

**HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**November 4, 2025**

Chairman Randy Kortering called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

**Present:** Chairman Randy Kortering, Members, Leo Barajas, Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Gretchen Molotky, and Jack VanderMeulen. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White.

**Absent:** Evan Sharp and Recording Secretary Sheila Webb.

**Public Comment:** None.

**Minutes:**

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of October 7, 2025 with a minor change on page 4 changing the words "8<sup>th</sup> Street" to "Clover Avenue". A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

**Presentation**

**5-Year Comprehensive Plan Update**

Mr. Chris Khorey from McKenna Associates was present to discuss updates of the 2025 Housing Study as well as the incorporation of the Housing Study into the Township Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Khorey asserted that the Comprehensive Plan is serving housing growth well and has planned sufficiently for it. He pointed out the levels of growth within Holland Charter Township as well as the surrounding trade area and how this affects housing supplies. Mr. Khorey also went over the current housing supply, affordability, demand, and the projected housing needs in the next 10-20 years. Mr. Khorey also noted some additional information that the Board of Trustees wanted in the study, showing what in-migration looked like back in the 2000s to give context for growth over a greater span of years.

Commissioners had questions and related discussion regarding where growth was coming from and whether they need to evaluate zoning and other policies to encourage more ownership style of housing in the future.

\*\* It was moved by Huesman and supported by Becker to recommend approval to the Township Board of Trustees for review and determination that the proposed amendment is acceptable for distribution to the surrounding municipalities and designated agencies per the Michigan Planning Enabling Act requirements. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

**Public Hearings**

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing** for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for an expansion of an existing Place of Worship including the construction of a new

pole barn storage building in Phase 1, office and youth classroom addition in Phase 2, and stair and bathroom addition and new picnic shelter in Phase 3. Petition is submitted by Russ Miller of Immanuel Church for land located at 325 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-35-400-012. The subject property is zoned AG Agriculture.

Present for this request was Russ Miller, pastor of Immanuel Church, 325 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Holland, MI 49423, Justin Longstreth of Moore & Bruggink, 202 Monroe Avenue NW, Grand Rapids, MI 49505 and Gina Paul of AMDG Architects, 25 Commerce Avenue SW, Suite 400, Grand Rapids, MI 49503.

Russ Miller noted that the church has seen growth over the past few years, much like the Township, and as a result of that growth, they are looking at adding some growth spaces to serve their needs. Mr. Miller noted that Phase 1 would consist of a new pole barn, replacing the old one, which would be used to store landscaping tools and equipment, as well as serve as added storage space for ministry related items. Phase 2 would consist of a classroom addition and youth space. Phase 3 would consist of a stairway addition, bathroom to serve the new playground space on the south side of the building and picnic shelter.

Chairman Kortering asked what the intended use of the picnic shelter would be. Mr. Miller stated that it will have picnic tables and that they may use it for an occasional outdoor church service. Mr. Miller noted they do not intend to have concerts under the picnic shelter as they want to be good neighbors to the residential development south of their property.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked what could be done to dress up the picnic shelter because the concept provided in the applicant's submittal packet appeared to be basic. Mr. Miller noted that they have actually worked with the architect since this submittal for a more decorative picnic shelter, as he was looking for something more compatible with the building as well. Ms. Paul, architect, had an updated concept for the picnic shelter which was displayed for the Commissioners to see.

Chairman Kortering asked why the whole project is broken up into three phases. Mr. Miller noted that they would ideally prefer to do the whole project in one phase, however, that depends on what funds they can raise for these additions. Mr. Miller indicated that they are close to being able to fund the whole project in one phase.

Chairman Kortering asked about the future 28 parking spaces proposed along the main drive aisle and driveway serving the church. Chairman Kortering noted that there may be concerns with incoming traffic from the driveway if a car is pulling out from a parking space. Mr. Longstreth, engineer, noted that they can evaluate this and work with Staff on what may be appropriate for added parking during site plan review.

Chairman Kortering asked staff whether the Commission would get to see this project again when they get closer to construction. Director Broersma noted that the Commission could stipulate that the site plan approval for the project needs to come from the Planning Commission. If not, the project will just work through an administrative site plan review with Staff.

Director Broersma noted that phase 3, consisting of the stair and bathroom addition, had some building code issues which came up from a preliminary review with building department staff. Ms. Paul noted that they clarified with the building official that the bathroom and stairway addition will require a two-hour rated firewall, which they will account for in the construction plans.

Ms. Molotky asked about the pickleball courts outlined in the previous site concept from 2022 and whether those have been approved. Director Broersma stated that the 2022 Special Land Use permit approval did not authorize the pickleball courts to be installed, and if the applicant wants those in the future, they will need to secure an amended Special Land Use permit. Ms. Molotky indicated support for outdoor services under the picnic shelter.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Commissioners discussed the opportunity for outdoor services to be held on the property and whether this should be rolled into the Special Land Use permit request. Commissioners discussed "outdoor service" with accessory music versus what classifies as a concert. Director Broersma noted that the Commission may not want to get into the weeds of what constitutes a concert, how many people may be under the picnic shelter, etc. and that they could stipulate that outdoor church service is limited to the picnic shelter. Director Broersma noted that noise regulations are listed under the Code of Ordinance and the enforcement of noise violations comes from the Sheriff's Department.

The Commission then reviewed the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

**1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.**

The Commissioners stated the use already exists and would be appropriate for the character and uses in the area.

**2. The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

The Commissioners have no concerns with this standard.

**3. The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

The Commissioners stated there may be concerns regarding noise depending on how the picnic shelter is used. The Commissioners noted they may wish to review stipulations for use of this structure.

**4. The use will be consistent with the intent and purposes of this ordinance and the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.**

The Commissioners stated the use is consistent and there are similar uses in the area.

**5. The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

The Commissioners noted there will be very minimal changes to the environment so there is no concern with this standard.

**6. The use will not result in traffic congestion, nor have an adverse impact on roads, nor cause hazards.**

The Commissioners stated the expansion of the use will not negatively impact traffic.

**7. There is need for the proposed use within the township, and the use will not be detrimental to the community.**

The Commissioners agreed that there is a need.

The Commissioners discussed whether they would like to see this come back to them for site plan review and approval. There was agreement from the Commission that they were comfortable with Staff handling the site plan review. Mr. VanderMeulen asked whether there are architectural standards for buildings and whether Staff could apply them to the picnic shelter. Director Broersma noted that the Zoning Ordinance does not have any architectural standards that apply to this property so Staff would not be able to apply any standards to improve the character of the pole barn. However, landscaping requirements in the ordinance may help to buffer these structures.

Chairman Kortering asked the Commissioners if they have any concerns with approving the three phases altogether. The Commission noted comfort with approving all three phases.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Molotky to approve the Special Land Use permit for 325 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue for an expansion of an existing Place of Worship with the continuation with the condition that the applicant will work with Staff for site plan approval for all three phases including parking, pavement, landscaping, and architectural details, all work must start within one year after final site plan approval, allow outdoor services that are non-disruptive to adjoining neighborhoods. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing** for consideration of amendments to change and add certain sections to the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township. The sections under consideration are: Article 3 – Agricultural District, Article 9 – Specific Use Requirements, and Article 22 – General Definitions. The proposed text is generally described as adding a new use, “Wetland Mitigation Bank”, its specific special land use requirements, and associated definitions to the Zoning Ordinance, as well as adding language to further define public and private streets.

Director Broersma noted that the Commission has worked on these text amendments for the last few months. What is driving the need to add “wetland mitigation banks” as a use to the Zoning Ordinance is that the Township has received a request to site a wetland mitigation bank in the Township, and after reviewing the Zoning Ordinance, Staff determined that the use “wetland mitigation bank” is not similar to another use in the Ordinance. After consulting with the Township Attorney, he recommended the use be defined and requirements be added to the Ordinance to detail where the use may be permitted and under what conditions, if any.

Director Broersma noted the amendment proposes to add “wetland mitigation banks” as a special land use to the Agricultural Zoning District. Planner White noted that one minor change had

occurred to the proposed language under the proposed “Section 9.28 Wetland Mitigation Bank” after consulting with Mike Pennington of Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy. Planner White noted that Mr. Pennington indicated some hesitancy with the Ordinance stating that the conservation easement for the wetland bank shall not prohibit improvements like trails, boardwalks, overlooks, etc. as EGLE’s standard conservation easement does restrict these types of improvements. Planner White noted that language has been added to grant the Commission authority to permit the prohibition of these structures and elements.

Director Broersma noted the other portion of this proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment includes changes to the public, private streets, alley, and front yard definitions. The changes to these definitions are intended to clarify that the streets like US-31, M-121, and I-196 are classified as public streets and a property fronting on these roads are subject to front yard regulations, including front yard building setback requirements. The need for this amendment arose out of a court case involving the application of front yard building setbacks along US31.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

The Commission then reviewed the Zoning Text Amendment Criteria from Section 21.4B of the Zoning Ordinance.

**1. The proposed text amendment would clarify the intent of the ordinance.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

**2. The proposed text amendment would correct an error or oversight in the ordinance.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

**3. The proposed text amendment would address changes to the State legislation, recent case law or opinions from the Attorney General of the State of Michigan.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

**4. The proposed text amendment would promote compliance with changes in other County, State or Federal regulations.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

**5. In the event the amendment will add a use to a district, that use shall be fully consistent with the intent of the district and the character of the range of uses provided for within the district.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

**6. The amendment will not create incompatible land uses within a zoning district, or between adjacent districts.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

- 7. The proposed text amendment is supported by the findings of reports, studies, or other documentation on functional requirements, contemporary building practices, environmental requirements and similar technical items.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

- 8. As applicable, the proposed change shall be consistent with the township's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

- 9. The proposed change shall be consistent with the township's desire to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Huesman to recommend approval of the proposed text amendments to Article 3, 9, and 22 of the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township as written to the Township Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

## **Other Business**

**Macatawa Legends, south of New Holland St and east of 144<sup>th</sup> Ave – Amendment to the Macatawa Legends Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan** – Submitted by Kelly Kuiper of Paramount Development Corporation on behalf of REIP Land Investments LLC in consideration of a proposed amendment including changes in the Phase 2 of the Fairway View Development phase. Changes consist of: 1) increasing the overall unit count for the Macatawa Legends PUD by 1 unit, from 605 to 606 total dwelling units, by increasing the total unit count within Fairway View by 1 unit from 108 to 109 total dwelling units; 2) reducing the site condominium width of several units on the south side of proposed road in Phase 2 of Fairway View; and 3) that private streets within Phase 2 of Fairway View will be constructed in compliance with Zoning Ordinance requirements but that surface course pavement shall be installed within 2 years of the date the development phase has been issued its first building permit.

Present for this request was John Tenpas of Driesenga & Associates, Inc., 12330 James Street, Suite H80, Holland, MI 49424.

Mr. Tenpas noted the Commission saw the proposed changes to Fairway View Phase 2 at their last meeting and are now looking for approval of the Resolution and Report for these changes. Mr. Tenpas noted he is present if the Commission has any follow-up questions.

Chairman Kortering asked Mr. Tenpas about the estimated completion date for this phase. Mr. Tenpas stated they would be looking to start construction on this phase spring or summer of 2026. Chairman Kortering asked whether the proposed completion date of December 31, 2033 for the full Macatawa Legends project, as noted in the Resolution and Report, is reasonable for Eastbrook. Mr. Tenpas noted comfort with this date for overall completion.

\*\* It was moved by Huesman and supported by Molotky to approve the Resolution and Report recommending approval of the Amendment to the Macatawa Legends Planned Unit Development Final Development Plan and direct Staff to distribute the document to the Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

## **Tabled Business**

**12635 Felch Street, Suite 10 – Special Land Use Permit - 70-16-16-100-074** - Consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for “Outdoor Display and Sales” use. Petition is submitted by Lowe’s Home Center LLC on behalf of Geenen DeKock Properties LLC. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled September 9, 2025)

\*\* It was moved by Huesman and supported by Molotky to remove the Special Land Use permit request from the table. Motion carried by voice vote.

Present to speak to the request was Todd Bartok of Lowe’s Home Improvement, 1000 Lowe’s Boulevard, Mooreville, NC 28117.

Mr. Bartok noted that Lowe’s is looking to approve an outdoor sales and display area for their retail items. Mr. Bartok noted that the Lowe’s team, Holland Charter Township Fire Chief and zoning staff met in September to discuss the fire concerns with items being stored outdoors. Mr. Bartok noted the plan they have provided to the Commission addresses the concerns of the Fire Chief by proposing only non-combustible items for display in front of the fire-suppressed canopies.

Director Broersma noted that the current plan shows “side by sides” and “golf carts” for display, which had not been discussed before. Mr. Broersma noted that these items are classified as “recreational equipment” under the Zoning Ordinance and require a separate Special Land Use permit approval. Mr. Bartok noted they just won’t sell those items then. Director Broersma noted that if the Commission is comfortable with the plan as presented, they could stipulate their approval noting that the side by sides and golf carts are not permitted with their approval.

Mr. Bartok noted that they are also planning on adding a temporary barrier around the display area in front of the Garden Center, as noted on the plan. Director Broersma asked for clarification on the site concept plan provided and whether the proposed sales areas in front of the building is intended to cover the concrete sidewalk and not display into the loading zone area. Mr. Bartok confirmed that the sales area in front of the building would occur on the concrete area, not the drive aisle or loading zone.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment. There was no one from the public present to speak to this request.

\*\* It was moved by Huesman and supported by Becker to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

The Commission then reviewed the Special Land Use Standards of Approval

- 1. The use will be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character and land uses in the general vicinity.**

The Commissioners stated the use already exists and would be appropriate for the character and uses in the area.

- 2. The use will be served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities, and schools.**

The Commissioners have no concerns with this standard.

- 3. The use will not involve operations, materials and equipment that will be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to any persons, property or the general welfare due to traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, vibration, or odors.**

The Commissioners stated no concerns with this standard if the golf carts and side by sides are excluded from this use permit request.

- 4. The use will be consistent with the intent and purposes of this ordinance and the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.**

The Commissioners stated the use is consistent.

- 5. The use will ensure that the environment shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal and topographic modifications, which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.**

The Commissioners noted there will be no changes to the environment so there is no concern with this standard.

- 6. The use will not result in traffic congestion, nor have an adverse impact on roads, nor cause hazards.**

The Commissioners stated the use will not negatively impact traffic.

- 7. There is need for the proposed use within the township, and the use will not be detrimental to the community.**

The Commissioners agreed that there is a need.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Barajas to approve the Special Land Use permit for outdoor display and sales for 12635 Felch Street, Suite 10 with the condition that the sales area occur on the concrete per the plan provided, only the non-combustible items listed on the plan, with the exception of "side by side" and "golf carts" or other motorized vehicles, may be displayed in the blue-shaded area outside of the fire-suppressed canopies at the front of the store and a temporary CMU or similar barrier along the green shaded area in front of the Garden Center per the site plan must be installed and maintained similar to the previously approved sales area. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

**Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment** - Consideration of amendments to Article 9 – Specific Use Requirements, Section 9.14 – Keeping of Farm Animals, Chickens, and Bees. Petition is submitted by Marissa Latchaw and Nicholas Omron. The proposed text is generally described as

permitting chickens on non-farm properties in the AG Agricultural, R-1 Low Density Residential, and R-2 Moderate Density Residential Zoning Districts under certain conditions. (Tabled July 1, 2025)

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to remove the Zoning Ordinance text Amendment request from the table. Motion carried by voice vote.

Present to speak to the request were Marissa Latchaw and Nicholas Omron, 12860 N Bellwood Drive, Holland, MI 49424.

Ms. Latchaw stated that they are looking to permit chickens in residential areas, similar to what is permitted in neighboring communities like City of Holland and Park Township. Mr. Omron noted that they have referenced other communities' ordinances and used them as a guide for some of the draft language provided. Ms. Latchaw noted that as residents, they do not feel equipped to be able to handle drafting an ordinance that handles the particulars of the permitting or licensing process and would defer to Staff or the Board on what that process looks like.

Ms. Latchaw noted that they would like to address some of the comments from the Staff report. Firstly, Staff had the question about raising chickens for meat, like broiler chickens and whether this needed to be further addressed. Mr. Omron stated that GAAMPs outlays procedures for chicken slaughter and re-emphasized that their draft ordinance language does not permit the outdoor slaughter of chickens. Ms. Latchaw noted that they had removed the requirement for chicken enclosures to be 25 feet from residential structures on adjacent properties from their previous language given they added in the requirements for lot line setbacks from these structures, which are the same as the required setbacks for accessory buildings. Ms. Latchaw also noted that many residents of the Township who she talked with had assumed that chickens were permitted in residential areas given when you complete a Google search of this question, Google notes "yes"; however, Ms. Latchaw stated that this is likely because the City of Holland permits it and Google is just providing a cursory answer. Ms. Latchaw also stated that the concerns for chicken nuisances may be minimal given pets, particularly dogs, which are permitted by ordinance also create nuisances through barking and waste. Ms. Latchaw noted chickens in comparison may be considered creating less of a nuisance from noise and waste.

Ms. Latchaw stated that she understands Staff's comments about adding more staff time for permit review, processing, monitoring and enforcement for these text changes. However, she notes that the fees collected for permitting would help to mitigate the burden on Staff by compensating them for their time afforded to these matters. Ms. Latchaw also noted that concerns about handling chicken waste may be misplaced as residents are required to handle their own personal waste (e.g., contracting with a waste hauler, etc.) and are required to handle their own pet waste.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Aaron Weenum, 3616 Beeline Road, Holland, MI 49424, noted that they had brought chickens believing that chickens were permitted in the Township, but then received an enforcement letter from the Township saying they needed to be removed. Mr. Weenum noted they removed the chickens but would like to have them again.

\*\* It was moved by Barajas and supported by Becker to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Becker asked Staff how this proposed language would impact residential properties subject to Planned Unit Development agreements. Director Broersma noted that there is language embedded in these PUD agreements that states unless the development has secured relief from a zoning regulation, the development shall comply with Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended from time to time, so a PUD development could potentially allow chickens if permitted by the ordinance. Director Broersma noted that many PUDs contain associations, who may decide to amend their HOA requirements to not permit chickens. That would be up to the HOA to do so.

Some Commissioners asked about what this ordinance language means for duplexes in the R-2 Zoning Districts. Director Broersma stated that the language as proposed would only permit chickens for properties containing single-family dwellings.

Chairman Kortering asked the Commission how they felt about the change from the previous draft language they saw in July as the language removed the requirement for separation distances for chicken enclosures from residential structures on adjoining properties and replaced those requirements with accessory building setback requirements from lot lines. Commissioners noted comfort with this change as it may make it easier for residents to measure from their own lot lines rather than their neighbor's building. Chairman Kortering noted that the Township does not have required setbacks for dog runs.

Chairman Kortering asked about how drafting the requirements for the permitting process would work. Director Broersma noted that typically licensing or permitting procedures, such as those for rental certificates, would be written into the Code of Ordinance, rather than the Zoning Ordinance. Ultimately, the Township Board of Trustees is responsible for approving changes to the Code of Ordinances, so if the Commission felt the draft language for the Zoning Ordinance amendment was appropriate and worded properly, they may recommend approval of the language to the Township Board of Trustees. The Board may then work on the permitting or licensing ordinance language, or direct Staff to work on the language, or could direct the Commission to work on the language.

The Commission then reviewed the Zoning Text Amendment Criteria from Section 21.4B of the Zoning Ordinance.

**1. The proposed text amendment would clarify the intent of the ordinance.**

The Commission found this criterion applies given the Zoning Ordinance does not permit residential chickens so the Commission is adding to address this regulation.

**2. The proposed text amendment would correct an error or oversight in the ordinance.**

The Commission found this criterion applies given the Commission is looking to correct permitting residential chickens as people are asking to allow them.

**3. The proposed text amendment would address changes to the State legislation, recent case law or opinions from the Attorney General of the State of Michigan.**

The Commission found this criterion does not apply to this ordinance amendment.

**4. The proposed text amendment would promote compliance with changes in other County, State or Federal regulations.**

The Commission found this criterion does not apply to this ordinance amendment but noted that the change would align with adjacent neighboring communities, like Park Township and City of Holland.

- 5. In the event the amendment will add a use to a district, that use shall be fully consistent with the intent of the district and the character of the range of uses provided for within the district.**

The Commission found this criterion applies given the applicants have addressed where the use would be allowed and under what parameters.

- 6. The amendment will not create incompatible land uses within a zoning district, or between adjacent districts.**

The Commission found this criterion does not apply to this ordinance amendment.

- 7. The proposed text amendment is supported by the findings of reports, studies, or other documentation on functional requirements, contemporary building practices, environmental requirements and similar technical items.**

The Commission found this criterion applies as the applicants researched other communities' ordinances for guidance on language and the change would align with what adjacent communities are permitting.

- 8. As applicable, the proposed change shall be consistent with the township's ability to provide adequate public facilities and services.**

The Commission found this criterion does not apply to this ordinance amendment, but the Commission notes added zoning enforcement responsibility.

- 9. The proposed change shall be consistent with the township's desire to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.**

The Commission found this criterion applies.

\*\* It was moved by Molotky and supported by Becker to recommend approval of the proposed text amendments to Article 9 – Specific Use Requirements, Section 9.14 – Keeping of Farm Animals, Chickens and Bees of the Zoning Ordinance of Holland Charter Township as written to the Township Board of Trustees. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

**11483 Lakewood Blvd – Special Land Use Permit – 70-16-22-271-005** - Consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for “Vehicles, Recreational equipment, manufactured homes, heavy equipment sales and rental” and “Vehicle Repair, including outdoor storage of vehicles awaiting repair”. Petition is submitted by Dave Timmerman of Union Land LLC. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. (Tabled August 12, 2025)

This item is to remain tabled. Director Broersma noted that the applicant is working on the plan, and that they are considering the option of going to the Zoning Board of Appeals for some of the items in their plan.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

#### **Review of 2026 Planning Commission submittal deadlines, meeting dates, and meeting times.**

Director Broersma noted that Staff has drafted the meeting dates for 2026 which can be found in the Commissioners' packets. Dates were generally chosen to fall on the first Tuesday of the month, unless an election, holiday, or school break were to occur on that date. Director Broersma also noted that Staff is still planning on a 6:00 p.m. start time, unless the Commission would like to consider another time. The Commission noted comfort with the 6:00 p.m. start time and proposed meeting dates.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to move the 2026 Planning Commission meeting dates as presented. Motion carried by voice vote.

Chairman Kortering noted that the Geerling apartment and mixed-use project on Lakewood Boulevard will likely be coming back to the Commission to review a proposed change to their nature trails and pedestrian bridge crossing. Director Broersma noted projects on-going in the Township.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 2, 2025, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate White  
Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator