all sides, which the church will have, in addition to matching building material and color. Mr. Schut reminded the applicant that the dumpster site will need a clear 10 feet to allow access for dumpster trucks and that vinyl or composite should be used for gate materials.

To approve screening of rooftop units, Mr. Zuniga requested the applicant to provide a detailed photo of their plans before the Commission can answer this concern. Mr. Schut requested rendering to be updated to show enclosures around mechanical units, or

otherwise put those units in a different location. Mr. Longcore clarified to the applicant that the Commission will not require a parapet wall so long as the applicant can show that they will add a screening wall to meet the same provisions of the ordinance.

The Commission agreed that a traffic study is unnecessary for the proposed project.

Mr. Longcore inquired about screening between the neighboring residential property and the church. The applicant assured that landscaping and fencing will be used to screen; however, they have not talked to the homeowner about an easement.

Regarding photometrics, Mr. Schut would like to see a detailed plan of lighting numbers going into the residential property to ensure ordinance is met. The applicant explained that the closest light pole to the house is 150 feet, significantly less than Family Fare, and that lights would go off at 11 p.m.

The Commission approved sidewalk widths.

The applicant expressed willingness to work with the homeowner about the shed encroaching on their property.

Regarding façade percentage and materials, Mr. Ransford explained there are no commercial regulations on façade percentage except on glass.

Regarding snow plowing, applicant explained they anticipate pushing snow off to the back of the property or against landscape islands.

Regarding landscaping along Presley Parkway, Mr. Zuniga would like to see a few more trees.

The applicant described the monument sign and asked for an additional directional sign at Presley Parkway to assist wayfinding. Commission confirmed this would satisfy ordinance on signs. Mr. Adams inquired about the 35-foot cross and how it and the monument sign would compare, but the applicant explained they do not have details yet. The Commission agreed they would rather see details on the cross before giving approval, as illumination of the cross can affect the neighbouring properties.

Zuniga would like to give the applicant the opportunity to improve and submit the drawings before the Commission will set a public hearing. Consensus was reached to allow staff to schedule the public hearing once the site plan reflects the direction of the Planning Commission.

#### **B. Allendale Charter Township – Maintenance Building**

Tim with Architectural Group presented the new drawings per comments made at previous meetings. He explained that the building is not part of the master plan of the park and will be used for maintenance and storage. The applicant is looking for formal approval to move forward with construction.

Mr. Ransford addressed discussion items from their last meeting, including pushing the building to the east to accommodate parking, seeking fire department input, and reviewing the copy of the Parks and Recreation master plan. He further added that engineering found no issues with draining, but that engineering questioned whether or not draining was covered by the township or the county.

Mr. Schut asked if the building could be moved to the east. The applicant explained storage, trailers, and so forth will occupy the east side of building, and, therefore, the building cannot be moved. Mr. Adams remarked that these items will need coverings, and the applicant agreed to use screening in addition to large trees. Mr. Ransford did not know off-hand if the ordinance has outside storage requirements in this regard, but Mr. Longcore remarked that the area east of the building needs to be designated as outside storage and will require screening to interrupt the park's site line to the storage.

Mr. Longcore requested continuity with building color to the future fire station. The applicant explained that he could not say whether or not it will be the same color as the Fire Department. Mr. Adams remarked that since other applicants are required to have such information for approval, this explanation is not satisfactory. Mr. Zuniga proposed that approval should depend on future buildings appearing similar to the maintenance building; however, the fire station will not be built for another 10 years and a decision to move forward with the maintenance building should not be held up by the fire station.

Motion by Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the Allendale Township Maintenance Building with the following conditions:

- Outside storage shown on site plan will include screening to meet ordinance and;
- Coordination of future buildings provide continuity as much as possible in architectural style and color.

Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 6-1.**

#### 10. New Business:

A. Discussion Item – Section 23.08 – Removal of Topsoil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Minerals

Mr. Longcore recapped a prior meeting with a mining application that involved some confusion over broad language in the ordinance regarding exceptions with special use permits. The question fielded was whether or not the language in the ordinance must be reworded to reduce confusion for future applicants, particularly in agriculture use. Currently, the language suggests that any excavation on property requires a mining permit.

The Commission discussed the language used in the ordinance, whether instances of creating ponds required a mining permit, as well as whether “removal” only meant removing material off the property, and if so, if that includes removing soil off the property in order to transport the soil back onto the property at a different location.

Mr. Ransford will draft changes to the section for the Commission to review at a future date.

11. Public Comments

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

12. Township Board Reports: None.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

**Next meeting March 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*March 2, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Schut, Kelley  
Absent: Zeinstra and Zuniga  
Staff present: Greg Ransford
3. Received for Information: An email from the township attorney regarding the text amendments section of the agenda.
4. Motion by Schut to approve the February 17, 2020 Planning Commission minutes with amendments. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 5-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the March 2, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 5-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*  
  
*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed the public comments period due to no public comments.*
7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review: None
9. Old Business:

## A. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments

Planner Ransford, when asked to introduce this portion of the agenda, deferred to the information provided by Chad recapping the ongoing revisions of the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Longcore described one of the provided documents: a list of approximately 82 parcels over 20 acres, many already in the development stage. The issue needing to be addressed was the necessity of requiring each parcel to connect to public water. Mr. Longcore maintained that developments within a certain distance must connect to public water.

Mr. Adams and Mr. Longcore, in response to a question by Mr. Schut, understood the map represented all 20-acre parcels within a thousand foot area of the water main. Mr. Schut and Mr. Longcore both presented a concern that several parcels outside the map would have trouble adding a private road and connecting to public water if required.

Mr. Ransford recollected from notes made in November 2019 that the Planning Commission requested language asserting that property owners wishing to split their parcels needed to install a private road and connect to the water main. The distance a parcel needed to be from the main for this requirement to apply, however, was never finalized.

The Commission, based on a concern posed by Mr. Schut, explored how high-density developments may adversely impact the aquifer. Mr. Schut proposed that the Commission should encourage properties, especially those in high density developments, to connect to public water whenever possible should this requirement not cause undue hardship on the development.

Mr. Longcore and Mr. Schut deliberated over density levels associated with private drives and shared driveways. They considered ways the Township can regulate parcel splits and impose the burden of expense put on property owners to route water to properties far from a water main, especially those properties with large frontage.

The Commission concluded that a development averaging a lot area of less than four acres, if creating a private road, would not need to connect to public water; however, a property four acres or more would need to meet this requirement. Additionally, properties within one thousand feet of a water main would need to connect regardless.

Ransford will draft changes to the section for the Commission to review at a future date.

## 10. New Business:

### A. Text Amendments

Mr. Ransford presented three proposed Text Amendments to revise the language of the ordinances listed below: Section 3.14, which would require site condominiums to build sidewalks even when using private roads, as current language only mentions the requirement for public roads; Section 23.08, which concerns the clarification of language when classifying mining operations as opposed to other means of moving soil; and Section 29.01, which addresses factors for rezoning requests. Mr. Ransford explained that the issues with the current sections involve consistency and unnecessary repetition.

- Section 3.14 – Condominium Project Approval

Mr. Longcore asked if the Commission would need to give easements for sidewalks if the area in question was a private development. Mr. Ransford wanted to defer that question to the Commission: would the maintenance of the sidewalks be the responsibility of the development lot owners, or would the sidewalks become part of the overall public network and therefore be the township's responsibility?

Mr. Schut put forth that a private development should be responsible for building and maintaining sidewalks, which falls within their responsibility to adhere to the ordinance. The Commission agreed on this point, with Mr.



Longcore adding that the township already requires developments to have maintenance agreements for private roads, water, sewage, and so forth.

- Section 23.08 – Removal of Topsoil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Minerals

The primary sentence in this Section discussed by the Commission was the following language: “The excavation, removal, or processing of mineral material including peat, earth, gravel, sand, clay, top soil, stone or other soils or materials, including overburden, or storage or transporting of such items on or from a mining site, or the reclamation of the site after removal or excavation of such items.” Mr. Longcore suggested removing the term “excavation,” observing that the term may also refer to digging dirt in one’s property in a manner not covered under a mining definition. Mr. Longcore also wanted to address whether or not moving soil to create a body of water would be considered mining.

Mr. Schut, after agreeing with Mr. Longcore’s point on the term “excavation,” questioned the meaning of “overburden” as it pertains to mining. Mr. Ransford used Google Search to confirm that the term referred to topsoil found above valuable material.

Mr. Kelley then brought the Commission back to a discussion on removing the term “excavation” from the section. Mr. Schut explained that the intent of the ordinance was to address issues of projects selling soil or processing soil for minerals sold off-site, as opposed to situations where topsoil is moved during construction projects. He suggested that this section should address situations where soil is being sold and transported off-site, which therefore would be subject to mining ordinances.

The Commission agreed that in addition to taking out the term “excavation,” they should stop the entire sentence at “overburden” to avoid redundancy, as the description following are implied when stating “removing or processing.”

Mr. Ransford will draft changes to the section for the Commission to review at a future date.

- Section 29.01 – Procedure for Changes

The Commission discussed modifications for a list of eight Rezoning Evaluation Factors proposed to be located within Section 29.01. The fifth factor in particular drew concerns: “Will there be any community impacts which should be considered, such as increased traffic, or others which might create a need for additional services or improvements?”

Mr. Schut argued that the answer to this question in almost all cases would be positive. Mr. Longcore countered that the purpose of the question was to assess the extent of impact, not necessarily whether or not there will be impact, and that the language should be edited to clarify that intent. Mr. Kelley also

acknowledged a potential vagueness in the question and asked if the Commission should develop the factors to fit a box or be open for interpretation.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Longcore deliberated over how the eight factor's language would help them make decisions per the Master Plan. This discussion prompted Mr. Ransford to chime in, explaining that many municipalities do not have such specific requirements within their zoning considerations and is, in fact, not required. Instead, many municipalities, if they do not have a list at all, simply use the planning practice of the Three C's for guidance, listed below:

- 1) Is the request consistent with the Master Plan?
- 2) Is the property capable of supporting the uses allowed?
- 3) Are the uses allowed compatible with the surrounding uses, zoning districts, etc?

Mr. Ransford remarked that Mr. Schut seemed concerned with allowing excessive rigidity in the authority to rezone properties because the Township must look at more than just the Master Plan for its decisions. Mr. Ransford posited that using the Three C's, or otherwise language that emphasised consistent decision making, would permit flexibility in making decisions while ultimately abiding by the Master Plan. If the Commission is not consistent, he added, then they will have a difficulty denying similar future requests that were allowed for a different applicant.

Mr. Longcore expressed partiality to the Three C's and asked the Commission if they would prefer language deferring to such a method rather than the eight questions in the current amendment. Mr. Adam's suggested the Three C's could act as a prelude to the eight questions, which he favored to force decision makers to think through critical components of rezoning. Mr. Schut also liked the prelude idea but was not yet convinced of the necessity of the current eight questions, as he preferred to avoid rigid checklists.

Mr. Ransford was directed to write revised language including the Three C's as a prelude to the eight factors and to revise the factors as statements rather than questions, for the Commission to revisit at a later date.

## B. Master Plan

Mr. Ransford established that the conversation regarding Master Plan revisions today would primarily focus on the agricultural chapter based on a discussion from a month ago to include wildlife corridors and more. He explained that, typically, the Master Plan's goals are to use core items that, when Land Use applications are submitted, applicants are encouraged to compare their proposals with the Master Plan to ensure conformity. Mr. Ransford asked the Commission to review whether or not the language should be stronger.

- Residential Chapter

Mr. Ransford's inquiry in the Residential Chapter revisions of the Master Plan pertained to how R1, R2, and R3 districts ought to have utility connections and that properties should not be rezoned unless they are within the area of utilities or had access to utilities. He asked whether the language should contain strong language that makes clear to applicants that connecting to utilities will be required due to the demand higher density zones have on utilities.

Mr. Longcore agreed that if a property is going to be rezoned to a higher density, the Township would want the property to use public water and sanitary to ensure utility demands are met.

The Commission approved the current revisions to the chapter.

- Town Center Discussion

When introducing the discussion for a potential Town Center, Mr. Ransford explained that language has not been drafted in the Master Plan for a Town Center to wait for Commissioner comments.

Mr. Longcore elaborated that the Town Center, which largely had positive feedback from the public, would be a manufactured downtown area similar to 8th Street in Holland, with apartments above, shops below, and exemptions for right of ways. The key problem, Mr. Longcore admitted, was that Holland had one individual capable of financially vitalizing the 8th Street area to make it attractive for businesses and visitors. The issue, then, is of practicality: is the Commission confident a developer would be willing to buy the 30 acres of land on the corner of 60<sup>th</sup> and Lake Michigan Drive and turn it into the Town Center?

Mr. Schut reiterated that to have a Town Center, the Township would need to manage infrastructure and acquire a developer willing to fund the project. Mr. Ransford suggested drafting language into the Master Plan anyway to include a Town Center if the opportunity arose, but Westerling asserted that the Township does not have the infrastructure for such a project regardless.

Ultimately, the Planning Commission agreed to pull out Town Center language entirely. Mr. Longcore noted that this would not necessarily prevent the implementation of a Town Center should a developer proposed to create one, which addressed Mr. Adams' concern about removing language. Mr. Ransford explained that in such an instance, the Commission can turn it into a PUD.

## 11. Public Comments

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

## 12. Township Board Reports: None

## 13. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Ransford, on behalf of Eastbrook Homes, presented to the Commission an image of a preliminary layout for a development proposed for behind the Metro Health near 60th

Avenue. Eastbrook Homes is requesting a meeting with the Commission to discuss the possibility of using the area for a development. The Commission recalled the public being unsatisfied with the rezoning of those lots to R3, but agreed to let Eastbrook meet with the Commission conceptually regarding the project.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

**Next meeting March 16, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*March 16, 2020 7:00 p.m.  
Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Kelley, Zeinstra  
Absent: Schut  
Staff present: Greg Ransford
3. Received for Information: Email regarding Polkton Township's Master Plan
4. Motion by Adams to approve the March 2, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the March 16, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairperson Longcore opened and closed public comment section due to no present public.*
7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review: None
9. Old Business:
  - A. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments  
Planner Ransford prompted discussion on the Subdivision Ordinance Amendments regarding acceptable average lot sizes for private road developments in relation to requirements to connect properties to public water. Mr. Longcore recounted the discussion from the March 2, 2020 meeting which explored if splits on 20-acre lots where a private road will be installed should face a requirement to connect to the water main. Additional questions posed were at which minimum this requirement would take effect and what minimum would maintain a subdivision's rural characteristic.  
  
Mr. Zeinstra expressed concern not with lot sizes but the number of wells on a property in addition to property waste involved in splits, adding that the Commission wants to preserve farmland as much as possible. Mr. Longcore clarified that the issue involved cases regarding private road additions, noting that the Commission's previous discussion concluded that properties that split their parcels with an average of four acres as well as add a private road would not need to connect to the water main. Mr. Zeinstra agreed; however, he favored smaller average lot sizes rather than the four-acre

average presented, noting that he would like to reduce the occurrence of developers building subdivisions on agricultural parcels.

Mr. Longcore expressed appreciation for Mr. Zeinstra's opinion, noting that the Commission would also prefer to see development closer to Lake Michigan Drive rather than on agricultural parcels. Mr. Zeinstra acknowledged the nuance of the issue, particularly in that the revisions would restrict development. He opined that the goal is to protect the aquifer by requiring residents to connect to the water main and conferred with Mr. Ransford regarding legality in restricting splits. The Commission also pondered how often similar situations occurred.

After deliberation over historical occurrences and how to maintain the rural characteristics of a development, the Commission concluded that instead of four acre averages, they would require that a development averaging a lot area of more than two and one-half acres, if creating a private road, would not need to connect to public water.

Before moving forward with the agenda, Mr. Ransford requested an off-topic discussion related to Subdivision Ordinances regarded street trees and the management actions taken by the Ottawa County Road Commission. He reiterated the language in Allendale Charter Township's ordinance on street trees. The problem communities are experiencing, he explained, is that the Road Commission is not allowing, on outside horizontal curves with intersections to residential driveways, the planting of trees—or are pulling already planted trees, which is stricter than the current code book. His firm has been working with municipalities to write language that keeps trees in front yards, as trees planted before the rules have grown large, creating safety hazards.

Mr. Zeinstra posed questions pertaining to utility easements that may conflict with permitting tree placement by streets or in front yards. He suggested simplifying the issue by adding language for trees not to be allowed in the right of way and should be planted in the front yard. Mr. Ransford noted that other communities have been requiring for trees to be outside of right of way but within 10 feet of it to maintain uniformity. Mr. Zeinstra countered that such a distance overlaps with utilities, and Mr. Ransford explained that in these communities, the attorney indicated that the municipality possessed authority over the utility company in such conflicts.

The Commission deliberated over instances of easement for utility companies to go around, under, or even through trees. Mr. Longcore prefers street trees but did not want to encounter a situation like Jamestown where trees are not being planted due to Road Commission requirements.

Mr. Adam's noted that the Road Commission's requirements might involve site distance, suggesting that the ordinance should tie into site distances as far as the offsets from the right of way.

Mr. Kelley said 11 feet would provide adequate site distance, and additional discussion prompted Mr. Ransford to display on the projector an illustration and table from the Ottawa County Road Commission Code Book laying out optimal placement of trees to accommodate site distance at intersections. After the Commission examined and discussed the diagram, Mr. Ransford suggested language that required applicants to have tree plans approved by the County. In this way, the ordinance could bypass the

issue of site distance entirely. Mr. Zeinstra added that applicants should submit County approval for the tree locations to acquire a driveway permit.

The Commission requested that Mr. Ransford insert and revise the new language into the Subdivision Ordinance to be reviewed at a future date.

## B. Zoning Ordinance Amendments

- Section 3.14 – Condominium Project Approval

Mr. Ransford recapped the previous meeting where the Commission agreed to require sidewalks for private roads in site condominiums and that these sidewalks should be privately maintained by the subdivision. Mr. Ransford noted that he added a provisions, pursuant to the recommendation of the Township Legal Counsel, to make it clear that the sidewalks would be privately maintained.

Mr. Zeinstra wondered if they could encompass other items within this revision to simplify the ordinance, such as the maintenance of trees or light poles. Mr. Ransford agreed to add in a reference to such maintenance, which would avoid conflicts with other parts of the ordinance.

Mr. Ransford was directed to insert language referencing related items to improve consistency and reduce conflict in other sections, which the Commission will review at a later date.

- Section 23.08 – Removal of Topsoil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Minerals

The Commission reviewed the changes to the mining ordinance, with Mr. Kelley remarking that the revised language read much cleaner and simpler. They briefly discussed errors in punctuation and missing wording, but otherwise approved the revisions to this section.

- Section 29.01 – Procedure for Changes

Mr. Ransford explained that the draft for this section added in the Three C's of Rezoning, noting that the original factors from the previous draft were maintained with the Three C's added as a prelude. He suggested deleting the first factor because it repeated one of the Three C's, and the Commission was comfortable with this deletion.

Mr. Longcore recapped the purpose of Three C's: to help prevent the rezoning factors from being too strict while guiding the Township in making decisions fit for the Master Plan.

The Commission deliberated over the need of the second section, with Mr. Kelley pointing out most of those factors were essentially repeats of the Three C's, and while they were useful checklists and additional talking points, he questioned its necessity. Mr. Zeinstra suggested moving those items as bulleted lists underneath the appropriate C.

Mr. Ransford will draft changes to the section for the Commission to review at a future date.

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports:

Trustee Zeinstra reported that Allendale Charter Township offices are currently closed to the public due to the COVID-19 pandemic. He did not have additional items to add.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:04 a.m.

**Next tentative meeting March 16, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**



# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*May 4, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*VIA GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Zuniga, Kelley, Zeinstra, Schut  
Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: None.
4. Motion by Zeinstra to approve the March 16, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the May 4, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 6-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairman Longcore open and closed non-public hearing comment section due to no public comments.*  
  
Commissioner Kelley arrived at 7:15 p.m.
7. Public Hearings: None.
8. Site Plan Review: None.
9. Old Business: None.
10. New Business:

- a. Walgreen's Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – Raymond Building

Commissioner Schut, the contractor for the Raymond Building, recused himself from the Planning Commission during this section, but made himself available for questions concerning the project's construction and building materials.

Steve Witte, representing property owner Greg Dejong, presented to the Commission the proposed project located on 6880 Lake Michigan Drive, currently part of the Walgreen's original PUD. The applicant proposed the project as a multi-tenant commercial building for a variety of businesses, including one drive-through. Mr. Witte detailed the current plan's proposed parking spaces, sidewalks, landscaping and barriers, building material, and water utilities. He added that the

applicant intended to use existing access points only. Mr. Witte also disclosed to the Commission plans for a future building; however, the current application does not cover approval for said future building.

Planner Ransford proceeded to address key items that warranted major changes to the PUD, the reason for the applicant's presentation to the Planning Commission. Furthermore, the applicant is submitting final plans and will use feedback during this meeting to prepare for a public hearing. Mr. Ransford explained that the plans do not appear to violate any ordinances; however, certain points require attention. Mr. Longcore organized the Commission to comment point-by-point based on the Fresh Coast Planning's memorandum.

Drive-Through: Mr. Longcore was amenable to permitting the applicant a drive-through, particularly since the Walgreens uses a drive-through for prescription pick-ups, should the building to use that space have small queues. Mr. Kelley voiced concerns about traffic backing up onto the main roads.

Mr. Witte elaborated that the business using the drive-through would not expect to have long drive-through lines, unlike nearby fast-food restaurants. He explained that the plans account for six queue spaces. If the queue becomes congested, then the line would become internal to the Walgreen's site, as the distance from the property line where queueing starts to 68th Avenue's right-of-way is 330 feet. In response to a question posed by Mr. Adams, Mr. Witte explained that the project had an access easement for Lake Michigan Drive and 68th Avenue.

Mr. Zeinstra inquired about volume limits in the ordinance, but Mr. Ransford could not recall language in the ordinance for such a scenario; however, as a condition for the PUD, a return for site plan approval before the Planning Commission for the future user could be required.

Parapet Issue: Mr. Longcore recalled that rooftop equipment did not require four-foot parapets under the condition that the equipment was invisible from street level. Mr. Witte detailed how the positioning of the proposed rooftop units would shield the units from street view. The Commission agreed to this placement with the condition that a note on the plans ensure the units will not be visible from the roads.

Proposed Building Façade Materials: Mr. Witte described the materials used to construct the building's façade, including doors, canopies, and the drive-through section. The Commission found the proposed building attractive, and Mr. Schut referred to other businesses that used similar materials, such as O'Reilly in Allendale and Embassy Suites in Grand Rapids.

Location and Property Screening for Transformer Pad: Mr. Witte admitted that he did not yet know what covering will be proposed for the transformer pad but assured the Commission that the applicant does plan to screen it. Mr. Longcore requested a rendering of the transformer's screening. Mr. Ransford remarked that the current PUD requires that the building's façade should extend as a matching wall to screen air conditioners and HVAC equipment mounted on the ground, though this language could be amended. The applicant requested an amendment if possible. Mr. Witte will provide a rendering of potential screening.

Northwest Corner of Parking Lot Setback Deviation: Since the plans deviate from current ordinance, the applicant requested approval to square off their parking lot to avoid interfering with the residential driveway on their northwest corner. The Commission had no further comments on the issue.

Establishment of a Reciprocal Easement West of Property Line: The applicant will accept requirement from the Commission to establish this easement. After some discussion, the Commission would allow for an easement on the north and south side of the property, though the applicant preferred a northern easement to avoid potential conflict with a future property owner. Mr. Ransford expressed indifference to the location of the easement as long as one existed to keep traffic off Lake Michigan Drive.

Existing Vegetation: Mr. Witte referred to the landscaping plan, which illustrates a buffer along the south property line; however, aerial photography shows existing vegetation in the same area. The applicant prefers to use existing vegetation, if sufficient, rather than adding the items proposed on the landscaping plan. Mr. Ransford explained to the Commission that the matter is enforceable; however, if the applicant is using a trustworthy landscaper that remains compliant, then enforcement may not be needed. The Commission agreed that preserving natural vegetation is desirable but suggested the Township should first verify that the vegetation meets ordinance.

Vehicle Stacking Area: The Commission had no comments on this issue.

Drive-Through Screening: The Commission discussed the necessity of drive-through screening, concluding that since the drive area is facing another commercial building, only minimal screening would be required. Mr. Witte explained that currently existing birch trees will be used for screening.

Metal Panelling at Dumpster Enclosure: The Commission and applicant deliberated over the appropriateness of the metal panelling. Mr. Witte described the appearance of metal panelling as sharp, contrasting well with the building. Mr. Schut explained that the metal panelling is durable, with an added benefit of being easily replaceable. The Commission concluded that the enclosure is appropriate within reason as long as the material matches the principal material on the building. For example, canvas dumpster enclosures are not within reason even if the building uses canvas as a principal building material.

Traffic Study: Mr. Witte argued that a traffic study would not be needed for this site; furthermore, Michigan Department of Transportation would not require the study and was satisfied with a permit. The Commission was agreeable to Mr. Witte's argument, and briefly discussed concerns over left-hand turns onto 68th Avenue, where traffic leaving the lot may become stuck by the nearby red light. Mr. Witte will contact the Road Commission regarding the 68<sup>th</sup> Avenue access.

Mr. Longcore then opened up comments for all other concerns not addressed by the memorandum. Mr. Zuniga posed a concern for maneuverability with loading and unloading semi-trucks, noting that the semi-truck path appears tight. The

Commission encouraged the applicant to address this issue to help future trucks navigate the parking lot.

Mr. Ransford was authorized to set June 1st as the earliest date for Public Hearing, providing the applicant time to amend and prepare their plans.

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: Mr. Zeinstra reported that the Township has been primarily reviewing issues related to Covid-19 and current Stay-at-Home orders.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

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

**Next meeting May 18, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*May 18, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*VIA GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Zuniga, Zeinstra, Schut  
Absent: Kelley  
Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: Email from Shawn Bates of Fleis & Vandenbrink regarding new Wastewater Treatment Building
4. Motion by Westerling to approve the May 4, 2020 Planning Commission minutes with revisions. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 6-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the May 18, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairman Longcore open and closed non-public hearing comment section due to no public comments.*
7. Public Hearings: None.
8. Site Plan Review: None.
9. Old Business: None.
10. New Business:

## A. Allendale Charter Township – Wastewater Treatment Buildings

Shawn Bates, presenter of the project, described the proposal for a new administrative building and maintenance building as part of the Water and Sewer Department. The project is currently in Phase One, and the applicant is seeking feedback from the Planning Commission.

Planner Ransford summarized his provided memo, reminding the Commission that capital projects such as the current application require review and recommendation to the Board. Additionally, such projects are to be treated like any other industrial operation. He listed four items of concern and stated that a public hearing is not required at this time.

Mr. Bates first addressed the concerns presented in the memo before Mr. Longcore prompted discussion of landscaping to the front of the building to the north. Commissioner Schut expressed concern that site plan did not clearly address property lines, particularly to the west, as well as greenbelts; existing vegetation should be shown on the drawings. The applicant agreed to overlay the drawings with an aerial photo and send it to the Commissioners for review.

The Commission discussed whether or not the extensive vegetation along the front of the property satisfied ordinance and came to the conclusion that keeping natural vegetation was preferable.

Mr. Longcore drew the Commission into discussion about the parking concerns and agreed that the parking lot appeared sufficiently broken up every 20 spaces, therefore meeting ordinance.

Commissioner Adams inquired whether or not retention basin will be needed. Mr. Bates explained that they were using existing storm basins for retention, and that further analysis suggested they would not need to add new basins. He also explained to Mr. Adams that the project is outside the 100-year floodplain, and that the applicant has renewed their National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit. The site has been listed as exempt. Mr. Adams also inquired about curb and gutter requirements, and Mr. Ransford explained that curb and gutter was not required for industrial projects. Mr. Adams recommended independent engineering review, and Mr. Bates agreed to pass the comment along.

Mr. Schut requested that the applicant update the photometrics shown on the plans. He also suggested adding a note to the plans referring to dumpster enclosure requirements, even though the site will not currently have a dumpster. The Commission also agreed the applicant should designate outside storage areas; the applicant agreed to look into screening.

Mr. Ransford and the Commission deliberated over whether or not to approve the application for a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Zeinstra wanted the applicant to return so that they could ensure enough screening to the west and adequate outdoor storage was added to the drawings. The applicant was amenable to returning, as the changes would not negatively affect their bidding schedule.

Mr. Adams confirmed with Mr. Bates that the applicant will be submitting the plans for a Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit from the Ottawa County Road Commission.

Mr. Ransford confirmed with the Commission and the applicant that the Maintenance Building appearance complied with regulations and that the applicant would be adding a façade to match existing buildings.

The applicant agreed to review and make changes to the plans per the Planning Commission's feedback as soon as possible for the June 1st meeting.

## 11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Schut requested modifications to the conferencing software to reduce distracting background feedback and to improve the speaker output quality of one of the Commissioners. Additionally, Mr. Ransford reviewed with Mr. Longcore the docket for June 1st, which included a public hearing for the Raymond Building. Finally, the Commission verified with Mr. Yeoman's, host for the GoToMeetings, that public can practically engage using the software without problems.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

**Next meeting June 1, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*June 1, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*VIA GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: Letter from Patrick Mark regarding the Raymond Building

4. Motion by Schut to approve the May 18, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the June 1, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented.  
Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**

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

*Chairman Longcore open and closed non-public hearing comment section due to no public comments.*

7. Public Hearings:

A. Walgreen's Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – Raymond Building

Steve Witte represented property owner Greg DeJong to present the revised plans for the proposed building at 6880 Lake Michigan Drive. Mr. Witte recapped the project for the Planning Commission and explained changes and other concerns addressed on the plans.

Commissioner Schut, the contractor for the Raymond Building, recused himself from the Planning Commission during the section; however, he made himself available for questions and comments.

Planner Ransford apprised the public of the project's situation, notably because the project required a major amendment to the Walgreen's existing PUD in addition to the planned drive-through, which is currently prohibited. If the project receives the Planning Commission's approval, the project will be referred to the Board of Trustees to hold a public hearing.

Chairperson Longcore opened the public comments section. Patrick Marks spoke briefly about concerns he and his wife had about the project's effect on property values. These concerns were addressed in his letter received by the Planning



Commission, and Mr. Longcore assured him they would respond to the letter during the meeting.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section due to no further comments from the public.*

The Commission agreed to permit the deferment of 19 out of the 104 parking spaces to aid future construction. Additionally, the applicant told the Commission that the water runoff, which is required to be collected, will be piped into a holding area approved by the Ottawa County Road Commission. Mr. Witte then addressed concerns regarding motorists losing control of their vehicle in the parking lot.

Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Witte to comment on the screening of the dumpster. Mr. Witte explained that the proposed dumpster in the southwest corner of the site will be screened by a metal wall in addition to surrounding landscaping. He then explained that the main issue would be the location and screening of the transformer pad, which the applicant approximated its location on the site plan. Mr. Ransford remarked that the transformer pad's estimated location was outside of the setback.

Mr. Zuniga urged the applicant to completely screen the transformer due to its distance from the existing house. He also requested the applicant adjust landscaping to account for headlights potentially shining into residential properties. Mr. Witte was amenable with the idea and agreed to work with the project's landscaper. Mr. Zeinstra also suggested increasing the berm to three feet tall.

Mr. Zeinstra, Mr. Longcore, and Mr. Ransford discussed a possible requirement for a future tenant to come before the Commission first before occupying the drive-through unit. Mr. Witte reiterated that the unit is intended for operations much smaller than larger drive-through restaurants. Mr. Zeinstra proposed limiting the speaker's decibels while Mr. Longcore recommended restricting the hours of operation; both of these suggestions were in lieu of requiring the potential tenant to return before the Planning Commission for the drive-thru area.

Motion by Westerling to recommend to the Board the approval of the Walgreen's PUD Major Amendment – Raymond Building with the following recommendations, with the revised plans to be reviewed by staff:

- Defer the 19 parking spaces as shown on the plans, with curb and gutter to be constructed;
- Screen completely the transformer pad to obstruct view and reduce noise levels;
- Ensure screening around the southwest portion of the parking lot to shield headlights from the residential property to the west;
- Limit speaker sound levels to no greater than 70 decibels if installed at the drive-through; and
- Permit operations between the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.

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

8. Site Plan Review: None.

9. Old Business:

A. Allendale Charter Township – Wastewater Treatment Buildings

Shawn Bates of Fleis & Vandenbrink began the presentation for the Wastewater Treatment Buildings plan. He described changes made to the plans per feedback from the May 18, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, including,

- Adding a note to specify that a dumpster enclosure will not be present on site,
- Adding an outdoor storage area,
- Adding a concrete pad for employees to store off-site items,
- Providing an aerial photo to illustrate existing trees in relation to proposed landscaping, and
- Adjusting photometric plans per concerns from the last meeting.

Mr. Ransford explained for the public that the project was before the Commission today due to the Planning Enabling Act, which requires the Planning Commission to review all capital improvement projects. He noted that ordinances exist for performance standards on outdoor storage, encouraging the Commission to ensure those standards are met in the plans.

Mr. Adam's advocated for the applicant to seek an independent engineering review to address concerns related to soil erosion, drainage direction, grading pavement issues, the proposed ADA ramp, electrical, roof drain outlets, and roadway profiles. The applicant objected to an independent review but agreed to discuss the recommendations further.

Mr. Schut advised the applicant to clarify setback and property lines in addition to ensuring a greenbelt is maintained in the appropriate areas.

Motion by Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the Allendale Charter Township – Wastewater Treatment Buildings with the following recommendations:

- Identify greenbelts along border of residential properties as not to be cleared;
- Identify greenbelt of existing trees adjacent to the outdoor storage area to the North that will be preserved
- Ensure all generators are screened;
- Encourage applicant to receive site plan review by a third-party engineer; and
- Address grading notations.

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

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports:

Mr. Zeinstra informed the Commission that the Independence Day parade was cancelled due to COVID-19 as well as most of the events; however, the Township will continue the fireworks event and encourage vendors to set up.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Due to the governor's recent lift on the Stay Home, Stay Safe Executive Order, the Commission discussed possibilities of having an in-person Planning Commission meeting on the 15th of June.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

**Next meeting June 15, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*June 15, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Charter Township Hall*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Zuniga, Zeinstra, Schut, Kelley  
Staff present: Greg Ransford
3. Received for Information: None
4. Motion by Adams to approve the June 1, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the June 15, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  

Resident Samuel from Life West Church requested temporary zoning clearance to use the warehouse located at 4850 Allen Park Drive as a new location for his church. Planner Ransford clarified that the Planning Commission does not grant temporary uses in that regard and that industrial zones do not allow churches. To grant clearance for the church, the Commission would need to agree that churches can use industrial zones and subsequently amend the ordinance.

Commissioner Kelley confirmed with Samuel that the church would use only about 1,100 square feet of the warehouse, and that the church has been communicating with the property owner, Laser Dynamics, to accommodate parking for the congregation. In response to a question by Mr. Longcore, the applicant added that the church expects to seat around 300 attendees.

The Commission agreed that churches would be a good fit to use industrial zones as a special use, and Mr. Ransford reiterated that amending the ordinance, which could take several months, would be the best route. The Commission advised the applicant to coordinate with Mr. Ransford to begin the process.
7. Public Hearings: None.
8. Site Plan Review: None.
9. Old Business: None.
10. New Business:

A. Hidden Shores West Planned Unit Development Major Amendment – “Park” Removal

Jack Barr presented for the PUD major amendment and began by updating the Planning Commission on how mining materials were used throughout the development to make ponds. Mr. Longcore inquired about any complaints by neighbors, and the applicant touched on an on-going well water dispute.

Afterward, the applicant addressed the request for the development to remove an existing park and replace it with pavilions. Mr. Ransford elaborated on the memo he submitted for the amendment, explaining that the request required a major amendment to the ordinance at the direction of the Planning Commission and a hearing before both the Planning Commission and the Board.

Trustee Zeinstra noted that pavilions instead of play structures would be a good trade off for the development. Mr. Longcore suggested that the pavilions would be more widely used and accessible by more people. The Commission agreed the plans were ready for public hearing.

Jack Barr indicated he would provide photos of the pavilions for the final PUD plan.

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: Trustee Zeinstra reported that the Township is gradually reopening following the governor’s lifted stay-at-home orders.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

**Next meeting July 6, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

July 6, 2020

7:00 p.m.

*Allendale Charter Township Hall & Conference Call via GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Zuniga, Zeinstra, Schut, Kelley  
Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: Email from resident concerning Ryan Kelley
4. Motion by Kelley to approve the June 15, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented.  
Seconded by Schut. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the July 6, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented.  
Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the public attended the meeting via conference call. Mr. Yeomans provided each caller 90 seconds to speak. Caller 2 and Caller 6 expressed desire for accountability among the Planning Commission, calling out conduct by Commissioner Kelley specifically.
7. Public Hearings: None.
8. Site Plan Review: None.
9. Old Business:
  - A. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments
    - Section 3.2(1)t – Requirements
      - Tree location complaints  
  
Planner Ransford reiterated previous discussion on the amendments before focusing on the item in question: requiring the Ottawa County Road Commission to review street trees at the first step of the plat. This requirement would allow the Planning Commission to know which trees need to be relocated prior to planting. Since the Commission discussed this item back in March, the Township staff have reported complaints by residents about street trees. Mr. Ransford advised the Commission to consider during their

discussion to classify the trees as front yard trees rather than right-of-way trees. Mr. Ransford also clarified that the Road Commission is experiencing issues with maturing trees.

Mr. Zeinstra appreciated the street trees for traffic control; Mr. Longcore and Mr. Schut noted that the Commission must compromise between attractive landscaping and visibility and maintenance problems caused by maturing trees. When prompted by Mr. Longcore, Mr. Yeomon's described complaints related to issues with trimming the trees. Mr. Adams noted that street trees may push up sidewalks; therefore, the trees would be a Township maintenance issue.

Mr. Longcore suggested using language that required trees that will become larger as they mature to be planted in front yards rather than the right of way. Mr. Schut noted that they would need to account for planting distance, as roots can grow as far as the canopy. Mr. Zeinstra offered the idea of implementing root barriers to protect sidewalks and researching the issue in more depth.

Mr. Schut suggested that the residents should be responsible for trimming trees whereas the Township will need to maintain sidewalks if buckled by the trees. Mr. Longcore questioned the extent of the resident's responsibility in this issue, and Mr. Ransford agreed to research the question further.

The Commission also recapped previous text amendment discussions, such as a move to write in the Three C's in the Master Plan for rezoning guidance.

The Commission approved Mr. Ransford scheduling the amendments for public hearing.

## B. Zoning Ordinance Amendments

### i. Section 3.14 – Condominium Project Approval

Mr. Ransford reiterated previous discussions on this section, noting that the ordinance language now treats condominium street requirements the same as subdivision applications.

### ii. Section 23.08 – Removal of Topsoil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Materials

Mr. Ransford explained that this section was mostly grammatical and punctuation revisions.

### iii. Section 23.12A – Private Roads and Streets, General Provisions

Mr. Ransford noted that discussion for this section referred to reducing the minimum lot size from four acres to two and a half acres in certain instances on private roads.

iv. Section 29.01 – Procedure for Changes

Mr. Ransford explained that these amendments concerned the Commission's request for revised procedures for change in the zoning ordinance.

The Planning Commission had no further comments on these amendments and directed Ransford to schedule for public hearing.

10. New Business:

A. Master Plan – Commercial Uses Chapter & Industrial Uses Chapter

Mr. Ransford expounded that based on workshops and previous discussions, these two chapters were drafted to address concerns over big box store appearances. Additionally, the planner requested the Commission to discuss whether or not all industrial land uses should be serviced by public sanitary sewer and water or if they only apply to intensive public land uses.

The Commission began the discussion by deliberating over the appearance of big box stores in the Township. Mr. Longcore noted that in the past, they have largely requested stores to maintain an attractive appearance that provides a "town center vibe." The idea, Mr. Schut added, was to have large, blocky stores such as Walmart or Meijer to break up their building façade. Mr. Ransford remarked that forbidding these stores were not enforceable as the issue was not related to the Zoning Ordinance; however, the Commission could require the stores to conform to the Master Plan.

The Commission also deliberated over the effect of businesses appearing like residential buildings. Mr. Schut and Mr. Zeinstra discussed the appearance of stores that use residential building materials. They noted that the current master plan encourages developers to use residential buildings as businesses in keeping with the Township's character and that this should change. Mr. Schut suggested that the Township evaluate commercial buildings on an regular basis, and Mr. Adams suggested an evaluation every five years.

The Commission then moved to discuss the Industrial Uses chapter. Mr. Zeinstra began by explaining that not all industrial buildings require considerable amounts of sewer and water, so the requirement may not need to apply to all industrial businesses. Mr. Longcore noted that they already have a requirement for industrial businesses to have utilities as needed. Mr. Zeinstra recommended adopting a change of use requirement for businesses moving into a building, but Mr. Schut countered this suggestion by explaining problems tenant buildings would have with such a requirement.

After more deliberation, Mr. Ransford summarized what the Commission wanted: industrial buildings, if they fall under intensive use, would be required to be serviced by public sanitary sewer and water. Mr. Ransford will perform the related revisions to the draft text.

B. Park Township Tree Preservation ordinance



Mr. Ransford introduced this ordinance, explaining that it was already scheduled for public hearing. The Township does not want to overregulate due to significant heritage in streets that they want to protect; however, some regulation would ensure that residential and commercial developments would require wildlife corridors, minimize tree removal, and provide setback on roads.

Regarding minimizing tree removal, Mr. Schut expressed partiality to the move, recalling AutoZone and the oak they removed. Mr. Longcore agreed that the ordinance might be needed to avoid businesses excavating old and beautiful trees and replacing them with what the business wants. Mr. Zeinstra posited that no one knows how long these older trees might last. He suggested businesses could use an arborist to determine whether it would be better to remove a particular tree or replace it with a younger tree, though even such a solution may be expensive. Mr. Schut offered the idea to require businesses to provide a site plan that details the developer's intentions for trees.

The Commission determined they were not opposed to the preservation of trees, agreeing that the ordinance draft Mr. Ransford presented was a good start. Ransford will update the Commission on the outcome of the ordinance at Park Township before the Commission proceeds with their own version.

11. Public Comments:

Mr. Longcore opened the second public comment section in the same passion as the first. All callers reiterated earlier concerns regarding Mr. Kelley's conduct in relation to recent racial tensions across the country. One caller also called for more diversity among the Commissioners.

12. Township Board Reports: Trustee Zeinstra reported that the Board has been occupied by the park statue among usual business.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

**Next meeting July 20, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

July 20, 2020

7:00 p.m.

*Allendale Charter Township Hall & Conference Call via GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Westerling

Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Schut to approve the July 8, 2020 Planning Commission minutes with amendments. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 6-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the July 20, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0.**

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

*Chairman Longcore open the public comment section.*

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the public attended the meeting via conference call. Mr. Yeomans provided each caller 90 seconds to speak. Caller 1 expressed disfavor for Commissioner Kelley's conduct on social media. Caller 2 advocated for the representation of women on the Planning Commission as well as concerns with Mr. Kelley.

*Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section due to no further comments.*

7. Public Hearings: None.

8. Site Plan Review: None.

9. Old Business: None.

10. New Business:

A. J&H Oil Special Use Amendment – 6209 Lake Michigan Drive

- Determination of minor versus major

Planner Ransford summarized J&H Oil's project as a small addition to include a walk-in cooler. The Planning Commission's responsibilities during the meeting were to determine whether or not the project qualified as a minor amendment, which needs only a notation in the meeting's minutes, or otherwise a major amendment, which consequently requires a full site plan

review and a public hearing. Mr. Ransford explained that Fresh Coast Planning already resolved some issues with the applicant.

The applicant added that Priority Construction planned to maintain the same materials as the existing building. Prompted by Trustee Zeinstra, the applicant accounted for the planned screening around the rooftop units. Mr. Zeinstra and Commissioner Adam's both disapproved the screening, and the applicant agreed to revisit the issue.

Mr. Longcore clarified with Mr. Ransford that if the Commission approved the project as a minor amendment, then the plans, as well as the parapet, would still need staff approval.

Mr. Schut noted that staff would likely approve the plans by the letter of the law but that the Planning Commission could go beyond that letter opined that the project looked more like an addition than an enhancement. The applicant replied that Priority Construction planned to match existing features of the building; however, he agreed to work with staff to meet requirements if needed.

Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Adam's agreed with Mr. Schut, suggesting to the applicant that extending the brick and revamping the screening would improve the building's appearance.

A consensus was reached to determine that the special use amendment was minor. After clarifying the Planning Commission's requests, the applicant agreed to revise the plans per feedback and be ready for review during the next meeting. Revisions are to include a parapet wall of at least four feet in height along the west and south walls, extend the masonry in the same fashion as the existing building along with other similar features to naturally blend the addition to appear as one construction.

A. Eastbrook Homes – 6138 Lake Michigan Drive (and 60th Avenue)

- Housing concept inquiry

Mr. Ransford introduced Eastbrook Home's housing concept inquiry, an informal site plan with elevations. The applicant desired feedback from the Commission before evaluating the project with the firm's engineers.

The applicant presented the project's general concept, including photographs of past projects, and requested feedback on the Commissioners preferences. He also wanted clarity on parameters and density before revising the plans and formally submitting them. The applicant also discussed their portfolio and the research that went into preparing this concept.

Mr. Schut was amenable to including more affordable housing in the Township and suggested that the Commission should revisit the requirements for single family homes. Mr. Longcore consulted with Mr. Ransford about the location's current zoning and whether or not it would need to be rezoned. Additionally, the Commission discussed reasons for why a previous applicant for this property was denied and how it compared with Eastbrook's plans.

Mr. Zeinstra would like to see vegetation among the homes and increased space between the houses. He also noted the importance of visitor parking. Commissioner Zuniga and Mr. Adams agreed that increasing footage would be beneficial. Mr. Kelley requested more information on amenities and sidewalks, then noted potential issues with the development's single access.

Mr. Longcore agreed that these concerns would fall under a traffic study question, and that the Ottawa County Road Commission may have some input. He also asked the applicant if they had an easement to connect Timber Drive to the dead end at the other end of the development. The applicant noted that he was aware of these issues and expected to have more discussions with the Township and Road Commission.

Mr. Longcore asked the applicant about amenities, and Mr. Adams suggested to the applicant to look into cul-de-sacs for the dead ends. The applicant agreed that these concerns and other topics would be explored and answered as they moved forward with their plans.

The applicant then summarized feedback from the Commission: ensure good buffering between homes, avoid student housing, establish adequate visitor parking, flesh out amenities, and reduce the development's density.

The applicant concurred with the Planning Commission's feedback and planned to connect with the appropriate Township staff to prepare for an official site plan review.

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore open the second public comment section.*

Mr. Yeoman experienced technical difficulties with GoToMeeting and requested the remaining callers to exit the meeting and call back in. The callers left the meeting and did not return.

*Mr. Longcore closed the second public comment section due to no present public.*

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Adams addressed the technical difficulties with sound experienced throughout the meeting. Mr. Schut inquired about the possibility of extending the use of remote technology beyond the pandemic, and the Commission and Mr. Yeomans discussed future changes and technology integrations.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

**Next meeting August 3, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

*August 3, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Charter Township Hall & Conference Call via GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Longcore, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra  
Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: None
4. Motion by Zeinstra to approve the July 20, 2020 Planning Commission minutes with amendments. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the August 3, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 7-0.**
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*:  
*Chairman Longcore open the public comment section.*  
Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the public attended the meeting via conference call. Mr. Yeomans provided each caller 90 seconds to speak. Caller 2 and Caller 4 criticized Commissioner Ryan Kelley's presence on the Planning Commission.  
*Chairman Longcore closed the public comment section due to no further comments.*
7. Public Hearings: None.
8. Site Plan Review: None.
9. Old Business:

A. J&H Oil Special Use Minor Amendment – 6209 Lake Michigan Drive

Planner Ransford recalled for the Commission J&H Oil's business during the July 20, 2020 meeting to determine the type of amendment required for the project's 275 square foot addition. The applicant revised the plans based on the Commission's feedback, and Fresh Coast Planning found the revisions satisfied those directions. The firm did identify another concern regarding ordinance language for parapet screening for the Commission to address today.

The Commission gave the floor for Don VandenBerg, representing the applicant; however, due to his technical difficulties, Mr. VandenBerg was unable to speak at

this point. Mr. Longcore invited the applicant to speak as soon as the difficulties were resolved. In the interim, the Commission continued the discussion.

Mr. Schut wanted to verify which of the units drawn on the map would be moved. Additionally, he posed a concern that the addition may not architecturally harmonize with the building and wondered whether or not the Planning Commission would be willing to approve the project despite its asymmetrical elevations. These comments drew agreement from Mr. Zuniga, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Westerling, all of whom criticized dissimilar elevations and lack of conformity in façade material.

Mr. Zeinstra concurred with another of Mr. Schut's points: if the applicant had room, the addition could be placed behind the building to preserve aesthetics.

Mr. VandenBerg was soon able to call in and respond to comments. He clarified for Mr. Schut that the smaller unit would be moved to the addition's rooftop; furthermore, he pointed out that the western wall, which had drawn criticism from the Commission, would be flanked by a car wash and not very visible to residents. The applicant's line then dropped from the call before he could finish.

Mr. Longcore suggested tabling the discussions to provide time for the applicant to respond without technical difficulties. Mr. Ransford then prompted the Commission to discuss the parapet wall or lack thereof on the north side of the building. Based on current ordinance language, the Commission agreed that a parapet would be needed along the north wall.

Motion by Schut to table J&H Oil Special Use Minor Amendment with direction to Ransford to communicate the concerns of the Commission to the applicant. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 7-0.**

#### 10. New Business:

##### A. True Value Special Use Amendment – 5425 Lake Michigan Drive

- Determination of minor versus major

Mr. Ransford began introductions for a proposed amendment by Allendale True Value: one addition to the main building and two accessory buildings. The proposal is before the Planning Commission today to determine whether the special use amendment is minor or major, needing only approval from the Commission if minor and otherwise requiring a public hearing if major.

Steve Witte of Nederveld, representing the applicant, informed the Commission that a formal site plan will be submitted for review once a survey is finished. He also elaborated on Mr. Ransford's description of the project and included an aerial view of the site.

Mr. Zeinstra suggested that the project was major because of the amount of changes occurring on the site. Mr. Adams and Mr. Kelley also agreed,

particularly because of the size of the proposed building on the west site. Mr. Schut added that he could concede to either minor or major, believing that the proposed changes were not too considerable. After a few more comments, the Commission came to a consensus that the special use amendment was major and therefore required a full site plan pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance and public hearing.

Motion by Adams concluding that the True Value Special Use Amendment is a major amendment. Second by Zeinstra. **Approval 7-0.**

B. University Park PUD – Parking lot setback

Mr. Ransford described this project as a building to be constructed on the southwest corner of 48th Avenue and Becker Drive. Proposed parking at a 10-foot setback held the planner's concern, notably because staff found no record indicating whether or not University Park PUD authorizes a 10-foot setback from the right of way. Additionally, no record of determination could be found for the construction of the nearby Main Street Pub, which sits less than the ordinance's current written requirement of 25 feet. Therefore, the applicant is making two inquiries:

- Can the Planning Commission recall evidence for a 10 feet parking lot setback, and
- Would this require a minor or major amendment?

Mr. Witte, representing an applicant who wished to remain confidential, indicated to conceptual plans, which included a two-story building. For the project to work, the plans needed authorization for a 10-foot setback.

Mr. Longcore noted that the person who could supply the requested information was unfortunately unavailable for counsel. Mr. Schut could also not recall specific details about how the Main Street Pub was approved, despite involvement with its construction.

Mr. Zeinstra believed that the existing was built to PUD requirements, but if they could not prove that belief, then they would need to make an amendment. Mr. Longcore preferred to see a consistent setback regardless of how Main Street Pub was approved, with Mr. Zeinstra noting that the parking should be fine as long as it otherwise met ordinance. Mr. Schut, recalling building projects during Main Street Pub's construction, suggested that the 25-foot setback ordinance was likely not being enforced at the time.

Motion by Schut to determine that the University Park PUD parking lot is a minor amendment at 10 feet, with the 48th corridor maintaining a 25-foot setback. Second by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

C. Trader's View PUD – Perimeter fencing

- Determination of minor versus major

Mr. Ransford apprised the Commission of Curtis Moran's request to amend the Trader's View PUD to remove a fencing requirement on the east property line, with the applicant, Mr. Moran, elaborating on this description prior to Mr. Longcore opening discussion.

After some deliberation over prior discussions and the property's plans, Mr. Schut expressed no problem removing the fence requirement. Mr. Adams confirmed that the property's neighbor had requested the fence due to a hunting concern, and Mr. Longcore added that the neighbor does currently expect the fence to remain.

Since alterations had been made to the original plans that nullify the reason for the requirement, Mr. Zeinstra suggested that the fence was not needed. Mr. Schut added that fence posts could instead be placed to delineate the property lines, though argued that the Township should not get into the practice of requiring fences to delineate property lines.

The Planning Commission came to a consensus to allow for the removal of the fence as long as the applicant submits plans proving the changes no longer require the fence.

Motion by Zeinstra to determine that the Trader's View PUD perimeter fencing is a minor amendment with the following notes:

- Applicant must submit updated plans eliminating the fence and the easement on Lot G and further note that the trail purpose is within the other easement to the water
- The Commission will not require 300 feet of fencing along the perimeter property line.

Second by Kelley. **Approve 7-0.**

#### D. Master Plan

- Commercial Uses Chapter
- Industrial Uses Chapter
- Residential Uses Chapter
- Public & Recreational Facilities Chapter
- Public Utilities Chapter

Mr. Ransford briefly presented each chapter, which had been discussed in previous meetings, with the goal to provide the Commission with an additional chance to review each. After Mr. Longcore opened discussion, Mr. Kelley pointed out an issue in the Commercial Uses Chapter, recalling that the Commission had decided on



reviewing commercial buildings every five years, rather than the annual currently written in the draft.

Mr. Ransford also highlighted the two chapters that the planning firm was interested in receiving feedback: Public Utilities and Public & Recreational Facilities Chapters. Primarily, Mr. Ransford wanted to know if the language accurately conveyed the Planning Commission's direction.

The Commission deliberated over a few questions, such as the extent of authority the Commission has with projects in the Department of Parks and Recreation and to removing references to low-impact ordinances.

11. Public Comments:

*Chairperson Longcore open and closed the second public comment section due to no present public.*

12. Township Board Reports: Mr. Zeinstra informed that the Board approved the Raymond Building and improvements to the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

**Next meeting August 17, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# Allendale Charter Township Planning Commission Meeting

August 17, 2020

7:00 p.m.

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll call:

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

Absent: Westerling

Staff present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Schut to approve the July 20, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 6-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the August 17, 2020 Planning Commission agenda as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0.**

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

Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the public attended the meeting via conference call. Mr. Yeomans provided each caller 90 seconds to speak. One caller had questions regarding a variance for newly purchased land and was directed to talk to Kelli McGovern in the Zoning and Planning Department.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment section do to no more public comments.*

7. Public Hearings:

A. Hidden Shores West – Planned Unit Development Major Amendment

Planner Ransford related to the Commission this project's plans, which include the establishment of a wetland area with two pavilions. This project will replace several evergreen trees, a walking path, and a play structure. On June 15, 2020, no issues were found, and as a result the Commission authorized Hidden Shores West to return for a final PUD site plan review.

Jack Barr of Nederveld, representing Grand Valley Developers, expounded on necessary alterations of prior plans, notably that the State requested more wetlands and a conservation area.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section:*

Resident Leah Fox spoke on behalf of her neighbors to encourage the Commissioners and project developer to construct a play area wherever possible. She also requested consideration regarding the walking trail, which currently has multiple outlets into private backyards.

Mr. Barr and Mitch Koster, also representing Grand Valley Developers, discussed with Ms. Fox about possible play structure locations. They agreed to continue the

conversation outside the meeting.

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

Commissioner Schut prompted discussion on the dead-end trails. Ms. Fox added that an additional trail running parallel to Shorewood Street could help resolve the issue.

The Commission and applicant proceeded to deliberate over whether to recommend the project to the Board during today's meeting or request the applicant to return for further review. Due to the public's input, the Commission conceded on the latter.

Motion by Zeinstra to table the Hidden Shores West - PUD Major Amendment until the following concerns are addressed: 1) A play structure is located on the site plan, and 2) The plans illustrate how the walking trail will be connected through the wetland area, at minimum. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 6-0.**

#### B. Allendale Crossings – Planned Unit Development Major Amendment

The applicant presented a 3D video illustration to the Planning Commission while describing progress on Allendale Crossings, a three building storage facility. He discussed the greenery used for shielding, including plans to conceal headlights from shining outside the parking lot.

Mr. Ransford expounded on the application by explaining the need for a major amendment and the list of directions provided by the Commission during a November 2019 meeting:

- Notate on site plan that irrigation will be provided,
- Install rolled concrete curbing throughout parking lot,
- Review drainage plans with Township engineer,
- Illustrate rain gutters on the buildings' north roof line,
- Supplement removed parking spaces with green space trees,
- Accommodate Arby's snow storage,
- Increase tree count in southeast portion of site,
- Create three-dimensional rendering or front elevation of proposed landscaping, and
- Consider changing storage unit doors to reduce garage-like appearance.

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

Trustee Zeinstra appreciated the storage door colors and commented on the use of white pine throughout the project, suggesting that the applicant use a tree species that would grow smaller and slower than the proposed. Commissioner Adams noted the curbs and expressed concerns with snow storage.

Afterword, Mr. Longcore and the applicant discussed drainage to the north of the project, and Mr. Schut inquired about whether an easement was acquired to dig the foundations. The applicant explained that they will pour a mono-slab foundation since

the buildings are unheated, and Mr. Schut conceded to the idea so long as the applicant could pull a building permit.

Commissioner Kelley, Mr. Longcore, and the applicant also reviewed concerns with traffic and nearby access points, which were approved in the last PUD. Finally, the Commission came to a consensus to move the project to the Board of Trustees.

Motion by Schut to recommend the Allendale Crossings - PUD Major Amendment to the Board with the following conditions: 1) Site storm water drainage is approved by Township Engineer, 2) Landscaping at the south side of the pavement is modified with smaller trees than white pine, to be reviewed by the Board, and 3) Rolled curb or high back curbs are used throughout the project. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 6-0.**

C. Subdivision Ordinance

- Section 3.2(1)t – Requirements
- Section 3.3(2) – Procedure
- Section 5.3.1.g – Water Supply and Sanitary Sewer
- Sections 5.3.1.h through m – Street Name Signs, Sidewalks and Crosswalks, Street Lighting, Greenbelts and Screen Plantings, Traffic Control Signs, Street Trees

A discussion on the above Subdivision Ordinances was combined with the below Zoning Ordinances. Minutes are found under Item D.

D. Zoning Ordinance

- Table 3.07.B.1 – Essential Services
- Section 3.14M – Condominium Project Approval, Site Condominium Projects
- Section 3.1402 – Condominium Project Approval, Street and Roads and Sidewalks
- Section 4.01 – Zoning Districts
- Section 12.05C – Development Requirements for All PUD's, Utilities
- Section 15.05D – Area Regulations, Lot Area
- Section 16.02A – Permitted Uses
- Section 16.03T – Uses Requiring Special Approval
- Section 23.03D – Automotive Uses, Farm Equipment, Construction Equipment and Vehicle Sales Lot
- Section 23.03D – Automotive Uses, Farm Equipment, Construction Equipment and Vehicle Sales Lot
- Section 23.08C – Removal of Topsoil, Sand, Gravel, or Other Minerals, Definitions
- Section 23.12A9 – Private Roads and Streets, General Provisions
- Section 29.01D – Procedure for Changes, Rezoning Evaluation Factors

Chairperson Longcore instructed the discussion on agenda items B and C to be grouped.

Mr. Ransford briefly recapped the ordinance amendments, a year-long project to finalize language on ground water protections with sewer and water ordinances, which included modernizing some sections.

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

Mr. Schut inquired about text changes regarding Section 3.1402, which had been revised to Allendale Charter Township standard construction requirements and wondered if the requirements were available to the public. Mr. Schut also suggested hyperlinking the web page with the requirements in the ordinance.

The Commission then discussed making the GC uses a special use within the Industrial Zoning District, such as in approvals for BizStream and Allendale Family Practice, with Mr. Schut concerned about excluding certain businesses otherwise. Mr. Longcore agreed that General Commercial could require a special use but wanted to discourage retail from operating in Industrial zones. Mr. Ransford suggested either proceeding with the currently written language or make modifications now, in both cases returning for closer review at a later time. The Commission agreed to proceed with the language as it is and revisit later.

Motion by Zeinstra to recommend to the board the Subdivision and Text Amendments. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 6-0.**

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. Old Business:

A. J&H Oil Special Use Minor Amendment – 6209 Lake Michigan Drive

Mr. Ransford recounted previous meetings with this project, reminding the Commission of their request for the applicant to match brick on either side of the addition and add parapets for all elevations. The plans now appear to satisfy the direction provided by the Commission.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Adams expressed continued concerns with the building's appearance, though acknowledged that the location did reduce options for the applicant. Mr. Zeinstra agreed, but noted that nonetheless the applicant met the Commission's requests.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the J&H Oil Special Use Minor Amendment as submitted with a plan date of 8/10/2020. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 4-2.**

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Commissioner Zuniga alerted the Planning Commission of potentially poor visibility when exiting the PNC Bank parking lot onto Boyne Boulevard due to vegetation growth from the nearby mobile home park. He also requested Mr. Ransford to consult with Supervisor Elenbaas about addressing the removal of the dumpster enclosure at a local apartment

building.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

**Next meeting September 8, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*September 8, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room & GoToMeeting Video Call*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: None
4. Motion by Schut to approve the August 17, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented with one clarification. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the September 8, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes 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 due to no public comments.*

7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review:

## A. Allendale Charter Township – Fire Station

Fire Chief Mike Keefe, representing the Allendale Charter Township Fire Department, presented progress on the proposed project, a 15,780 square feet fire station on Township Hall property at 6676 Lake Michigan Drive. The Fire Chief recounted the research and development of the current site plan and responded to comments in the Fresh Coast Planning memo to explain the reasoning behind certain brick and landscaping choices.

Planner Ransford summarized his memo for the Commission, noting that due to the Michigan Planning and Enabling Act, capital improvements such as the proposed project require review and approval by the Planning Commission for recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Additionally, the Board requested that the project meet the Township's GC Zoning requirements. Furthermore, Mr. Ransford drew the Commission's attention to the planning firm's primary comments: 1) continuity in architectural style among Township buildings as discussed during approval for the Allendale Maintenance Building, and 2) disparity between front yard landscaping requirements and the proposed trees on the site plan.

Afterward, Mr. Longcore invited Commissioner comments. Mr. Kelley began by agreeing with the Fire Chief to reduce the number of trees in the front yard due to fire truck movement in and out of the property. No Commissioner expressed disagreement with this subject.

Mr. Schut proceeded to clarify the type of masonry to be used and confirmed with Mr. Keefe that discussions had not yet been had about masonry in future plans for the building. He also expressed desire for the Board to initiate a plan, such as a study, to ensure consistency between this building and future Township buildings. Mr. Schut then remarked on potential traffic and pedestrian crosswalk issues in the lot's access points, parking lot, and sidewalk connections in relation to the proposed building.

Mr. Adams also pointed out potential flaws in the sidewalk plan for pedestrians crossing M-45 to the park. Mr. Yeomans acknowledged that the inclusion of the new fire station will affect the current layout of the Township's facilities and assured the Commission that conversations with affected departments will be held or have already been started. Mr. Keefe added that they are still developing parking and crosswalk solutions. Mr. Adams then clarified with Timothy Vande Zande of The Architectural Group, Inc. that the plans presented today were not preliminary, but that the parking lot plans were still in development. Mr. Adams also requested clarification on whether the plans have been reviewed by the Department of Parks and Recreation, and Mr. Yeomans noted that this concern was included in ongoing conversations with other departments.

Mr. Adams also wanted to ensure that costs had been considered given the possibility that adjustments may need to be made in the future, dependent on changing needs and new information that may not fit with the current complete plans.

Mr. Westerling inquired about the applicant's intentions with removing the overhead doors or turning the area into a greenspace, but the applicant did not have an answer at this time.

Mr. Schut asked about the project phases, suggesting that the Board implement at least preliminary planning for the sidewalks and parking lots instead of going with the current uncertainty. He urged the applicant to consider how busy days might affect the functionality of the parking lot, crosswalks, and so forth; additionally, he urged the applicant to determine some sort of plan to account for future construction projects on the lot to reduce costs associated with alterations.

The Commission later agreed that having a parking lot coming off the main drag would not be a good idea.

Mr. Vander Zande, responding to a question by Mr. Longcore, explained that the catch basin will not accept rain to account for a future parking, at which point it will connect to a leaching basin system.

Mr. Adams asked if a preliminary parking lot had been made, which was affirmed by Mr. Vander Zande.

Mr. Keefe expressed understanding of the Commission's concerns about costs on the chance a redesign or remodeling will need to be done in the future if certain aspects are not accounted for now; however, he implored the Commission to allow them to continue moving the project forward due to lacking space at the existing Fire Department.

Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Ransford if the Commission would be able to approve the project as is, and Mr. Ransford explained that a recommendation to the Board could be made with conditions, which could be modified by the Board. Mr. Longcore



acknowledged that the issues primarily voiced by the Commissioners today went beyond the scope of the project itself and related more to long-term considerations with the Township buildings, and that such decisions may need to be drafted soon to avoid wasting dollars after construction is already happening.

Motion by Schut to recommend to the Board the approval of the site plans for the Allendale Charter Township – Fire Station—including the existing curb cuts but excluding the relation to the Township offices, parking lot, and drive—until further development of future plans for the Township building parking lot, additional sidewalks, and pedestrian circulation, to be approved by the Planning Commission prior to starting construction on the Fire Station. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 7-0.**

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports:

Trustee Zeinstra reported staff changes at the sewer plant and planned discussions for plaques added on park statues at the next Board meeting.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, September 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*September 21, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room & GoToMeeting Video Call*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Longcore, Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: None
4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 8, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the September 21, 2020 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 due to no public comments.*

7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review:

A. VanderMolen – Kennel

Planner Ransford introduced the applicant and their project, a special use application to operate an inside-only dog kennel on 8801 Filmore Street. The VanderMolen's previously operated the kennel before ceasing for some time. At the time, the zoning ordinance permitted kennels by use by right in this district; however, applicants now must seek a special use permit and review. Fresh Coast Planning's review, Mr. Ransford continued, determined that the proposed kennel will have adequate room for the dogs, with the following suggestions for the Commissioner's to discuss:

- Modifying or preserving current landscaping;
- Changing proposed gravel parking, which is required for special use applications, to paved, though gravel is permissible for agricultural zones; and
- Adding a path along Filmore.

Mr. Zeinstra remarked that current landscaping is sufficient due to the kennel's hours of operation and its countryside location. The Commissioners joined in agreement.

Mr. Longcore prompted discussion of the parking area and sidewalk. Mr. Schut believed that applicant has no reason to pave the parking area and that gravel is sufficient for their purposes. Mr. Adams asked the applicant about business traffic,

and the applicant explained that customers will primarily be arriving and departing at appointed pickup and drop off times. Mr. Adams also asked about the number of dogs expected to be present, and the VanderMolen's responded that their kennels max at 16. Additionally, the Commission agreed that the applicant should not need to add a path on Filmore until the street has a sidewalk.

Furthermore, Mr. Schut inquired about the approval process of the sign, opining that the sign should be approved by permit rather than the Commissioners. Mr. Ransford noted that the Commission can approve the sign or have the sign approved administratively. Mr. Schut requested a plan of the sign should the Commission choose to approve a sign.

Mr. Kelley then asked about their decision to operate an indoor, rather than outdoor kennel. The applicant explained that their home contains plenty of room for the dogs to play and receive sunshine; additionally, an indoor kennel more easily contained the animals.

The Commissioners also asked the applicant about their neighbor's familiarity with the business. The applicant replied that their neighbors are familiar with the kennel except for one recent household. Mr. Longcore recommended that the applicant speak with the neighbor prior to them receiving a notice about the public hearing to assuage concerns prior to the meeting.

Afterwards, the Planning Commission reached a consensus to move the application to a public hearing, and directed Mr. Ransford to schedule the hearing at the next available meeting, which may be as soon as October 19.

9. Old Business:

A. Allendale Charter Township – Wastewater Treatment Facility, Siding Modification

The applicants for the Wastewater Treatment Facility introduced and recounted the project, using drawings to illustrate the new buildings and modifications. Additionally, the applicants discussed ordinances as well as benefits related to metal-sided buildings. They also explained that the general use of the buildings will be for vehicle storage.

The Commissioners proceeded to discuss the construction and material of the buildings and examined the drawings. The Commissioners complimented the use of ribbed paneling, noting that the materials help avoid the building becoming a less durable pole barn construction.

After some discussion, the Planning Commission approved the modifications and type of material to be used for side paneling.

10. New Business: None

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 Allendale Crossings project was recently passed, and the Board is proceeding to create a 2021 Township budget.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

A. Park Township Tree Preservation Language Update

Mr. Ransford addressed the language updates per the Tree Planning Committee review since the Planning Commission's approval. The Committee believed some of the language to be too burdensome in regards to requirements for trees on individual lots not part of an approved development, and, additionally, altered the definition of canopies. Lastly, a different appeals path and new set of standards for review were developed, though approval does not require all standards to be met. The new language update has not been approved by the Board as of this time but will be reviewed during their October meeting.

Mr. Schut noted that he did not want to add unnecessary hardships as the Commission discusses approvals, with Mr. Zeinstra voicing agreement, adding that providing recommendations rather than requiring applicants to meet all standards for trees, as created by the Committee, would be helpful.

Mr. Longcore requested Mr. Ransford to put the additional discussion of the language on the Planning Commissioner's agenda when time comes available.

Mr. Zuniga also brought up a concern about a new development with no trees in any of the backyards.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, October 5, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*October 5, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room & GoToMeeting Video Call*

1. Meeting called to order.
2. Roll Call:  
Present: Westerling, Adams, Zuniga, Schut, Kelley, Zeinstra, Longcore  
Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans
3. Received for Information: None
4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 21, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the October 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **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 public comments.*

7. Public Hearings: None
8. Site Plan Review:

- A. True Value – 5425 Lake Michigan Drive – Building addition and two accessory buildings

Planner Ransford recounted the previous Planning Commission meeting which determined that the changes requested by the applicant constituted a major amendment. Mr. Ransford went on to describe the project as an approximately 9,400 square foot addition and 6,400 square foot accessory building, along with other improvements.

Furthermore, Mr. Ransford continued, some deviations requested by the applicant require a formal amendment to the ordinance per the Allendale Professional Park PUD, the project's location. For the remaining requests, the Planning Commission may grant certain waivers.

Steve Witte from Nederveld, representing True Value, elaborated on the application. The plans, Mr. Witte remarked, will add on to an existing structure that presently does not meet the PUD's standards; therefore, it would be problematic to update the building to current performance standards. At Mr. Longcore's prompting, Mr. Witte then presented the requested deviations to the normal Zoning Ordinance:

- Allow existing light fixtures to remain at site

Mr. Zeinstra was not opposed to the request and recalled no complaints of the existing lighting. He assumed that the builders of the original site new the ordinance at the time. Mr. Schut noted that the current pole lights appear

to meet ordinance; however, he also observed a few wall packs that do not meet ordinance and suggested that the applicant update these lights to match the new buildings, which do meet today's ordinance. Mr. Witte and Tom Miedema agreed to update the existing wall packs to meet current standards.

- Dismiss requirement to add curbing to the existing building's north side, which has gone without curbing for many years

After Mr. Witte described the applicant's reasoning for the request, the Commissioners expressed that they saw no reason to add curbing to existing pavement.

- Dismiss requirement to plant additional trees from current five mature trees to eight trees and six shrubs, in addition to the existing landscaping block

Mr. Witte explained that the applicant plans to add new landscaping along Commerce Road, which lacks landscaping; however, the north property line, east property line, and front of the property along Lake Michigan Drive all have mature trees. Additionally, the parking area for True Value contains an ornamental landscaping block.

Mr. Schut did not have a problem preserving the current landscaping as long as it can meet the ordinance and exists on the applicant's site. He then inquired about landscaping on the north and east property lines. In response, Mr. Witte suggested having a landscape architect visit the site and count the trees for the Commission to review in the final report.

After the applicant's suggestion, Mr. Adams encouraged them to add new landscaping regardless, and Mr. Longcore observed that the apparent landscaping block on Lake Michigan Drive seemed less like landscaping and more like a display area. Mr. Witte agreed, noting this issue was the most notable concern on which they sought guidance.

Mr. Zuniga pointed out that a primary reason for a landscaping requirement was reducing or eliminating vehicle headlights beyond the property. The Commissioners subsequently debated the sufficiency of the display area as a landscaping block. Mr. Ransford located outdoor display area requirements in the ordinance, and the Planning Commission and applicant discussed whether or not the display could fulfill those requirements as landscaping.

Mr. Kelley noted that the area existed on the site for many years without complaint, and with the store's hours closing at seven p.m., headlights will unlikely be a problem at night. Mr. Longcore, meanwhile, was amenable to the display area if it was already in compliance or if it could be brought to compliance. However, he expressed issue with altering rules for one applicant only because the structure exists now and never received complaint. Mr. Zeinstra remarked that based on the normal ordinance and the process to make changes under the PUD, the Commission did not have an option to be lenient on this display area.

The applicant and Commissioners deliberated over potential solutions. Mr. Schut offered some potential modifications that could bring the area to compliance, such as reconfiguring the patio area to become less a display

and more a permanent fixture while adding plant life to delineate between it and the sales area.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant should return with plans of the area showing modifications that will bring the display area to compliance with the ordinance.

- Permit a six-foot tall dumpster enclosure made of solid white vinyl

While Mr. Schut was agreeable to the request, Mr. Adams expressed hesitancy in setting a precedent to allow a deviation simply because the enclosure's location behind a building. Mr. Zuniga joined in agreement, referring to the nearby McDonald's dumpster enclosure and suggesting the applicant should match the building materials. Mr. Zeinstra also agreed that the enclosure should be made with block and echoed a suggestion by Mr. Westerling to make the gate vinyl.

The applicant and Commissioners then deliberated for a time and referred to other commercial buildings as examples. Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Longcore voiced concerns with durability. Finally, the applicant agreed to return with revised plans for the enclosure materials to match the block on the main building, as the Commissioners could not agree on white vinyl.

- Allow for no additional sidewalk in front of existing building

Mr. Witte elaborated that they were planning to create a sidewalk connection on Commerce Drive; however, the applicant did not want to add new sidewalk toward the front of the building on Lake Michigan Drive in part because of the planned connection and the previously discussed display area.

Mr. Zeinstra was agreeable to only adding sidewalk up Commerce Drive, which currently does not have sidewalk. Mr. Ransford then recited the ordinance on the matter to the Commissioners. Mr. Adams maintained a preference for a sidewalk going to the building's front door for consistency with most surrounding buildings on Lake Michigan Drive.

After further deliberation, the Planning Commission and applicant agreed that a sidewalk connection could be added from Lake Michigan Drive through the patio area in addition to deferring sidewalk installation on Commerce Drive.

Mr. Witte also listed the deviation requests for the Allendale Professional Park PUD:

- Dismiss requirement for an interior landscape area every 30 parking spaces

Mr. Witte drew attention to the plans, where it was noted that if the Planning Commission so required, they would remove one parking space to add a landscaping island. The Commissioners liked the idea of instead removing two parking spaces and having the sidewalk connection coming from Lake Michigan Drive go to the island, thereby complying with the Allendale Professional Park PUD Ordinance.

- Permit the proposed setback for the proposed accessory building as shown in the plans

Mr. Witte explained that the reasoning for this request was due to an interfering storm line.

The Planning Commission discussed the implications of amending the PUD for this deviation. Meanwhile, the applicant offered suggestions and potential modifications they could make to the proposed accessory building, such as changing it to a covered, open display that could more comfortably sit at the currently required setback.

The Commissioners were not opposed to the idea but requested the applicant to return with plans for this modification concept that complies with the required setback.

Mr. Witte continued on to address comments and suggestions made by Mr. Ransford:

- Avoid wrapping the metal posts on the proposed 640 square foot open building with masonry

Mr. Miedema explained the building's use—a cover for sale items—and noted that the structure would not be visible from the road. The Commissioners agreed that there would not be a use in wrapping the poles with masonry.

- Remove requirement for a four-foot tall parapet wall and maintain the current eight-inch parapet wall

The building's current existing rooftop units are not necessarily screened from the road, so the Commissioner's discussed whether to require the addition to have a higher wall than the existing or have a continuation of appearance.

At the Planning Commission's request, the applicant agreed to have renderings or plans made to illustrate visibility, or lack thereof, of rooftop units, then add screening accordingly.

- Not require applicant to conduct a traffic study

The Planning Commission agreed that a traffic study is not necessary.

After Mr. Witte finished covering the requests, Mr. Longcore opened discussion for the Commissioners.

Mr. Zeinstra began by questioning if current drainage has been accounted. The applicant replied that he assumed there was a regional basin but expressed assurance that he will get more information from the Water Resources Commissioner. Mr. Miedema noted that the Township Engineer has already reviewed the plans and did not comment on the water drainage.

Afterward, Mr. Schut asked about parking, and Mr. Ransford indicated that it was sufficient. Mr. Witte noted that there would be 47 parking spaces after eliminating two for the landscaping island. He also agreed to add a three-foot backup area.

Mr. Schut then asked the Planning Commission if an internal access should be constructed to the east of the property. Mr. Ransford, after reviewing past notes, agreed that this was requested of McDonald's and that now would be a good time to require the internal access. The applicant agreed to look into the process.



Mr. Adams asked about grading, suggesting the applicant reduce the steepness of the south and north contours. Mr. Witte agreed to revisit the contours and try flattening as much as he found possible.

Lastly, the Planning Commission came to a consensus to have Mr. Ransford set a public hearing at the earliest available time, pending plans are updated accordingly.

B. Mini Storage Depot – 11135 64th Avenue – Indoor and outdoor warehouse/storage facility

Mr. Ransford introduced Mini Storage Depot as a special use application to construct a self-storage facility on 64th Avenue. He pointed out some key points for the Planning Commission to discuss:

- determining the sufficiency of the proposed six-foot vinyl privacy fence;
- allowing for the existing trees and shrubbery in lieu of a traditional greenbelt;
- requiring internal access easements to adjacent properties;
- determining the adequacy of screening for the proposed AC condensers; and
- requiring a traffic study, though the applicant does not meet any threshold.

Clint Patterson, introducing himself as the applicant and developer for the project, shared his screen with the Planning Commission during the comment section.

First, Mr. Longcore prompted discussion on the six-foot fence. Mr. Zeinstra was amenable with sufficient landscaping, as was Mr. Longcore, though he asked about adding more trees and shrubbery. Zach Voogt of Moore and Bruggink elaborated on the current landscaping and the desire to preserve it for the residential backyards; nonetheless, Mr. Zeinstra wanted to see more trees. The applicant agreed to swap out some current trees for more evergreens.

Second, Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Ransford to elaborate on requirements for internal access easements. The Commissioners discussed the difficulty of adding an internal access due to the current configuration of the plans and agreed it was not necessary.

Afterward, Mr. Longcore forwarded conversation to the screening of the AC condensers. Mr. Patterson used his shared screen to illustrate the location and intended screening for the units, which will include a ribbed wall and landscaping, on the west side of the main building as opposed to the east side, where it is shown on the plans sent to the Township. The Planning Commission agreed that this would be sufficient.

As for the traffic study, Mr. Longcore and Mr. Zeinstra remarked that a traffic study was not likely needed.

Mr. Zuniga then inquired about the wire fence adjacent to one of the residential properties. Mr. Patterson responded that there will be plenty of landscape screening. Mr. Longcore requested additional landscaping for the sake of the adjacent property owner.

Mr. Schut shifted conversation to the overall appearance of the buildings. Mr. Adams wondered if the storage facility was the best use for the property. Mr. Schut suggested that rotating the plans to have the nicer façade facing M-45 might improve street-side appearances. Mr. Longcore opined that a plain storage facility

did not fit this location and that better sites existed in the Township. He maintained the other Commissioner comments about flipping the plans or otherwise redesigning the storage buildings to look more like commercial buildings rather than storage units.

The applicant agreed to consider as a team the Planning Commission's requests.

The Commissioners and applicant then deliberated over whether or not to set a public hearing or having the applicant return for a second review. After discussion, Mr. Longcore directed Mr. Ransford to set a public hearing for November 2<sup>nd</sup>, but also schedule the return of the site plan at a meeting prior to the public hearing.

C. Curtis Moran – 4334 Bliss Street – Mining permit for excavation of a pond

Mr. Ransford expounded on Curtis Moran's special use application to excavate approximately 104,233 cubic yards of material over a four-year period to create a pond. The pond will be located on the same parcel as an under-construction single-family home. The project, Mr. Ransford continued, will have a crushed entry drive, and the applicant is proposing deferment on the development of the sidewalk to a later date. Additionally, Mr. Ransford explained that the applicant is requesting a waiver from the required landscaping given the proposed pond's seclusion. Mr. Ransford added that they have not received comments from the Township Engineer.

Kelly Kuiper of Nederveld, representing the applicant, then provided additional description of the project, which will become a four-acre pond serving as an aesthetic feature of the new construction home. Ms. Kuiper explained the type of material to be excavated as well as transportation of the soil, standard hours of operation, truck routes, and equipment. Regarding the memo items, she explained that the applicant is requesting 50 feet of crushed concrete due to the lack of paving on Bliss Street. Additionally, she elaborated on the seclusion of the proposed pond to explain the waiver for landscaping.

Mr. Longcore turned comments onto the Commissioners and clarified with the applicant that they will be prepared to address public hearing concerns regarding dust, such as agreeing to use a berm.

With no other comments from the Planning Commission, Mr. Longcore directed Mr. Ransford to schedule the project for a public hearing.

D. Superior Allendale, LLC – 11231 92nd Avenue – Farmer's Market

Mr. Ransford presented the final project, a currently existing farm market, without formal approval, seeking to establish a permanent building for operations, in addition to site improvements, fencing, and landscaping. Mr. Ransford then listed off items for the Commission's consideration:

- relocation of a metal picket fence,
- a waiver on sidewalks given the location,
- determination of the building as commercial, and
- approval of outdoor display areas.

Afterward, the applicant, Clement Audu of Nederveld, introduced himself and reiterated the description and requests of the project.

The Commissioners proceeded to review the plans and make clarifications where needed. Mr. Longcore prompted discussion on the sidewalk before asking about the zoning requirements for the fence. The Commissioners agreed to defer sidewalk construction along Lake Michigan Drive and 92<sup>nd</sup> Avenue until such time sidewalk is constructed on adjacent property within either right-of-way. The Commissioners discussed the setback requirements for the fence, and Mr. Longcore asked to move the fence 10 feet from the Lake Michigan Drive right of way.

Then, Mr. Longcore asked the Commissioners for thoughts on façade requirements. Mr. Schut suggested providing the applicant as much leeway as possible due to it being a farm market, though added concern that this direction could allow for a less attractive site.

Finally, the Commissioners discussed the outdoor display areas. Mr. Longcore clarified with the applicant that the area will be inside the fence, and that the items will not be left out.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the Superior Allendale, LLC farm market with the condition that the applicant will move the fence 10 feet from the right of way of Lake Michigan. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 7-0.**

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports:

Trustee Zeinstra reported on progress of ordinance discussions and budget approval.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 10:11 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, October 19, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*October 19, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Kelley

Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: Memo from Township Engineer

4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the October 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-0.**

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 public comments.*

7. Public Hearings:

A. VanderMolen – 8801 Fillmore Street – Kennel

Planner Ransford recalled for the Planning Commission the proposed VanderMolen kennel, an inside-only dog kennel not to exceed 16 enclosures for the dogs. The Township, Mr. Ransford noted, had recently adopted language for kennels after having received various complaints not related to the current applicant, which made such businesses require special use permits. After having a preliminary review with the Commission during the September 21st meeting, the VanderMolen's have returned for final review. No changes were requested in the previous meeting except for details on signage, which the applicant chose not to have.

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

The Commissioners clarified with Mr. Ransford some details on the process of special use applications before proceeding with the approval.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the VanderMolen Kennel Special Use Application with no additions. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 6-0.**

B. Hidden Shores – Mining Extension Request

Planner Ransford introduced the Hidden Shores application as a request to extend mining operations on a pond for a period of one year. The operation's initial approved time period was set for six years, which can be extended by the Planning Commission following a public hearing. The developers became aware they would need time and are requesting an extension now, which, if approved, would expire on July 27, 2022. Mr. Ransford continued that the applicant has provided a progress plan, and that as of now the permit is to expire on July 2020 without permission to extend.

Afterward, the applicant elaborated on the request, noting that they had previously reported they were done with operations earlier in the year but soon after discovered sand, which they would like to remove to make the lake deeper by about 12 feet. The applicant then explained that the PUD resolution did not define mining operations, so they are also seeking clarifications to the matter before finishing the lake.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section.*

Ken Smith, whose residence on 1051 70th Avenue is directly across the street from the digging, first wanted confirmation that the lake would not exceed the initial proposed size; the applicant gave an affirmative. Secondly, Mr. Smith requested reassurance that the developers would maintain a commitment to resolve any additional problems that may arise from the extended digging. Mr. Smith noted that over the course of the operations, nearby residents, including himself, experienced water problems, which the developer did work to resolve.

David Roesma on 1515 78th Avenue joined Mr. Smith in the request, noting that his neighbor had come up short in his well.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know if any complaints had been filed that were not fulfilled, though Mr. Ransford and the applicant were not aware of any. Mr. Longcore then permitted Mr. Smith to add in another public comment, whom reported that one of his other neighbors had begun to experience serious problems and that nothing was done after having reported to Kirk Keller. The applicant noted that he could try reaching out to someone who could resolve these issues, though added that the residents could try contacting the developer, who would have more power to address the problems, rather than Mr. Kirk.

Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Ransford if it was the responsibility of the Township to address the issues on the effected parcels. Mr. Ransford, while he could not find any specific language, explained that such complaints were usually between the property owners and developer; however, the Township could certainly see about following up, being the enforcing power. After the applicant, Mr. Longcore, and Mr. Ransford discuss specific language regarding the handing of complaints, the Commission prepared for an approval.

Motion by Schut to approve the extension of the Hidden Shores Mining Permit. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 6-0.**

Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Longcore added afterward that the applicant could revisit the ordinance regarding what constitutes mining, as the language had been revised in recent meetings.

## 8. Site Plan Review:

### A. M-45 LLC – 4755 Lake Michigan Drive – Automobile Filling Station and Convenience Store

The applicant, represented by Chad Mencarelli of Land and Resources Engineering, introduced the project: a 6,200 square foot gas and electric refueling station with 41 parking spaces on the corner lot between Lake Michigan Drive and 48th Avenue. Using presentation papers to illustrate the site plan, Mr. Mencarelli provided details on the street entrances, storm water retention plans, lighting, proposed canopy, dumpster enclosure, and architectural style of building.

Primary issues noted by the applicant were concerns with installing a sidewalk due to grading on the Lake Michigan Drive side and landscaping with the monument sign, which they hoped to keep clean and simple.

Afterward, Mr. Ransford elaborated on details of the special use permit requirements for auto fueling stations in the district, explaining that a public hearing will be required depending on the conclusion of this meeting. He added that a few things of note were requirements for wall signage as well as the applicant meeting threshold for a traffic study.

Mr. Schut proceeded to go over his various concerns, noting that he would not recommend rip wrap and that he would like to know the height of the monument sign, as it was bound by the road elevation. He recommended that the applicant install a sidewalk despite the grading issues and offered a few ideas on how to do it, which includes a boardwalk. Additionally, Mr. Schut requested that the applicant update sheet 8 of the plans regarding the dumpster, as there are two different dumpster details and only one plan can be approved. Finally, he reviewed the parapet height and concerns for the rooftop units being visible.

Mr. Adams then provided his concerns, firstly that he agreed with Mr. Schut on adding a sidewalk access to Lake Michigan Drive. Additionally, he noted that the driveway was rather steep and posed safety issues during winter in addition to potential issues with runoff being unable to flow into the catch basin as intended. Mr. Adams also noted the plans contained three different plans for sidewalks and that the applicant should clarify which plan was to be used.

Mr. Adams continued on discussing the applicant receiving a flood plain permit and intentions for the 48th Avenue side, which Mr. Mencarelli responded that they are waiting the Ottawa County Road Commission for input. Mr. Adams lastly emphasized a need for additional details on the northern retaining wall.

Mr. Longcore prompted the Commission to discuss any issues with the brick-wrapped columns and vegetation to the north, the latter of which Mr. Zeinstra expressed satisfaction but noted it was difficult to tell for sure until the site was cleared. Mr. Longcore then added his agreement regarding the need for a pedestrian access on Lake Michigan Drive, particular for students who live nearby in the apartments.

Mr. Adams also requested a rendering to illustrate how the building will appear from M-45, notably to show covering of the rooftop equipment.

The Commissioners furthermore discussed the applicant receiving reciprocal easements for the sake of future development within the property to the east. They

also agreed a traffic study was not necessary due to existing turn lanes. Mr. Zeinstra recommended more landscaping, which the applicant agreed to look into.

Lastly, Mr. Longcore directed Mr. Ransford to set a public hearing once the applicant returns with the requested changes.

9. Old Business:

B. Mini Storage Depot – 11135 64th Avenue – Indoor and outdoor warehouse/storage facility

Mr. Ransford reiterated previous concerns for the application to build a Mini Storage Depot and added that a public hearing is scheduled for the November 2 meeting. Primary changes the applicant made to the plans, per the Planning Commission's direction from the last meeting, follows:

- Increase southern fence height as well as landscaping, including the replacement of some deciduous trees with evergreens;
- Add landscaping to shield the northwestern house; and
- Alter plans to use the main building to shield storage units from Lake Michigan Drive.

Mr. Longcore prompted discussion on the six-foot fence, which had been increased to 8 feet; the applicant indicated that the fence was solid and that additional landscaping will be added. Mr. Schut requested more details on the fence, and the applicant explained that it will be a black and made of solid PVC. Mr. Zuniga expressed satisfaction with these details, noting that he had voice the concern in the last meeting.

The Commissioners then discussed the screening for the dwelling to the northwest and afterward the building along Lake Michigan Drive. Mr. Longcore and Mr. Zeinstra requested additional screening to break up the elongated building's north wall.

Additionally, Mr. Schut prompted the applicant to look into a reciprocal easement for the northeast lot.

Mr. Longcore directed the applicant to return to the already scheduled public hearing with improved drawings for review and final approval.

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Zuniga discussed concerns with Natan's Automotive, which was not approved for car storage but currently has vehicles behind the fence. Mr. Ransford agreed to pass the request on to the Township staff.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, November 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**



# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*October 19, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Absent: Kelley

Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: Memo from Township Engineer
4. Motion by Schut to approve the September 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**
5. Motion by Longcore to approve the October 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 6-0.**
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 public comments.*

7. Public Hearings:

- A. VanderMolen – 8801 Fillmore Street – Kennel

Planner Ransford recalled for the Planning Commission the proposed VanderMolen kennel, an inside-only dog kennel not to exceed 16 enclosures for the dogs. The Township, Mr. Ransford noted, had recently adopted language for kennels after having received various complaints not related to the current applicant, which made such businesses require special use permits. After having a preliminary review with the Commission during the September 21st meeting, the VanderMolen's have returned for final review. No changes were requested in the previous meeting except for details on signage, which the applicant chose not to have.

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

The Commissioners clarified with Mr. Ransford some details on the process of special use applications before proceeding with the approval.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the VanderMolen Kennel Special Use Application with no additions. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 6-0.**

- B. Hidden Shores – Mining Extension Request

Planner Ransford introduced the Hidden Shores application as a request to extend mining operations on a pond for a period of one year. The operation's initial approved time period was set for six years, which can be extended by the Planning Commission following a public hearing. The developers became aware they would need time and are requesting an extension now, which, if approved, would expire on July 27, 2022. Mr. Ransford continued that the applicant has provided a progress plan, and that as of now the permit is to expire on July 2020 without permission to extend.

Afterward, the applicant elaborated on the request, noting that they had previously reported they were done with operations earlier in the year but soon after discovered sand, which they would like to remove to make the lake deeper by about 12 feet. The applicant then explained that the PUD resolution did not define mining operations, so they are also seeking clarifications to the matter before finishing the lake.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section.*

Ken Smith, whose residence on 1051 70th Avenue is directly across the street from the digging, first wanted confirmation that the lake would not exceed the initial proposed size; the applicant gave an affirmative. Secondly, Mr. Smith requested reassurance that the developers would maintain a commitment to resolve any additional problems that may arise from the extended digging. Mr. Smith noted that over the course of the operations, nearby residents, including himself, experienced water problems, which the developer did work to resolve.

David Roesma on 1515 78th Avenue joined Mr. Smith in the request, noting that his neighbor had come up short in his well.

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

Mr. Adams wanted to know if any complaints had been filed that were not fulfilled, though Mr. Ransford and the applicant were not aware of any. Mr. Longcore then permitted Mr. Smith to add in another public comment, whom reported that one of his other neighbors had begun to experience serious problems and that nothing was done after having reported to Kirk Keller. The applicant noted that he could try reaching out to someone who could resolve these issues, though added that the residents could try contacting the developer, who would have more power to address the problems, rather than Mr. Kirk.

Mr. Longcore asked Mr. Ransford if it was the responsibility of the Township to address the issues on the effected parcels. Mr. Ransford, while he could not find any specific language, explained that such complaints were usually between the property owners and developer; however, the Township could certainly see about following up, being the enforcing power. After the applicant, Mr. Longcore, and Mr. Ransford discuss specific language regarding the handing of complaints, the Commission prepared for an approval.

Motion by Schut to approve the extension of the Hidden Shores Mining Permit. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 6-0.**

Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Longcore added afterward that the applicant could revisit the ordinance regarding what constitutes mining, as the language had been revised in recent meetings.

## 8. Site Plan Review:

### A. M-45 LLC – 4755 Lake Michigan Drive – Automobile Filling Station and Convenience Store

The applicant, represented by Chad Mencarelli of Land and Resources Engineering, introduced the project: a 6,200 square foot gas and electric refueling station with 41 parking spaces on the corner lot between Lake Michigan Drive and 48th Avenue. Using presentation papers to illustrate the site plan, Mr. Mencarelli provided details on the street entrances, storm water retention plans, lighting, proposed canopy, dumpster enclosure, and architectural style of building.

Primary issues noted by the applicant were concerns with installing a sidewalk due to grading on the Lake Michigan Drive side and landscaping with the monument sign, which they hoped to keep clean and simple.

Afterward, Mr. Ransford elaborated on details of the special use permit requirements for auto fueling stations in the district, explaining that a public hearing will be required depending on the conclusion of this meeting. He added that a few things of note were requirements for wall signage as well as the applicant meeting threshold for a traffic study.

Mr. Schut proceeded to go over his various concerns, noting that he would not recommend rip wrap and that he would like to know the height of the monument sign, as it was bound by the road elevation. He recommended that the applicant install a sidewalk despite the grading issues and offered a few ideas on how to do it, which includes a boardwalk. Additionally, Mr. Schut requested that the applicant update sheet 8 of the plans regarding the dumpster, as there are two different dumpster details and only one plan can be approved. Finally, he reviewed the parapet height and concerns for the rooftop units being visible.

Mr. Adams then provided his concerns, firstly that he agreed with Mr. Schut on adding a sidewalk access to Lake Michigan Drive. Additionally, he noted that the driveway was rather steep and posed safety issues during winter in addition to potential issues with runoff being unable to flow into the catch basin as intended. Mr. Adams also noted the plans contained three different plans for sidewalks and that the applicant should clarify which plan was to be used.

Mr. Adams continued on discussing the applicant receiving a flood plain permit and intentions for the 48th Avenue side, which Mr. Mencarelli responded that they are waiting the Ottawa County Road Commission for input. Mr. Adams lastly emphasized a need for additional details on the northern retaining wall.

Mr. Longcore prompted the Commission to discuss any issues with the brick-wrapped columns and vegetation to the north, the latter of which Mr. Zeinstra expressed satisfaction but noted it was difficult to tell for sure until the site was cleared. Mr. Longcore then added his agreement regarding the need for a pedestrian access on Lake Michigan Drive, particular for students who live nearby in the apartments.

Mr. Adams also requested a rendering to illustrate how the building will appear from M-45, notably to show covering of the rooftop equipment.

The Commissioners furthermore discussed the applicant receiving reciprocal easements for the sake of future development within the property to the east. They

also agreed a traffic study was not necessary due to existing turn lanes. Mr. Zeinstra recommended more landscaping, which the applicant agreed to look into.

Lastly, Mr. Longcore directed Mr. Ransford to set a public hearing once the applicant returns with the requested changes.

9. Old Business:

B. Mini Storage Depot – 11135 64th Avenue – Indoor and outdoor warehouse/storage facility

Mr. Ransford reiterated previous concerns for the application to build a Mini Storage Depot and added that a public hearing is scheduled for the November 2 meeting. Primary changes the applicant made to the plans, per the Planning Commission's direction from the last meeting, follows:

- Increase southern fence height as well as landscaping, including the replacement of some deciduous trees with evergreens;
- Add landscaping to shield the northwestern house; and
- Alter plans to use the main building to shield storage units from Lake Michigan Drive.

Mr. Longcore prompted discussion on the six-foot fence, which had been increased to 8 feet; the applicant indicated that the fence was solid and that additional landscaping will be added. Mr. Schut requested more details on the fence, and the applicant explained that it will be a black and made of solid PVC. Mr. Zuniga expressed satisfaction with these details, noting that he had voice the concern in the last meeting.

The Commissioners then discussed the screening for the dwelling to the northwest and afterward the building along Lake Michigan Drive. Mr. Longcore and Mr. Zeinstra requested additional screening to break up the elongated building's north wall.

Additionally, Mr. Schut prompted the applicant to look into a reciprocal easement for the northeast lot.

Mr. Longcore directed the applicant to return to the already scheduled public hearing with improved drawings for review and final approval.

10. New Business: None

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments:

Mr. Zuniga discussed concerns with Natan's Automotive, which was not approved for car storage but currently has vehicles behind the fence. Mr. Ransford agreed to pass the request on to the Township staff.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, November 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

# ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

*November 2, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Allendale Township Public Meeting Room & GoToMeeting*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call:

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

Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: Letter from Alex Bartnik

4. Motion by Zuniga to approve the October 19, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes with clarification to error on item 5. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 7-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the November 2, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Schut. **Approval 7-0.**

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

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

Alex Bartnik requested the Township to place a sign forbidding engine braking, referring to a similar sign in Georgetown Township on Filmore Street.

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

7. Public Hearings:

- A. Curtis Moran – 4334 Bliss Street – Mining permit for excavation of a pond

Planner Ransford described the agenda item as a special use permit request to excavate a pond at 4334 Bliss Street, previously reviewed by the Planning Commission during the October 5 meeting. The project requires a special use permit to proceed as well as public hearing. Mr. Ransford added that the plans remain unchanged from the previous meeting and that the Township Engineer reviewed the plans and found no issues.

Kelley Kuiper of Nederveld, representing the applicant, reiterated Mr. Ransford's description. She elaborated that the project is a proposed four-acre aesthetic pond as part of the new construction home being built on the same parcel, serviced only for the property owners. The developers will excavate approximately 104,233 cubic yards of soil, clay, and sand; the top soil, Mrs. Kuiper added, will remain on-site while the sand will be removed for use on other building projects. She also detailed additional requests, including a waiver from building a sidewalk until Bliss Street is paved and permission to construct the first 50 feet of Hall Road with crushed concrete due.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section:*

The first caller, Ken Roesma of 4384 Rose Street, opined that the pond will neither be an asset nor look aesthetically pleasing on the relatively thin parcel; additionally, he noted that the gravel-paved 46th Street was quickly becoming torn up and worried that Bliss Street will look the same due to the project. Mr. Roesma also asked for the expected timeframe to complete the project and suggested that the Township review after four years.

The following public commenter shared Mr. Roesma's concern, adding that her neighbor did not want the pond built. Furthermore, she expressed concerns about the potential issues involved in putting up another gravel pit, both in terms of safety and damage to the aesthetics of the country to which her family had moved.

Maurice Roesma of 12230 40th Avenue was the next commenter and introduced himself as one of the brothers who sold the property to the current owners. He discussed concerns with the gravel pit, relating that such areas were often intrusive on neighborhoods. Secondly, he asked Ms. Piper to explain how the developers planned to keep the gravel road smooth to avoid the situation happening on 46th Avenue.

Lastly, Lisa Moorhouse, the resident directly south of the property, brought forward concerns with the pond's proximity to her land, notably due to potential for washout and mosquito problems, in addition to shared concerns with the condition of the road.

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

Mrs. Kuiper proceeded to clarify the gravel pit issue, providing assurance that the material to be removed will be sand and that no processing and sorting will occur beyond traditional excavation. Secondly, Mrs. Kuiper assured the public that Nederveld intends to follow the Township's special land use requirements, particularly regarding the Haul Route guidelines. The applicant, she explained, will be responsible for any road challenges and complaints caused by the development.

Furthermore, she explained that the homeowner has the right to live on the property and construct a pond if that is what they believe will provide an agricultural feel. As for mosquito concerns, Mrs. Kuiper described the depth of the pond, which will reduce the growth of algae and mosquitos, and noted that the ordinance does not address the matter. Lastly, Mrs. Kuiper provided a conservative approach to the pond's construction, expecting the project to involve six to eight trucks removing material a day, eventually adding up to about four years of excavation. Since the type of fine sand to be removed is in high demand for home building, Mrs. Kuiper anticipated the material to be removed quickly, perhaps even in less time than the anticipated four-year maximum.

Following Mrs. Kuiper's response, Trustee Zeinstra suggested the Planning Commission require the developer to put in a berm and landscaping, which prompted agreement from Mrs. Kuiper and Mr. Longcore.

Commissioner Schut then expressed empathy with the neighbors, relating experience with living near a similar excavation site, but also acknowledged the demand for the type of sand to be removed and that the Planning Commission has approved such small-scale excavation projects in the past. Mr. Schut added that the

Township should improve the process of road approval to address the region's freeze-thaw cycle and reduce the burden of complaints on the neighbors. He suggested approving a short-term plan and have the applicant return for renewal.

Mr. Longcore responded by addressing the possibility of developers not correcting road challenges regardless. Commissioner Zuniga pointed out that other townships use fees, monthly inspections, and other types of enforcements rather than a complaint-driven system. Kevin Yeoman then spoke up, explaining that the Township recognizes the issue and is working with other department heads to find a solution that will remove the burden from neighbors to have a complaint addressed.

Afterward, Mrs. Kuiper suggested that the applicant will likely be open to providing additional information and checking in when needed, perhaps coordinating with the monthly soil erosion inspection already required, or however the Commissioners would prefer to see the report.

Commissioner Adams responded by expounding on Mr. Schut's suggestion—that the Township review the project once per year and reevaluate then, especially if complaints have been issued.

Mr. Longcore then asked Mrs. Kuiper to elaborate on her actual timeframe estimation. Mrs. Kuiper believed the project will be more likely be complete in two years, so Mr. Longcore suggested a two-year review.

Furthermore, Mr. Longcore brought up the neighbor's concern about the pond's proximity to the southern property line. Mrs. Kuiper replied that should the Commissioner's condition approval for a berm to be installed, then the southerly neighbor will be protected from washout.

Mr. Adams then asked about emergency overflow and storm event precautions, to which Mrs. Kuiper described the pond's actual high water line at approximately 90 feet in addition to the developers maintaining a 25-foot buffer as required by ordinance. As the pond is not for storm water retention, the developers will use soil borings to measure water elevations below the surface, which will calculate the high water line. Additionally, Mrs. Kuiper noted that since they are not creating additional pervious surfaces, the pond will not affect the property's ability to capture a major storm event.

Mr. Schut asked if water could reach the high water elevation, and Mrs. Kuiper replied that they are not concerned with the possibility, as they are maintaining a one-foot difference typically only required on subdivision lots.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the Curtis Moran mining permit conditional on the applicant ensuring the following:

- Completing the special land use project in two years, with the availability of a two-year extension if the applicant is in good standing;
- Keeping stockpile from exceeding 15 feet from original grade;
- Adding a vegetated berm around the area of operation to minimize aesthetic disturbance to neighbors and eliminate washout concerns;
- Establishing a \$50,000 credit;



- Modifying Bliss Street to change to the gravel portions of Haul Road; and
- Documenting steps taken to maintain road and including that documentation in the annual report.

Adams second. **Approval 7-0.**

B. Mini Storage Depot – 11135 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Indoor and outdoor warehouse/storage facility

Mr. Ransford introduced the Mini Storage Depot by recalling for the public and the Commissioners the project: a proposed indoor and outdoor storage facility that enters off Lake Michigan Drive. The project was before the Planning Commission for preliminary review on October 5 and again on October 19. Mr. Ransford described the Commissioner's requested modifications: 1) increase landscaping along the south side with evergreen trees; 2) improve layout of building along Lake Michigan Drive to shield the facility's use; 3) add landscaping along building's wall on Lake Michigan Drive to break up the building's length; and 4) provide reciprocal agreement to northeast side.

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment section:*

Caller 1, who lives at the corner of Henry and 65th Avenue, asked about the exact location of the facility, the duration of lighting throughout the night, traffic, and noise level. The next caller, Corey Lindy Mango, challenged the Planning Commission to address whether or not the facility will be the best use of this property, being on the face of the community.

Afterward, Elliot Richards asked about entrance locations, screening for the easterly properties, hours of operation, type of access to the facility, duration of construction, light and sound intrusion, and number of units to be constructed. Lastly, Ray Wojcik shared similar concerns for noise and traffic issues.

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

At Mr. Longcore's prompting, Mr. Ransford explained that the plans have been available to the public as of two months ago and confirmed that the only entrance was on Lake Michigan Drive, with no 64th Avenue access.

Clint Patterson, representing the applicant, asserted intentions to construct the facility with high standards for appearance, noting as well that all units are to be interior facing and not visible from the road. Additionally, leasers cannot live nor conduct business inside the facility and will only be used for household and goods storage. Consequently, the facility will have low noise and traffic levels. As far as lighting, Mr. Patterson described the proposed lighting to be interior facing.

Mr. Patterson continued on to address the construction timeframe, anticipating eight to ten months depending on winter conditions. Additionally, he noted that the property's seller will retain the outparcel, with the entrance on 64th Avenue to be used for later developments. He also explained that while the facility is a 24-hour operation, the facility will be fully fenced, and all leasers must enter with a gate access code, except for new customers who must visit during office hours. Lastly, he expressed assurance that the monthly traffic would be about 30 vehicles a month, or six per week.

Mr. Longcore then confirmed with Mr. Patterson that decorative fencing will be used along the building's front with black vinyl chain link fencing for the sides. The back of the property will use six-foot tall solid PVC fencing with heavy landscaping. Mr. Patterson also described the appearance of the storage units for the public that did not see the plans.

Mr. Zeinstra confirmed with Mr. Yeomans that plans will be posted the following day for the public to view.

After a few additional clarifications and recommendations for improved landscaping, the Commissioners discussed the concerns with the property's use. The Commissioners expressed appreciation to the applicant for working diligently to address each modification request, and complimented the applicant on the building's appearance and landscaping. Mr. Schut and Mr. Zeinstra opined that the facility would not be a detriment to the community, particularly with the improvements made to the building façade and landscaping.

The Commissioners also discussed the items on Mr. Ransford's memo, notably how the applicant can establish a reciprocal easement despite current difficulties.

Mr. Kelley then confirmed with the applicant that they will be willing to make the lights on the storage units timed or otherwise motion sensing, if not already.

Motion by Schut to approve the Mini Storage Depot conditional to the applicant meeting the following:

- Provide updated photometric and lighting control plan, which must be reviewed by the Planning Commission;
- Update landscaping between front building and Lake Michigan Drive by pushing the trees further from the wall to allow room to grow;
- Update easement as approved by Township Engineer;
- Submit a copy of the lease to the Township staff that shows how noise and other activities of customers are regulated by the owner;
- Meet requirements of Fire Department and Township Engineer reviews;
- Bury utilities and note accordingly on site plan;
- Execute necessary landscaping easement related to document along Lake Michigan Drive; and
- Meet all remaining items on memo by Fresh Coast Planning.

Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 6-1.**

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Winter Ready Program Presentation – Kevin Yeomans

Mr. Yeomans presented the Winter Ready Program, a project to use DDA funds to assist Allendale businesses that may struggle during the winter months. He is before the Planning Commission to discuss the implementation of a dual resolution passed

by the Township Board and the Planning Commission to have a legal route for this program.

Mr. Zeinstra clarified with Mr. Yeomans that plans relate to setting up temporary structures, such as tents with heating systems for restaurants that need extra outdoor space. Mr. Yeomans also explained that the program would close come Spring.

Mr. Schut and Mr. Longcore agreed that expediting the process and giving the Board authority to approve the project would benefit local businesses. Mr. Longcore added the recommendation to make it clear to businesses that the borrowed items would be a one-time, seasonal operation.

The Commissioners reached a consensus to add the program to the agenda.

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, November 16, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

***November 16, 2020***

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

***Via GoToMeeting Software***

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call

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

Absent: Longcore

Staff Present: Greg Ransford

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Kelley to approve the November 2, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Westerling. **Approval 6-0.**

5. Motion by Schut to approve the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 6-0.**

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

*Vice-Chairman Schut opened and closed the public comment section for non-public hearing items due to no comments.*

This agenda item was opened and closed twice due to technical problems.

7. Public Hearings:

A. True Value – 5425 Lake Michigan Drive – Building addition and two accessory buildings

Steve Witte of Nederveld, representing the applicant, began the public hearing by summarizing the project: a building addition and two accessory buildings, which the Planning Commission determined at a prior meeting required a major amendment to the Allendale Professional Park PUD. Furthermore, Mr. Witte described the list of changes made to the proposed site plan per the Commissioners' feedback.

Planner Ransford concurred with Mr. Witte's presentation and reiterated the Planning Commission's determination which led to the project's major amendment process. Mr. Ransford concluded that should the Commissioners find the changes satisfactory, they may approve the resolution tonight.

*Commissioner Schut opened and closed the public comment section due to no public comments.*

After the public comment section, Mr. Schut led the Commissioners through a discussion on the list of changes provided by Mr. Witte:

*Lighting Fixtures:* No objections to applicant installing shields to lighting fixtures.

*Landscaping:* No objections to proposed landscaping plan.

*Front Yard Display:* Mr. Schut first confirmed with Mr. Ransford that front yard display areas are permitted in the ordinance should the area meet the 25-foot setback requirement. No objections to proposed front yard display changes.

*Dumpster:* No objections to proposed dumpster enclosure changes.

*Sidewalk:* No objections to proposed sidewalk plans.

*Accessory Building (southern):* No objections to proposed accessory building plans.

*Parapet Wall:* Mr. Westerling observed that the units appeared to be set back far enough for screening purposes and opined that adding a white screening wall would be a detriment to the building by drawing eyes to it. Mr. Schut agreed that the units should be far enough back on the wall but asked if the proposed screening would suffice. Mr. Westerling replied that the screening would look better than a parapet wall.

Mr. Zuniga proceeded to compare the situation to the neighboring McDonald's, which the Planning Commission had required a parapet wall along all sides of the building. He questioned the specifics as to how the Planning Commission should determine the need for a parapet wall, namely along the view from which road. Mr. Adams agreed with the question, and on Mr. Schut's prompting, Mr. Ransford explained that the ordinance required screening from all elevations. He added that the Planning Commission recently had a similar discussion regarding J & H Oil's small addition to ensure screening on all sides.

Mr. Schut recalled a recent screening parameter approval for Lighthouse Community Church and explained that, most importantly, the screening should blend into the building. Mr. Westerling agreed, noting that the screening could either draw or defer attention. Mr. Zeinstra agreed that it was unnecessary to add a taller parapet wall around the parameter and that a screening system would suffice.

Additionally, Mr. Westerling inquired about the size of the new rooftop units. Tom Meidema put in that units will be smaller than the existing. Mr. Westerling and Mr. Schut then discussed how to determine the approval of the rooftop units. Afterward, Mr. Ransford reminded the Commissioners that the applicants currently have a product proposed for screening. Mr. Schut noted that the provided description was rather vague and suggested that the motion should be conditioned by the rooftop units.

Mr. Kelley prompted Mr. Meidema to provide additional details on the proposed screening plan; afterward, the Commissioners agreed the description sufficed.

*Parking Lot:* No objections to proposed sidewalk details and plans for reciprocal easement. Before moving on, Mr. Schut asked Mr. Ransford if there was any way to address having McDonald's make the connection. Mr. Ransford explained that the Township had little involvement in such matters; however, they do have the document requiring McDonald's to comply with the connection in case municipal involvement is necessary. Mr. Ransford then agreed to make a note to prompt staff to ensure during future inspections that McDonald's will be ready to make the connection when needed.

Mr. Witte and Mr. Meidema agreed that it is clear McDonald's will have to meet the connection; however, they do not anticipate any issues and intend to work with their neighbor to make the connection happen.

After going over the list of items, Mr. Schut made the applicant aware that the approval during this meeting will not include the signage.

Lastly, Mr. Schut asked about the second entrance on the property, and Mr. Meidema explained that it is a secondary entrance for customers. Mr. Schut wanted to ensure appropriate signage would be installed to make clear the purpose of the secondary entrance.

Motion by Adams to approve the True Value application with the condition that screening for the rooftop units are approved by staff. Seconded by Westerling.

**Approval 6-0.**

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. Old Business:

A. Mini Storage Depot – 11135 64th Avenue – Indoor and outdoor warehouse/storage facility

- Landscaping Plan and Photometrics Plan review

Clint Patterson, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the project, explaining that they were requested to bring back plans to be reviewed by the Township to ensure standard was met on the access easement into the neighboring, vacant lot. Additionally, photometric plans were requested to ensure lighting would not affect the southern residential lots. Lastly, the Planning Commission had asked the applicant to adjust the landscaping along Lake Michigan Drive to account for growth of evergreens.

Mr. Ransford noted that the type of vegetation and placement should allow room for the trees to grow.

There were no objections to the landscaping, photometric, and access plans.

Motion by Kelley to approve the Mini Storage Depot Landscaping and Photometrics Plans as presented. Seconded by Zuniga. **Approval 5-1.** Dissenting vote by Adams.

10. New Business:

A. Master Plan

- Transportation Chapter
- Implementation Chapter

Mr. Ransford introduced the agenda items as the last two chapters needed for review for the Master Plan amendments. Regarding the transportation chapter, most of the information existed from the current language. Mr. Ransford provided an overview of changes.

Mr. Zeinstra pointed out a few corrections, mostly regarding a typo and noting the existence of a non-motorized trail in the Township.

Mr. Schut brought up pedestrian crossings on busy roads, noting the Township has very poor pedestrian crossings, and asked if this was the place to discuss such improvements particularly along Lake Michigan Drive. Mr. Ransford replied that improving the crossings would need to be made through ongoing communication with the Michigan Department of

Transportation. Mr. Schut went on to ask if the Commission should make a recommendation to a higher board to put pressure on MDOT to make the improvements before an accident occurred.

Mr. Adams suggested adding a note to the end of the chapter to make a recommendation for an under or overpass. Mr. Ransford agreed that this would be a good idea as it shows that the Township is concerned with pedestrian safety. Mr. Zeinstra added that Adam Elenbaas, the Township Supervisor, is working with MDOT to facilitate pedestrian crossings on Lake Michigan Drive. The Commissioners continued to discuss which suggestions should be made to improve the crossings.

Mr. Schut requested Mr. Ransford to connect with Supervisor Elenbaas about the Planning Commission's concern about pedestrian crossing.

Mr. Ransford explained that the Planning Enabling Act requires that every Master Plan includes a zoning plan, which shows a relationship between the Master Plan classifications and the zoning districts. Fresh Coast Planning created tables to show these relationships. He also elaborated on revisions made to the language on definitions of each classification, including the addition of definitions for Commercial and Industrial classifications.

Mr. Adams brought up the Master Plan classification terms and asked if there was any way to make the organization and language of the terms, particularly in residential, more simplified. Mr. Ransford agreed, but explained that modifications to the classification labels would be needed, and noted that there would need to be a mental shift in how the Planning Commission and Board of Trustees read the language. Later, Mr. Adams also discussed with Mr. Ransford about a concern with how some definitions in agricultural classifications were worded.

Mr. Zeinstra then brought up language in the section on high density, asking for clarification on specific wording.

Additionally, Mr. Kelley asked about extending language involving residential sewer and road requirements.

11. Public Comments:

*Commissioner Schut opened and closed public comment section due to no present public.*

12. Township Board Reports: Trustee Zeinstra reported that the Board approved two resolutions to permit outdoor dining and temporary signage, limited to May 3rd. Additionally, the approved the budget and made a statement regarding racism.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

**Next meeting Monday, December 7, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

*December 07, 2020*

*7:00 p.m.*

*Via GoToMeeting Software*

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Roll Call

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

Absent: Westerling

Staff Present: Greg Ransford, Kevin Yeomans

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Adams to approve the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approval 4-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the December 7, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda as presented. Seconded by Adams. **Approval 4-0.**

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. M-45 LLC – 4755 Lake Michigan Drive – Automobile Filling Station and Convenience Store

Commissioner Schut and Commissioner Kelley, were both present by the start of this agenda item, having arrived after agenda items four and five.

Planner Ransford began the presentation for the M-45 LLC project by recapping the applicant's appearance at the October 19, 2020 meeting. Secondly, he highlighted notable directions the Planning Commission provided the applicant at that time: 1) add sidewalk from the building to Lake Michigan Drive, 2) improve the site's west elevation, and 3) provide adequate screening of the rooftop equipment. Finally, Mr. Ransford explained that Fresh Coast Planning determined the applicant's changes to the site plan satisfied the Commissioners' requests.

The applicant, Steve Matthews, did not provide additional commentary.

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

Mr. Longcore opened the Commissioner and staff comment section and directed the discussion through the memo items provided by Fresh Coast Planning.

1) **West Elevation:** Prompted by concerns and suggestions mentioned by Mr. Schut and Mr. Zeinstra, Mr. Matthews agreed to add windows—including false windows where necessary—to break up the wall.



- 2) **Rooftop Screening:** The Commissioners agreed the applicant met the screening requirements.
- 3) **Driveway Grading:** The applicant pointed out that they have re-graded the driveway access on Lake Michigan Drive, bringing it down to between 6.3–6.4. Mr. Adams, who brought up the original concern during the last meeting, approved the changes.
- 4) **Retaining Wall:** The Commissioners agreed the retaining wall met requirements.
- 5) **Permitting:** Mr. Matthews noted that the EGLE Permit, Soil Erosion Permit, and Storm Drain Permit have been acquired; remaining permits, such as construction and sanitary sewer permits and the 48th Avenue access permit from the Michigan Department of Transportation, are pending approval from the Planning Commission. Mr. Ransford added that approval from the Township Engineer and Attorney is pending due to missing information regarding the access point.

After the Commissioners discussed the memo items, Mr. Zeinstra, Mr. Schut, Mr. Kelley, and Mr. Zuniga agreed that the applicant satisfied the Planning Commission's concerns.

Motion by Zeinstra to approve the M-45 LLC special land use per the conditions described in the review letter from Fresh Coast Planning and the addition of two transom windows along the western elevation. Seconded by Kelley. **Approval 6-0.**

#### 8. Site Plan Review:

##### A. Metro Health – 4830 Becker Drive – Medical Offices

Mr. Ransford described the Metro Health site plan as a 15,477 square foot building for medical offices located within the University Park Planned Unit Development. Additionally, the building will be on the corner of Becker Drive and 48th Avenue, with Lake Michigan Drive to its south, consequently bounding the property by three streets. Mr. Ransford then drew attention to the goals of the University Park PUD, noting that the ordinance requires pedestrian activity and outdoor social gatherings. Finally, he provided additional details and applicant requests for the site plan.

Steve Witte, representing the applicant, reiterated Mr. Ransford's commentary and proceeded to review requests indicated in Fresh Coast Planning's memo. Afterward, Brian Goheen elaborated on the request to use spandrel glass to bypass the current building materials limit of 40 percent on glass.

Mr. Longcore started the Commissioner and staff comments section by discussing the University Park PUD, observing that the development appears to have moved away from its original language, and asked Mr. Ransford if an amendment to the PUD would be needed to approve the Metro Health project. Mr. Ransford agreed an amendment might make for cleaner documentation; however, he suggested that the applicant could still meet the standards of the PUD by adding a bench or similar, therefore encouraging pedestrian traffic and social gathering in addition to the sidewalk requirements.

Mr. Zeinstra and Mr. Schut disagreed that an amendment would be needed, particularly if a bench, patio, or both was added. Mr. Witte agreed that it should be possible to add a bench or bike rack. One of the representatives of Metro Health

expressed willingness to add a bike rack and benches. Mr. Kelley also noted accessibility issues with the sidewalk.

*Parking:* The Commissioners agreed increasing parking rows in the front yard would be reasonable.

*Landscaping:* The Commissioners agreed that the front yard landscaping along Becker Drive was satisfactory.

*Sidewalks:* 5-foot width from Becker Drive to building. Mr. Schut and Mr. Longcore observed inefficiencies in pedestrian circulations with the sidewalks as is but acknowledged the limitations of the site. Mr. Zeinstra found the five-foot sidewalk to the east to be adequate, but would like to see the sidewalk to the east to be extended to 48th Avenue. Mr. Adams agreed, suggesting the use of a boardwalk to compensate for grading issues.

Furthermore, Mr. Longcore pointed out that emails from the Township Engineer echoed the Commissioners' concerns. The Metro Health representative countered the need for the additional sidewalk by noting most traffic to the building would arrive to the clinic using public transportation. With input from Mr. Ransford, Mr. Longcore pointed out that a sidewalk would be required, whether now or five years later. The representative acknowledged the Commissioners' comments but continued to push back, referencing the steep grading issues on the site. Mr. Sickima asked if the Township would be willing to assist making the sidewalk requests feasible; Mr. Longcore noted that the Township Engineer has already expressed willingness to help as needed. Mr. Witte agreed to continue discussion to address the issue.

*Dumpster Placement:* The Commissioners' agreed the placement of the dumpster was satisfied; however, Mr. Schut suggested increasing the size of the enclosure.

*Windows:* The Commissioners agreed with the use of spandrel glass does not impact the maximum 40 percent rule.

*Traffic Study:* After a discussion on the nature of traffic that commonly occurs at health facilities, the Commissioners agreed that a traffic study would not be needed at this time. Mr. Zuniga suggested a traffic study once the applicant expands at a later time.

*Mobile Unit:* Direction was given to the applicant to indicate on the site plan that the mobile unit will not become a permanent feature on the property, to identify its frequency and duration on site.

With no more comments from the Commissioners, Mr. Longcore directed Mr. Ransford to schedule a public hearing for January 4, 2021.

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Lake Placid – Annual Mining Report

Mr. Ransford introduced this agenda item as the annual report required by the ordinance for mining operations. The applicant reported that operations have proceeded smoothly, with operations expected to end during the spring. Additionally, phase three of the project is in the works to get into motion during the 2021 year.

The Commissioners accepted the report.

B. DeYoung – Annual Mining Report

Much like the previous item, Mr. Ransford described the project as a final report for mining operations, which have been proceeding quicker than expected.

The Planning Commission accepted the report.

11. Public Comments:

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

12. Township Board Reports: None

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments: None

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

**Next meeting Monday, December 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.**

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**December 21, 2020**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Via GoToMeeting Software**

1. Meeting called to order

2. Roll Call:

Present: Westerling, Adams, Schut, Zeinstra, Longcore

Absent: Kelley, Zuniga

Staff Present: Planner Greg Ransford (arrived at 7:08 p.m.)

3. Received for Information: None

4. Motion by Schut to approve the December 7, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes.  
Seconded by Adams. **Approved 5-0.**

5. Motion by Longcore to approve the December 21, 2020 Agenda. Seconded by Zeinstra.  
**Approved 5-0.**

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

*Chairperson Longcore opened the public comment period.*

Lindsay Mohr, of Fresh Coast Planning, stated that Planner Greg Ransford would join the meeting shortly.

*Chairperson Longcore closed the public comment period.*

7. Public Hearings: None

8. Site Plan Review: None

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Taco Bell – 4989 Lake Michigan Drive

- Minor vs Major determination for building addition

The Commissioners discussed their opinions on the determination. Both Adams and Zeinstra felt it was a minor determination. Mr. Schut felt the same with the exception of the effect this could have on the neighbors of Taco Bell.

He feels that the Commission should have input from the neighbors. He also stated that he had zoning questions for Mr. Ransford. Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Schut regarding a request to view the building materials.

Chairperson Longcore asked Mr. Ransford if a zoning ordinance requires that the building materials match the existing materials. Mr. Ransford stated that the ordinance requires that all elevations of the building meet the requirements. The Commission and Planner Ransford discussed similar past building additions and the influence this decision could have on future additions.

Mr. Ransford asked Chairperson Longcore if the Commission is focused only on the addition or if this is also an opportunity to correct any antiquated parts of the building. Mr. Schut asked if the Zoning Department would be able to visit the site to find any concerns. Mr. Ransford replied that he will ensure this happens.

Consensus was reached that the review must return to the Commission with updated plans meeting the zoning ordinance provisions for the façade.

#### B. JMM Developers – Annual Mining Report

The applicant was not present at the meeting. Mr. Ransford said that there are no complaints on file and the applicant feels that excavation will be completed in 2021. They would like to return to the Commission and apply for an expansion to add additional land. Mr. Ransford confirmed the information in their annual report.

There were no comments from the Commissioners and the report was accepted as presented.

#### C. Master Plan – Appendix & Map

Mr. Ransford stated that they are nearing the end of the content for the Master Plan. There is information that is better suited in the Appendix rather than in the middle of the Master Plan. He would like the Commission to consider if any of the maps need to be updated. The Path and Greenway Master Plan Map was previously referenced in the Transportation Language, now known as Transportation Chapter. At the last meeting, it was proposed striking the Path and Greenway Master Plan Map to reference the Parks and Trail Master Plan Map which is in the Five Year Recreation Plan. Mr. Ransford said that they are closer to sending the Master Plan to the Board of Trustees.

Chairperson Longcore opened the discussion with the Commissioners about the Greenway Map. Mr. Zeinstra suggested postponing this discussion until Mr. Zuniga could be present because he is part of the Parks and Recreation

Committee. Chairperson Longcore said that the Greenway Map is meant to connect parks and schools in order to create a walkable community. Mr. Ransford said that the language of the current Master Plan indicates that when reviewing site plan proposals the Transportation Chapter states to consult the Trail Plan. The Commission discussed the Non-Motorized Trail Plan and potentially incorporating it with the Greenway map. The Commission viewed and discussed the Greenway Master Plan Map.

Mr. Ransford discussed the Future Land Use Map and the area of 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive. The Commission discussed the lack of municipal water and sewer at the parcel and how the land should be categorized. They then discussed Springfield area, west of 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and the density of the area. Planner Ransford will check the zoning of this area to ensure that it matches the map. The Commissioners then agreed that the Town Center be changed to General Commercial and discussed the Public/Semi-Public classification on the Map. The Commissioners agreed that the survey will be left in the Master Plan.

Staff was directed to update the Master Plan map and Appendix accordingly and return it for further review by the Commission, once available.

#### D. Annual Work Program – updated

Mr. Ransford introduced the Annual Work Program. The Commissioners discussed the ranking of the items. Mr Schut suggested adding Section 24.06J as a discussion item with particular regard to the maximum glass provision. He also suggested moving 7, 9, and 10 down the list.

Staff will revise the Annual Work Program and return it to the Commission at a future meeting.

#### E. 2021 Meeting Schedule

Motion by Schut to approve the 2021 proposed Planning Commission Meetings dates with the change of omitting the meeting date of July 5, 2021. Seconded by Zeinstra. **Approved 5-0.**

### 11. Public Comments

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

### 12. Township Board Reports

Mr. Zeinstra stated that the Township Board has appointed new members to some of the different committees.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments

Mr. Ransford will be on vacation during the next meeting but Lindsay Mohr will be present. Kevin Yeomans stated that he is working with Township staff to facilitate future meetings if they continue to be held virtually.

14. Chairperson Longcore adjourned at 8:57pm.

**Next meeting Monday, January 4, 2021 at 7:00pm**

