

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
July 7, 2026

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, Doug Becker, Angela Huesman, Gretchen Molotky (arrived at 6:09 pm), Evan Sharp, and Jack VanderMeulen. Also present was Community Development Director Corey Broersma.

Absent: Leo Barajas

Public Comment: None

Minutes:

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Sharp to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 2, 2026. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 2. Motion carried.

Public Hearings

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a Special Land Use Permit approval for an “Animal Services, Kennel” use specifically for a dog training and daycare facility. The petition is submitted by Robert Crough of Paradigm Dog School on behalf of Deb Lewis of Heitman Properties LLC for property located at 3225 132nd Avenue described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-08-300-026. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was Robert Crough of Paradigm Dog School, 3225 132nd Avenue, Holland, 49424. Ms. Deb Lewis, former land owner for property located at 3225 132nd Avenue, Holland, 49424 and Todd Billings.

Mr. Crough stated that he’s been training for animal behavior, biology, and psychology in this town for upwards of 25 years. He’s been at this location for 20 years. He started training in people’s homes in the early 2000s, went full-time. There are a lot of these dogs that can’t go to doggy daycares. The 2002 special use for dog training that’s already in place is what he’s operating under. Somewhere in 2002, he had a client that had a dog who had a scuffle. He said he was really upset with the other dog and owner. So, she called the police on the other dog. She didn’t call the police on the business. She just wanted the other dog out, which he stated he obliged. Shortly after that, he got an email stating that he was not in compliance with the 2002 use, he was told by the Township that it’s supposed to be a dog training facility with no overnight boarding.

Chairman Kortering asked if this was approved in 2002. Mr. Crough said he had some emails back and forth in 2002. He spoke with the animal control person at the time. This person basically just laughed it off and said he didn’t need to have a kennel license. And agreed that this is a dog training business and everything that they do is centered around training.

Mr. Crough stated in 2002, it was all dropped. The township no longer pursued it, and I was carrying on with business as usual. He believes last winter, he had an employee who got a little crazy, started accusing his staff of animal abuse. She quit and then threatened he and his employees with all kinds of false charges. It was about maybe, two or three weeks after that, he got the same exact letter that he received in 2002 saying that he was not in compliance. He stated he came in and spoke with Mr. Broersma and told him that this is a dog training school.

Mr. Crough said he was told some things that were just incorrect, and he said he tried to talk it over one on one, but it did not go well. The verbiage vet, or a clinic, were used which he says is not true. There's none of that verbiage in there. So, he said when he got the next letter, he came down in good faith in person and tried to speak and say what was going on. He was told that training dogs, the owner must be there, which is not true. The dog doesn't even have to be there to be training. He's done plenty of training with people where the dog is not even in the room, because dog training is mostly training people especially when you're in the field.

Mr. Crough stated he spoke to the Sheriff. So, when the former employee called, the sheriff came out, and he later spoke with him on the phone. Mr. Crough said there was no talk of him saying that he had to have a kennel license or that that he was only training off-site. He told them what he was doing was training at the location, including group classes. He says he also trains in public. They also take dogs in for what's called pack rehab. This is for dogs that can't go to a dog park or a boarding facility. They come into the facility and are taught social skills.

Mr. Crough then talked about kennel licensing and Michigan law Act 339 of 1919, 287.271. He said that under this law if he would have dogs licensed under a kennel license, that none of the dogs are allowed to leave the property. So that would mean, technically, that the owners can't come pick up their dogs. He said that he understands this to mean that kenneling is when a dog is confined. Michigan law states that they are for breeding, training and confinement. Repeatedly, it talks about confinement. The spirit of the law is to catch people who are hoarding, people who call themselves a rescue and have 50 dogs at their house. He stated that he is not responsible for these dogs including their Rabie tags or dog licenses. Though he requests those things from everyone before they can come in.

Mr. Crough believes that a charter township, which is only located in Michigan, can change definitions of state laws or can conflict with them. Another section here that the Commission can look at is 287.7 270, section 10, which also discusses keeping and harboring and confining animals. He stated that is not what he does.

Chairman Kortering asked Mr. Crough if he was found to be, on December 14, 2025, non-compliant from an enforcement that was started after a complaint was received, found evidence of training occurring off-site, due to the use being more recently described as a doggy daycare. Mr. Crough said in 2022 he emailed Mr. Broersma. He said that's what the 2002 special use said and that a different owner had described it as a doggy daycare which Mr. Crough said was a completely different business.

Chairman Kortering questioned whether the property is listed as a doggy daycare or kennel. What you are asking to do is list your property as a kennel? Mr. Crough said no he is not a kennel, it is more of a daycare or a training facility, which means dogs do not stay there. Chairman Kortering clarified that no dogs stay there overnight then? Mr. Crough said that dogs do not stay there overnight.

Mr. Broersma clarified that in 2022, a former director had an agreement with a former owner that this would be a dog training school. Due to change of owners and processes, things have modified slightly to be a daycare facility. The Township's discussions with Ottawa County Sheriff's Department early on said they needed a kennel license. In order for the township to sign off on that, there needs to be a special use for a doggy daycare, kennel license, dog training facility, et cetera. Mr. Broersma continued. Mr. Crough has a successful business. We celebrate that, but what he's doing is slightly different than what the former director gave that property permission for. We're asking him to come in, set the record straight with what he's doing, get the approval, and continue on with business that's clearly supported by the community.

Chairman Kortering asked Mr. Crough to explain what they do at the facility so that the Commission can understand. Mr. Crough said daycare is a word that everybody's encompassing. It's a lot like saying people say invisible fence. Invisible fence is actually a company, invisiblefence.com it's a business. Traditionally, like Eddie and Barkus, if you're going to bring them up, they bring dogs in. They put them in individual little spots. and make sure that they don't do anything all day long so that when they go home to the owner, there's no problems. And I hated that whole thing from the very beginning, so I changed it. He said they have a preschool where staff pulls them out, they train them all day long.

Chairman Kortering asked if they go home at the end of the day. Mr. Crough said yes, they all start leaving around 3 pm for the day. He said owners are bringing them in for professional socialization and training.

Mr. Crough stated that the business that he is running here is exactly the same as the use that it was approved for in 2002. With highly trained staff that are certified for various organizations. Some dogs stay for a couple hours some stay most of the day.

Chairman Kortering said you understand what Mr. Broersma is saying that this is not just a training. Let's just declare on the record that it's not just a training facility. Mr. Crough said then you can do what you want, but he said he's not going to lie and say that he's not a training facility just because that's what is wanted. He said he can't say that. He said the Commission is the one in charge, so he said "my fate is in your hands."

Chairman Kortering said I think it's our interpretation if the dogs are there for a period of time, one might call it a daycare. And all we're trying to say is this piece of property is being used for this purpose. We're just trying to get the record straight. So that the next owner has the correct land use. Mr. Crough said the next owner can come in here and ask for permission, if they're doing something different than training. Mr. Crough stated that he would like the whole thing dropped and just operate under the 2002 land use.

Ms. Molotky asked for clarification regarding the fact that they received a letter from code enforcement that the business wasn't operating under the special use what it was supposed to be under in 2002. Ms. Lewis came forward to speak. Did you own the property in 2002? Ms. Lewis answered that yes, she and her husband, Jim, bought the property in 2002 as a dog training facility. Ms. Molotky said that she knows when you train a dog, they do go and they are socialized during the day. And it happened to be when I was working, obviously. That's how they learned.

Mr. Broersma stated that the prior determination was very strict that it was dog training. The Sheriff's Department indicated some training was happening off-site, that there is a daycare component to it. The dogs aren't being physically trained, to jump through hoops, to sit, et cetera, throughout the entire 8 hours of the day. There is some daycare component to it. We agreed that

this has deviated from a strictly dog training facility in our eyes and our ordinances, based on conversations with the owner, with the Sheriff's Department, with complaint, et cetera.

Mr. Broersma continued, it has taken a long time to get to this point, but this was the solution. The other option was to challenge the Zoning Administrator's determination that this was a wrong determination. The applicant has chosen not to go through this. I truly believe this is the simplest way to correct this. Put it on the record that it is a dog training facility with a daycare component to it, no dog grooming, et cetera, what the applicant has written on the request.

Ms. Molotky stated if we get you under the daycare use then you are protected all the way around. Would you, Mr. Crough, be happy with that? Mr. Crough answered yes, as long as I'm left alone. Right now, I am losing money because I've had to cancel trainings.

Mr. Todd Billings came up to speak. He stated he's been going here for 20 years. He went on to explain under Michigan law, there's only two ways to change a non-conformity, a property, it's sometimes called grandfathering in, but it has a legal basis. And so even if the definition of a kennel is changed later on, that doesn't apply in this case because it has a non-conforming use. So at least from Michigan State University, what he was able to find says there's only two ways for that non-conforming to stop, and it's not dependent upon if it's the same owner. Either the local government purchases the property or the property owner specifically says, he doesn't want the non-conforming usage there. Mr. Crough shouldn't need to pay for the new certification, and he shouldn't have had to pay the fines and for this hearing because there was no legal basis for Holland Charter Township to revoke Paradigm Dog School's non-conforming use.

Mr. Broersma stated that there were no fines. There was a fee for tonight for the advertising of the public hearing. Again, setting the record straight from what was said before was a strict dog training school. The ordinance changed in 2018. It's come to light since after 2018 that this use has changed. Mr. Broersma the use may still contain dog training, but there was a daycare component to it based on the complaint we've had, based on talk with the sheriff's department. Some of the letters of support received tonight have clearly classified it as a daycare. We just need to classify the use so it has a proper special land use permit. It does not have one now. Ms. Molotky said we just need to clean up some ambiguous paperwork so that it shows that Mr. Crough can continue doing what he's passionate about and everybody can take their dogs there.

Mr. Broersma clarified that the licensing fees do not fall under Township jurisdiction, that the fees are issued by the County.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Ryan, from Grand Haven, MI. He stated that he brings his dog to Paradigm Dog School, and he is in favor of the special land use petition.

Steve Norris, 13250 Riley Street, Holland, MI. He stated that he owns property within proximity of Paradigm. He is in favor of the special land use petition.

Deb Lewis, former owner of the building. She stated that in 2002, she and her husband, Jim, purchased the building and did private training in the building. In 2008, they started calling it a day school, where people could drop off their dogs in the morning, and they ran them through regimented programs. In 2007, the building was sold to Dr. Heitman, who is a veterinarian. This is where the confusion came in, because veterinarians have different stipulations that they're bound by, and they can keep dogs overnight. The business became Canine Antics, and that was

an actual doggy daycare. But her understanding is Dr. Heitman was within his rights because he was a veterinarian. He could do that. So, it was Canine Antics from 2007 to approximately 2014. There was another owner in 2014 that had some problems and she lost the business. So, Ms. Lewis bought the business back in 2015. She said she eventually sold the business to Mr. Crough, and he brought it back to its original use in 2002.

Michelle Kennett, Director of Best Pals Animal Rescue, 13888 Blair Lane, Holland, MI 49424. Works closely with Paradigm Dog School for years. She is in favor of the special use petition.

Tonya Christiansen, Must Love Dogs, 106 Washington Avenue, Grand Haven, MI 49417. She said she's had a working relationship with Paradigm Dog School for 10 years. She stated that what he does is training for the whole day and that he is not boarding or running a kennel.

Steve Simmons, 100 170th Avenue, Holland, MI 49424. He stated he has brought his dog there for training, and they do an amazing job.

Linda, Port Sheldon Township, MI. She wanted to go on record saying we love Paradigm and the people there. And we pray that it will remain there to bless all of us for many years to come.

Mr. Broersma, stated that they have a stack of letters that the Township received. He listed the names of those that sent in letters of positive support of Paradigm Dog School: Amy Bauer, Dawn Declean, Carol Gray, Chelsea Bennut, Pam Tomchick, Michelle Vanderholst, Jenna Fox, Erica Patterson, Terry and Diane Robron, Diane Nearup, Amy Kavanaugh, Bill Hendrick, Megan Rabinow, Sarah Parker, Karen Seguin, Gray Emerson and Kimberly, Chad Stoke, Susan Hendrick, Deborah Ellis, Melissa Wire, Lisa Slaw, John Connolly, Joan Bonge, and Kathleen Kennedy. Two additional letters were provided by the applicant from Brian and Angel Haygood as well as Deborah Ellis.

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

Chairman Kortering confirmed with Mr. Crough the hours of operation and the number of dogs in the facility at one time. Mr. Crough said they are open from 7 am to 6 pm and have group classes from 7 pm to 8 pm. The maximum number of dogs he has had in a given day is 115 dogs. Mr. Crough agreed to 100 dog maximum at one time in the building.

Mr. Broersma said that with other facilities that deal with dogs they have a couple other things that they need answers on. If there are floor drains, there is a need for drain screens and then understanding what the chemical restrictions are of what can be flushed down the drain after cleaning up after a dog. Having the applicant talk with our Public Works Director as a condition of any approval is recommended. Mr. Crough said there is no drain, but there is a sink. It is basically an open area.

Mr. Broersma commented that based on the Township calculation there should be 12 parking spaces. If there are nine (9) employees that doesn't seem like enough parking for customers in addition to employees. Mr. Crough said that typically there are three (3) employees there on a normal day plus himself, unless we need to call in people. He said that parking in 20 years has never been an issue and that the detail shop by him gave him permission to use the parking behind their building if they need it. Mr. Broersma suggested that he create a deferred parking

agreement so that if parking starts becoming an issue in the future there is an agreement in place. These parking spaces would need to be painted spaces that meet code.

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 agreed that the use is compatible with the surrounding businesses.

- 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 agreed that currently it is served.

- 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 have no concerns with this standard.

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

The Commissioners agreed that this standard was met.

- 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 agree that there will not be any changes to what is currently there so this meets this standard.

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

The Commissioners stated that it has been operating this way for years.

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

The Commissioners agreed there is a need for the use in the community, displayed by the number of people here in support and the number of letters received.

The Commissioners discussed that no animal grooming is permitted on site.

**** It was moved by Becker and supported by VanderMeulen to approve the Special Land Use Permit specifically for dog training and daycare facility at 3225 132nd Avenue with the conditions that a minimum of nine parking spaces be provided and the applicant shall secure a deferred parking agreement with the Township for a total of 12 parking spaces. Approval from the Public**

Works Director to be secured for drains. No overnight animal boarding is permitted. No animal grooming services are permitted, except for brushing. No animal breeding is permitted. Approval is limited to a maximum of 100 dogs, and the hours will be from 6 am to 9 pm. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

At 7:19 pm Chairman Kortering asked for a short 5-minute break.

Chairman Kortering reconvened the meeting at 7:25 pm.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a request for a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan for Patrick Vawter of Capstone Communities on behalf of K & J Legacy LLC. The proposed development plan for the “The Cottages at Holland” would consist of 265 dwelling units within a mix of different style buildings. The petition is submitted by Patrick Vawter of Capstone Communities on behalf of K & J Legacy LLC for property located at 3717 Beeline Road, described specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-09-200-037. The property is zoned R-3 High Density Residential.

Present for this request were Patrick Vawter and Jim Beatty of Capstone Communities, 431 Office Park Drive, Birmingham, AL 35223 and Bruce Callen of Callen Engineering, 108 E Savidge Street, Spring Lake, MI 49456.

The applicant stated that they have a presentation. The applicant noted that this development is located at Beeline and Greenly Street and that they are proposing 265 rental units. The applicant stated that it's a combination of unit types, one-, two- and three-bedroom unit types.

The applicant stated that Capstone is a vertically integrated company out of Birmingham and that they have been doing cottage communities across the southeast primarily since 2007. The applicant noted that they manage 13 properties to date and have a programmatic partnership with a public real estate investment trust that put us in some Midwestern markets in Grand Rapids and Western Michigan with the demographics and the need for housing brought us to this market. The applicant stated that they have been working with a local brokerage out of Grand Rapids, Honeycrisp Ventures, and they brought us this site. The applicant noted that a lot of market supply and demand for the demographics from overall Ottawa County housing demand was attractive to them. The applicant stated that their product would be appealing to class A typical market rental rates, comparable to Redwood, but a little bit more amenitized than that type of development.

The applicant stated that they have a clubhouse that all residents will have access to and that a lot of units will have enclosed backyards featuring a six-foot dog-eared wooden fence, private backyards with artificial turf and concrete patios. The applicant noted that the clubhouse will have updated exercise equipment, will be open during normal business hours. The applicant stated that within the clubhouse, there will be on-site management and on-site maintenance as well. And here's a site plan with a legend that speaks to all the different unit types. The applicant noted that there is an intricate network of drives and that they tried to focus the architect on a new urbanist approach to housing. The applicant pointed out all the networking of streets and alleyways and that a lot of the units are rear served, but they will all have access to all the amenities, the pool, and it's appealing to a wide demographic. The applicant stated that their units appeal to empty nesters, transient folks, someone that's looking to buy a home, but maybe is not quite ready to purchase. And they've seen this across all the communities that they've built to date.

Chairman Kortering asked what the two units were by the pool. The applicant stated that they are 4 loft rental units which offers a little bit of variety and there's also a loft that overlooks the pool. Chairman Kortering asked where they park. The applicant noted that there's parking along the south of the clubhouse and there's parking in front of the clubhouse that would serve those four units. The applicant stated that they are one-bedroom units. The applicant stated that their management company has 36 years of experience starting in student housing and then moving into the conventional world. The applicant noted that they intend to have 5 full-time employees on site during normal business days, which would be Monday through Saturday.

The applicant noted they will be using a valet trash service same as they do in 13 other communities that they manage. The applicant stated that for a one-bedroom unit, one trash can will be provided, two trash cans for a two-bedroom unit, and two trash cans for a three-bedroom unit. The applicant noted that they service the trash once a week or every five business days through a third-party valet service, they go through and pick up the trash from the cans and take it to the one dumpster enclosure location. The applicant said that they also allow all the residents access to that dumpster location throughout the work week, during business hours. The applicant stated that they will service the rollaway dumpster on demand during lease up and then will go in more of a schedule-oriented operation and will be pulled once a week like their other communities. Chairman Kortering voiced concern about emptying the dumpster only once a week with that many units.

The applicant stated that the valet service has really helped mitigate residents going to the dumpster whenever they want to. The applicant noted that it's a lot easier to put your trash on your front porch than it is to take it halfway across the property. Chairman Kortering asked if the valet service brings it to the dumpster or brings it off site. The applicant stated that the valet service brings it to the compactor, the compactor has a sensor on it, and when the compactor is full, they would service on demand. Mr. VanderMeulen asked if recycling would be offered. The applicant stated that they have offered recycling in previous communities, and if it's something the Township would like to see, they would absolutely be willing to implement that practice.

Chairman Kortering asked if the trash containers would be stored in the garages or in front of their units. The applicant noted that they can be stored inside or outside the garages. The applicant stated that if there are screening requirements or concerns, they would certainly collaborate with their management team to find the best path forward. Mr. Broersma stated that they can't sit out more than 24 hours at the street. Mr. Broersma noted that code enforcement would have it brought back to the house to a location not in front of the house but could be at the side of the house. Mr. Broersma stated that this is a fair concern given the density of how many cans might be along the parallel parking spaces. The applicant stated that they would be happy to implement that in management.

The applicant stated that there will be 272 garages on site. The applicant noted that 118 of those are attached to a unit, and the remaining 154 are either detached or standalone. Chairman Kortering asked if the large units north of the pool were one-bedroom units. The applicant stated that they refer to that building as a manor house and that there are two different types, a 10-unit building and the other is a 12-unit building. The applicant stated that they really prioritize the walkability in the community, having an intricate network of sidewalks and green spaces for people to walk their dog or enjoy. Chairman Kortering noted that it looks like they have a lot of green space.

Chairman Kortering asked if there is a requirement for safety around the pond. Mr. Broersma noted that there is not, but that it is something certainly to consider. Mr. Broersma stated that the Ottawa County Water Resource Commissioner would review how they'd grade the slope into the ponds.

The applicant presented slides depicting the different floor plans. The applicant started with a two-bedroom cottage with an attached garage. The applicant stated that the garage is 334 square feet, rear-loaded, and there's a fenced-in backyard. The applicant noted that there's a patio that's accessible from the living room that the residents will be able to enjoy, along with the yard that includes the artificial turf. The applicant noted that they backfill the artificial turf with some sort of aggregate or pebble or gravel, something that's easy to maintain and doesn't get disturbed with weeds in the summertime.

The applicant then talked about the two-bedroom townhouse with a garage, along with a three-bedroom cottage with a garage. The applicant noted that they have a very similar iteration to the cottage, just three bedrooms. The applicant stated that the townhouses are aligned on the access drive onto Beeline on the northeast corner of the site. The applicant noted that they're also strategically placed throughout the community to give a little bit of variety in building elevations from a street perspective.

The applicant next spoke about the manor homes. The applicant noted that the first floor all have loaded garages with access into an internal corridor. The applicant stated that there are two units on the first floor, four units on the second floor, and four units on the third floor. The applicant stated that the second manor house has 12 units instead of 10. The applicant noted that it's the same building type, but that there is a carriage house on the side and increased square footage to offer some variety. The applicant said that they all have garages that access the internal corridor. The applicant stated that there are storage units on this first floor that are noted along with the riser room. The applicant noted that there are two storage units on the second floor and on the third floor alike. Chairman Kortering asked if they have to put elevators in the 2nd and 3rd floor units. The applicant noted that they are all walk-ups.

The applicant talked about the carriage house which is on the left side. The applicant stated that there are two garages on the first floor at ground elevation, and then a studio unit on top of those two garages. The applicant noted that the floor plan on the right side is their one-bedroom standalone cottage that showcases the same backyard which does not have an attached garage. The applicant stated that there are four of these unit types.

The applicant next talked about the buildings that are just to the east of the pool. The applicant noted that they have big windows to give a nice view of the pool and the amenity area and the rear of the clubhouse. The applicant spoke about the floor plan of the clubhouse which has fitness equipment accessible to residents, a lounge and seating area, office space for on-site management, and the entry gathering way.

Chairman Kortering asked how many apartments were there. The applicant stated 265. Chairman Kortering asked how many garages were there. The applicant noted 272 total garages. Chairman Kortering asked if everybody has a garage to store their trash container in. The applicant stated that yes, they did. Mr. Sharp asked if the garages were always attached to the building that they're residing in. The applicant stated that they were not. The applicant said that of the attached garages, there are 118 units with an attached garage with either a one-car or a two-car garage. The applicant noted that the two-car garages are attached to the three-bedroom cottages. The

applicant said that of the 154 standalone garages, those are open to anyone within the community to rent and are first come, first serve. For the garages that are attached to those three-story buildings, the applicant noted that the resident will have the right to rent those garages first, but if they opted out of renting one, someone from across the community could rent one of those garages if they choose.

Ms. Molotky asked where do they park then. The applicant stated that if they do not have a garage, there are 343 surface parking spots within the community. The applicant noted that in the staff report it said the required code is 2.5 per dwelling unit, and we are currently with garages included at 2.3. Chairman Kortering asked if they were asking for a small exception there. The applicant stated that they were. Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the width of the garage doors. The applicant stated that the garages' dimensions are 12'x 24'. Mr. VanderMeulen noted concern with the garage doors in the units to the north. The applicant stated that they would get with their architect after this and provide more clarification on the exact dimensions. The applicant stated that these are floor plans and that they haven't gotten to the point of putting a drawing set together yet.

Chairman Kortering asked how many of these facilities do they have in Michigan. The applicant stated that this would be the first. The applicant noted that they have built three student housing developments in East Lansing, but as far as the build-to-rent cottage communities are concerned, this would be the first.

Chairman Kortering noted concern with the driveway on the south side, when you're coming off the road and then you've got to quickly make a carousel. Chairman Kortering stated that it doesn't seem like that would be the easiest to plow or the safest. The applicant stated that they are working with the Ottawa County Road Commission and will convert Greenly as the thru street to give people better access to the highway. Chairman Kortering stated that he can see the advantage of going to the west but is talking about coming from the east, going west, and now going to turn and very quickly having to make a carousel. The applicant stated that converting from a two-lane to a three-lane, they need to have a lengthy taper because of the offset and that this is as close as they can get to the east and they don't want to go any further west. The applicant noted that the intent is that this will accommodate not only average vehicles, but also the fire trucks. The applicant stated that it also is intended to give a nice view of the corridor up the middle of the site. The applicant noted that there are safety considerations and constraints due to the taper that they have to transition from two lanes to three lanes. Chairman Kortering voiced concern whether it was a safe entrance or not. The applicant noted that it helps eliminate stacking to residents leaving the community by creating a longer drive so that cars don't stack up trying to make that turn out.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked where are they going to put all the snow. The applicant stated that the intent is to push the snow toward the pond. Mr. VanderMeulen asked where are the mailbox kiosks going to be. The applicant noted that all the mailboxes will be located on the outside of the clubhouse under a covered awning. Chairman Kortering stated that it looks like they probably have enough traffic lane to not back up there.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked what is their rent pricing or who's their target audience in relationship to the area of median income. The applicant stated that their starting rents or average rents throughout the community start at \$2,200 and would be comparable with Class A market rents. The applicant noted that it would be similar to Redwood, but with a little more of a premium with the more amenitized package within the community. The applicant stated that as far as demographics go, they understand the industry in western Michigan, and that there are a lot of

transient people who come here for work. The applicant stated that short term, for instance, folks that would be looking for a house to rent rather than an apartment to rent.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the smart home features. The applicant stated that every unit will have a smart lock front door. They'll be able to download an app to their phone, unlock the door from their phone instead of having a fob. The applicant noted that they also have a smart home technology package which will allow residents to control the thermostat from their phone, but that is all within the smart home package.

Ms. Molotky noted concern with the parking and that it seems really tight. Ms. Molotky asked if the Fire Chief has said anything. Mr. Broersma noted that the Fire Chief has and that there are a couple comments in the staff report about that.

Ms. Molotky asked if the starting point is \$2,200. The applicant stated that was the average rent and that the high end would be \$2,700, which would be for a three-bedroom unit. Ms. Molotky asked what's the additional charge for the garage. The applicant stated \$200. The applicant noted that for the units that have an attached garage, the rent is assumed already, and there is no additional rent with the garage. For the units that do not have an attached garage, there would be a charge of \$200 on top of the starting rent. Ms. Molotky asked if there were any lower price. The applicant stated that the one-bedroom starting unit is \$1,585 including the gym and that rent pricing has not been set yet.

Ms. Molotky asked about the pet rule. The applicant stated that he would have to defer to their management team, but traditionally, there's certain species that aren't allowed. The applicant noted that cats would be allowed too and wasn't sure what the allowed pet limit would be. The applicant stated that they intend to have a fenced-in dog park. The applicant noted that there would be additional fees for pets. The applicant stated that they would share what a standard lease would look like with them.

Ms. Molotky asked if there would be any type of security on site. The applicant stated that there will be 5 full-time employees and that a lot of times the manager will live on site, but it's not always required. The applicant noted that what they've seen very popular is a courtesy officer but there wouldn't be security around the clock. The applicant noted that they typically gate their communities, but the Fire Chief's preference was not to gate the community.

Mr. Sharp noted concern with snow, especially where, from what was described, it's either going to get pushed into some parking spots or it's going to get pushed into a lake and a bunch of salt-filled snow pushed into a lake will cause problems. Mr. Sharp stated that he is interested in what the farmers will have to say because he has a lot of the same concerns around turning in intersections. Mr. Sharp questioned the private backyards and the green spaces and wanted to know where the distinction is between those. The applicant pointed out on the floor plan where the fenced-in privacy backyards would be for the two-bedroom cottage unit type, the two-bedroom townhouse unit type, the three-bedroom cottage unit type, and the one-bedroom cottage.

Chairman Kortering stated that he wanted to talk about the fire review. The applicant stated that the Township's fire truck is unique enough that all of AutoCAD doesn't have that specific template. So they picked one that they thought approximated it as close as any other template, but apparently it didn't satisfy. The applicant noted that they are now going to another one that is grossly larger than the specifications that the fire marshal is and just tweaking some intersections

and some lane widths. So it's in the process. The applicant stated that they will then work with the fire marshal as to the more most appropriate hydrant locations, which have not illustrated yet.

Chairman Kortering asked if they would be working with the Fire Chief on hydrant placements and that there would be a minimum 26-foot-wide aerial access. The applicant stated that yes, they've already started. Chairman Kortering voiced his concern over one dumpster serving 265 units. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that he would like to see recycling a part of their pickup.

Chairman Kortering stated no preliminary concerns from Ottawa County Water Resources regarding storm water management and no preliminary comments from the Ottawa County Road Commission yet. Chairman Kortering stated regarding parking, the distance between the rear of a unit to the side of an adjacent unit is exceptionally close. The applicant noted that they all meet the 10' x 22' for the parallel parking and the others are 9' x 18'.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if they would be putting in the road and if bicycle paths would be included. The applicant replied that they would be putting in the road. The applicant stated that everything to the west is traditional 5-foot sidewalk that's already in play, already up to the cul-de-sac, and they are going to be continuing that along the north side. The applicant noted that they are going to grant 10 more feet of right-of-way to the county, and they'll locate that sidewalk there. The applicant stated that they are going to grant them 17 more feet along Beeline because then they'll have their linear parking and sidewalk over there. The applicant said that they are going to make a crossing down at the intersection of Greenly and Beeline to tie into the bike path down on the opposite corner and have pedestrian connection points throughout the development.

Chairman Kortering opened up the hearing for public comment.

Dale Vootberg, 3565 Beeline Road, Holland, MI stated that he lives directly south. Mr. Vootberg stated that he is concerned with the lack of green space and the trash service for a development of this size. Mr. Vootberg voiced concern over the added traffic in the surrounding area and if there's adequate parking in the new development. Mr. Vootberg stated that he is concerned with how he is going to get out of his property. Chairman Kortering noted that would be dealt with the Ottawa County Road Commission. Mr. Vootberg noted that he will be losing a lot of privacy and wanted to know if there is some type of a berm that they could put on the south side of Greenly on his property to help.

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

Chairman Kortering asked about garbage collection and the concern that if they miss the collection, is there a chance of garbage probably blowing through the area and is that part of your five-person management team to address that. The applicant stated yes, and there would be penalties inflicted. The applicant noted that he doesn't know that information but can gather that information and provide that. The applicant confirmed that a three-bedroom unit has a two-stall garage and then there is a tandem space that is directly behind the garage door. So the tandem spot could serve as an additional parking space. The applicant stated that they wanted to be good neighbors so they will engage a landscape architect to address the privacy issue and have a plan regarding the driveway situation.

Chairman Kortering went through Section 16.1.C to determine whether the proposed PUD meets the intent and purpose of Article 16. The purpose of the PUD process is to provide a design option to allow for one (1) or more of the following:

Preliminary PUD Planning and Zoning Analysis

- 1. Innovative land development in terms of variety, design, layout, and type of structures constructed;**

Yes, the Commissioners agreed that this standard is met.

- 2. Efficient use of land to facilitate a more economic arrangement of buildings, circulation systems, land use, and utilities;**

Not met.

- 3. Adaptive re-use of significant or historic buildings;**

Not met.

- 4. Mixed use development projects and/or mixed use buildings;**

Not met.

- 5. Preservation and protection of significant natural features, open space, and cultural/historic resources;**

Not met.

- 6. Promote efficient provision of public services and utilities;**

Not met.

- 7. Minimal adverse traffic impacts and accommodate safe and efficient pedestrian access and circulation;**

Not met.

- 8. Convenient recreational facilities;**

Yes, the Commissioners agreed that this standard is met.

- 9. Use and improvement of land where site conditions make development under conventional zoning difficult or less desirable; and**

Not met.

10. Open Space Development option, per Section 16.3 E.

Not met.

Chairman Kortering next went through the following: The qualifying conditions for a PUD involve consistency with the (1) Master Plan, (2) Unified Control, and (3) Recognizable Benefits for the Community per Section 16.2 – Qualifying Conditions.

PUD – Preliminary Qualifying Conditions

Chairman Kortering stated that the PUD meets the master plan in the following areas: designates the subject property for high density residential, has approximate density of 10 to 15 units per gross acre, and that the project would add different housing stock types. Chairman Kortering noted that the proposed development would include completion of Greenly Street as desired by the master plan. Chairman Kortering noted that unified control of the PUD is not a concern.

The Commission then discussed the recognizable benefits where the applicant shall demonstrate that the PUD provides at least four (4) of the following site design elements, which could not be attained under conventional zoning:

- 1. Mixed-use development with residential and non-residential uses or a variety of housing types.**

Not met.

- 2. Pedestrian/transit-oriented design with buildings oriented to the sidewalk and parking to the side or rear of the site.**

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 3. High quality architectural design beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance.**

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 4. Extensive landscaping beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance.**

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 5. Preservation, enhancement, or restoration of natural resources (trees, slopes, wetland areas, water views, etc.).**

Not met.

- 6. Preservation or restoration of significant or historic resources.**

Not met.

- 7. Provision of open space or public plazas or features.**

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 8. Efficient consolidation of poorly dimensioned lots of record or property with difficult site conditions (e.g. topography, shape, etc.).**

Not met.

- 9. Effective transition between higher and lower density uses, and/or between non-residential and residential uses; or allowing incompatible adjacent land uses to be developed in a manner that is not possible using a conventional approach.**

Yes, the Commissioners agree.

- 10. Shared vehicular and pedestrian access between properties or uses.**

Not met.

- 11. Mitigation to offset impacts on public facilities (such as street improvements).**

Yes, the Commissioners agree due to the connection to Greenly Street.

- 12. Significant use of sustainable building and site design features such as: water use reduction, water efficient landscaping, innovative wastewater technologies, low impact stormwater management, optimize energy performance, on-site renewable energy, passive solar heating, reuse/recycled/renewable materials, indoor air quality or other elements identified as sustainable by established groups such as the US Green Building Council (LEED) or ANSI National Green Building Standards.**

Not met.

Chairman Kortering stated that they have at least 5 recognizable benefits. Chairman Kortering stated as for deviations, the applicant has not detailed their zoning deviation request and Staff believe at a minimum, the proposed PUD will be seeking deviations from the following: incorporation of detached single-family unit as part of a development project, this results in three single-family dwellings. Chairman Kortering asked that when they come for the final, they're going to have to declare that. Mr. Broersma stated that in R3 zoning districts, single-family dwellings are not permitted, so this would be a deviation that they are seeking. The Commissioners agreed that they do not have an issue with this deviation.

Chairman Kortering asked for clarification regarding exclusion of garages for the single-family dwellings and some two-family dwellings and plans should identify housing types for comparison with floor plans provided. Mr. Broersma stated that every single-family and two-family home is required to have a garage, and some of the detached garages are away from the actual location of where homes are. Mr. Broersma noted that there's those garage-only dedicated buildings and whether or not those are sufficient. Mr. Broersma stated that those are garages for anybody and are not necessarily for that renter or tenant within a single-family or a two-family dwelling. Mr. Broersma noted that if you're comfortable with that, it would be a deviation. The Commissioners did not voice any opposition.

Mr. Broersma stated that a minor issue that came up when going through the floor plans was that there was a unit shown with what looked like a water heater potentially in the garage. Mr. Broersma noted that they will want to make sure that the size is still a minimum of 10 feet wide by 22 feet deep with that little inclusion into the garage. Chairman Kortering stated that they'll make a note of that. Mr. Broersma stated that or seek a deviation.

Chairman Kortering stated the next possible zoning deviation: permission to utilize 2.3 spaces per dwelling unit for the project instead of the required 2.5. The Commissioners stated that they are all right with this deviation because they didn't designate all the space on the street for parking so there were other spaces that were not counted as designated parking but have some concerns during the winter months.

Chairman Kortering stated the next possible zoning deviation: permission for 22 one-bedroom units to fall under the minimum 640 square feet permitted for a one-bedroom multi-family unit in an R-3 district which results in 22 units at 576, slightly higher than the minimum of 550 for a studio, and the applicant shall demonstrate whether all units will comply with the Township storage requirements. The Commissioners discussed that the storage requirement is beneficial. The Commissioners discussed the price of the rent versus the size of the floor plan. Mr. Broersma stated that in terms of storage, the ordinance reads it has to be 10% of that minimum floor area for the one-bedroom. Mr. Broersma asked that if they are giving relief from that for a one-bedroom down to the 576, are they also giving relief from the storage to the new square footage or would they need, in this case, 64 feet of floor to ceiling storage for a 576 square foot unit. Ms. Huesman stated that it should be appropriate with the square footage and to adjust the storage to be the same as the actual versus the requirement. Mr. Sharp stated that either a new limit should be set or expect this to be what we already have. The Commissioners agreed that the storage requirement should match the size of 10%, and that they are concerned about the square footage of some of the units.

Chairman Kortering stated the next possible zoning deviation: allowance of different landscape standards from the property buffers. Mr. Broersma noted that overall the landscaping was exceeding in general but that there was a deviation in one buffer location. The Commissioners discussed that the final plan will include species, heights, and stall sizes and that deviation may only be permitted if it results in a higher quality development or better integration of the uses in the PUD with surrounding uses.

The Commission then reviewed the Preliminary PUD Approval Standards. A preliminary PUD development plan shall only be approved if it complies with each of the following standards and applicable standards established elsewhere in Article 16.

- A. Intent and Qualification. The proposed PUD complies with the intent and the applicable qualifying conditions of Sections 16.1 C and 16.2 C of this article, respectively.**

The Commission did find that the request met a minimum of 4 of the recognizable benefits under Section 16.2 C.

- B. Uses. The uses conducted within the proposed PUD, the PUD's impact on the community, and other aspects of the PUD are consistent with the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Plan.**

The Commissioners agreed with this standard.

- C. Design. The proposed PUD shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in a manner harmonious with the character of adjacent property, the surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the development.**

The Commissioners agreed with this standard.

- D. Character. The PUD shall not change the essential character of the surrounding area.**

The Commissioners agreed with this standard.

- E. Impact. The PUD shall not be hazardous to adjacent property or involve uses, activities, materials, or equipment that will be detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, or glare.**

The Commissioners agreed as long as there is approval from the Ottawa County Road Commission.

- F. Public Service Capacity. The PUD shall not place demands on public services and facilities more than current or anticipated future capacity.**

The Commissioners agreed with this standard since sewer facilities are in the area.

- G. Utilities. Underground utilities, including telephone and electrical systems, are required within the limits of all PUDs. Appurtenances to these systems, which can be effectively screened, may be exempt from this requirement if the Planning Commission finds that such exemption will not violate the intent or character of the proposed planned unit development.**

The Commissioners agreed this is not an issue since the applicant agreed that all power will be underground.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Huesman to approve the proposed preliminary planned unit development plan for “The Cottages at Holland” for Parcel Number 70-16-09-200-037 as presented pending approval from the Fire Chief. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 1, Absent - 1. Motion carried.

Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration of a request for a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Development Plan for “Woodlands Crossing”. The proposed development would consist of a mixed-use planned unit development featuring a mixture of existing commercial tenant spaces, proposed multi-family residential dwellings, a proposed park, and existing natural features including wooded/wetland areas. The petition is submitted by by Nick Nykerk of HBPC-OB LLC for property located at 12330 James St, described specifically as Parcel Numbers 70-16-21-238-001 through -009. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present to speak to this request was Nick Nykerk of HBPC-OB LLC, 12330 James Street, Holland, MI 49424, Ben Striegel, from Jamestown Township in Hudsonville, MI and Alex Frazier with Fishbeck, 1515 Arboretum Drive SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49546.

Mr. Nykerk acquired the land in 2023 with the hopes of bringing some vibrancy to this parcel. In 2023, a condominium was created for this parcel through Life Circles. Partnered in 2024 to bring the ODC and one of their daycares to one of the units there, which is now Gentex's daycare. Mr. Nykerk said their plan is for housing for workforce housing.

Mr. Nykerk said right now planned to be a site condo with sub condominium for each parcel as indicated. And then they'll have a master agreement that goes through shared and common elements, roadways, maintenance, and that type of thing. So that phase will come next after we get this, should we get preliminary approval, we'll start to work on those details and perhaps that'd be part of the next submittal just to bring some clarity to that. We've already started having some conversations with ODC on how do we be amicable to their needs and running their operation and then what the apartments will need and how that's going to work together.

Mr. Nykerk stated one other unique factor is we did initiate a conversation with Jubilee Ministries here in town, a nonprofit that works on providing below market home ownership options. We've kind of earmarked an area on this plan. I believe it's unit 3 in the southeast corner. He said this is something that Jubilee would then develop. We think they have their own program. And so I don't know what the full involvement would be, but that's kind of the initial plan.

Chairman Kortering asked about the trailer rental area and asked if that is still operating. Mr. Nykerk said they are still operating in Unit 6 at the southwest corner. So, there could be, that could remain there, but that would be something we would work on to see what that location would be going forward. But we try to accommodate that tenant, given that they've gotten that special use permit.

Chairman Kortering asked if he could give a high-level plan so the Commissioners have a better understanding of what is being planned at this location. Mr. Nykerk said there's a few things that might be adjusted a little bit from the plan you see up here. And when it says unit 2 there, you see that lot line goes to the top of the page or all the way to the east. We're probably going to bring that down because there's a desire to have contiguous green space that runs from the south to the north of the property. And right now you can see there's a trail encircled there on the top of the page to the left, which is what ODC uses for some of their kids to get outside. So ODC is enjoying that green space and as this becomes a little cleaner, there's potential for some mutual benefit to both ODC and the apartments to maybe rid some invasive species in there, put some more defined trails, and do some things that would really be a benefit both to the apartments, but also then for ODC to have some impact there. So, our intent is to try to improve this site for all users and also the community.

Chairman Kortering asked if there would there be some form of agreement. Because you can't get to that property other than by a path right now. It's not going to be developable based on this current plan. If it's an ODC property, is there some agreement? Mr. Nykerk answered there's some initial stuff with this, early on we allowed an unlimited license agreement with ODC to utilize any green space that's within the floodplain. So that was something we talked about to make sure that they had something there that regardless of ownership, changing hands, whatever, that they had a really firm commitment that space would be there for them. And then depending on how

things evolve, that could be expanded a little bit or there would be some sort of mutual shared care.

Mr. Nykerk stated one other improvement we did along with Dutch Village was to get the existing orange roof town centers to sign on to a drainage easement. So after it was acquired, there was difficulty with Ottawa County Water Resource getting approvals and with just new energy, and some help with the new owner there. They've been a little more agreeable to kind of work for a greater good. So, it's been good to get that accomplished for Ottawa County Water Resources. And then along with that, they've allowed this parcel to be grandfathered in from a impervious area of what was originally improved. And so, if there is any future development, the only place that maybe there could be is potentially Unit 5, but probably not. But we're probably going to reach close to our maxed-out development because like the impervious area for number 6, even if we would try to put something there with setbacks and all the compliance with the C-2 zoning, it's already impervious. So it won't impact any of the storage or site water type things. So we think we're in a good spot from that aspect.

Chairman Kortering asked if they own the Life Circle Building. Mr. Nykerk said they do not, but the parking lot there is a common element of the building. And so that will stay with the building and he has like a 52% ownership in that building. So it's a controlling interest, but we work together with ODC and Life Circles to manage the property, and we have a formal board.

The Commissioners raised a concern with both the senior care and the daycare for young kids in there. You got two real vulnerable populations. And with apartments, with tenants, sex offenders, anything like that living in there. How are you going to screen that? I think there's a concern that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Nykerk answered that is important. And we've talked with ODC a little bit now on some of those provisions that we'd want to put in, Ben could probably speak to this more. They more than likely have a vetting process now when they review renters and that type of thing. And so that could be something that we handle in our bylaws of the operating agreement for the apartments. And then we'd work with ODC and probably Life Circles to see if they have any concerns. We haven't gone to that level yet today, but we are aware of those items and want to make sure we're being a good neighbor.

Mr. Striegel said before he started doing real estate development full-time, he built and maintained power lines and most recently for the Holland Board of Public Works. So, he knows the community very well. We have a community on the south side of Holland called the Black River Flats, right off M40. If you're familiar with Kensington, that single-family subdivision, we are partners with them. We bought right up to them. That's been a successful community. We have a great property management team, so it's always fun looking at our tenant base. Specifically, right here in Holland, you know, where the people come from, where do they work, how far they are commuting? I can tell you that that's been a very successful project. We think that we have a great project to bring into the market that's at a price point that is achievable for most people. You know, we're not going to build something that's \$2,900 a month. There's always a place for that. I respect it. But if we open the doors tomorrow, a two-bed, two-bath unit would be \$1,695. And we don't build it out of gold, but we don't use any cheap product. Nothing you can cut with an X-Acto knife. So we use real hardwood floors, real wood trim, solid surface countertops, stainless appliances. The two-bed, two-bath units are super nice because one of the bedrooms is a true master. It has an en-suite bath, a walk-in closet. So those are popular units. We just fully completed a community over

in Middleville, right on the north side of Middleville, southeastern Grand Rapids. And it's also very interesting looking at needs, needs change. And where I'm going with that is the need in terms of 1 bed units and then two bed units. It seemed like when we opened Black River Flats, the two bed units were moving quickly. We had waiting lists. Now in Middleville, it's like 1 beds are hot again, but I think the answer is to provide an equal mix of both. And we're very proud of the communities that we built. John is our property manager. He could tell you about every strict process we go through in terms of screening. But I mean, it's extensive. Yeah, we want to be good and vibrant. And yeah, I can't make guarantees on people like nobody could. I mean, there could be a bad actor in any group of any group of humans, but I think it could be a real asset for the community.

Chairman Kortering asked if they have on-site management. Mr. Striegle said they have on-site management. A community like this with 96 units is not going to support a full staff but there will be a leasing agent on-site. And then, we will have the luxury of sharing resources between this community and our community on the south.

Mr. Striegle added it's really neat when you can have so much green space, but you're kind of still in an urban area. So, I think we're going to lean into that with our amenities, with walking trails, nature trails, gazebo and garden areas, and a dog park. And in terms of some questions that came up earlier, you can't tell people no on pets because nowadays with the law in Michigan, with the ESA, the emotional support animal laws lots of people have dogs and cats. It's just the reality of where we're at. It was also pointed out that there are two pickleball courts.

Ms. Huesman noted she will be giving comments and opinions tonight as a residence, but she will be abstaining from the vote on this particular project because the applicant is also part of the board of directors for her employer.

Mr. Becker noted that they don't have very detailed plans at this point, and he will probably have more questions when they come back with the detailed plans.

Mr. VanderMeulen noted that because he is on the board for Jubilee Ministries, he will also be abstaining from the vote on this application. He did comment that as you drive through the area having apartments going up there, that's not going to look a whole lot different than the hotel.

Ms. Molotky added that she appreciates that he is upfront with your rental starting it and knew exactly where to target that and letting us know. She thinks that will be a great improvement to the area. Are Black River Flats and Meadowville the first two you've done? Mr. Striegle said that these are the first with his partner, Mr. Heyboer, that they have done together. However, Mr. Heyboer has done more projects prior to this.

Mr. Sharp stated once we get the detailed plans, he will also probably have more questions. He doesn't have anything that's concerning here at this point. He said he's a huge fan of Discovery Center.

Mr. Frazier said we've gone through a few deviation requests, mostly regarding setbacks, lot coverages, as we've had to get creative with property line placement, and as we talked about earlier, already looking at adjusting one to make things work. I know we're going to go through some of the zoning with parking and setbacks and things like that. Is now the time to do that or would that be later? Staff stated that now would be a good time to discuss this.

Mr. Frazier said he would like to start with the deviation. Buildings within units 4 and 7 are seeking relief from a front yard setback. So, 4 is the existing L-shaped structure there, and 7 of the existing buildings at the very north. So those existing structures that we tried our best to cater to the lot lines around to provide the maximum separation, but we do have that shared access drive that is going to be acting as a major thoroughfare through the condo. So that's one of the deviations that we're requesting.

Mr. Frazier then went on to the item in the Staff report that asks if any additional spatial standard deviations are requested, such as the 25% lot coverage. He said with the R-3 zoning, units one and 2, we're actually requesting a 35% lot coverage. That's in accordance with the R-3 standard. And then the four-to-one lot to depth to width ratio for unit 2, I think we're going to solve that when we pull that property line back down.

Mr. Frazier then moved to the storage unit. We have a setback storage unit there in unit 2 adjacent to the ODC property. We are trying to provide the required amount of storage to the community while also making it convenient. We thought that was a good spot as well to create some buffering between the multifamily and the ODC use there.

Mr. Frazier then discussed unit 3 that should be considered a corner lot, which is the potential Jubilee area. As we get further into a site plan with that parcel, we'll evaluate the setbacks and the lot coverages, and we may have to move that north property line a little bit further north into that linear park to technically conform with some of the lot coverage requirements. But again, that's a future site plan that we don't have anything really set in stone. What we have shown here now is a suggested plan of what could go here, but nothing concrete yet.

Next, Mr. Frazier talked about a deviation to grant permission for varying width on the shared driveway. It's my understanding that the code requires a 66-foot-wide right of way, even if it is private. We are a little less than that in some of the areas, especially with some of the parking up close to that shared access drive. To still create that central thoroughfare through the community, we are requesting a deviation from that requirement just due to some of the space limitations that we have with the development. It's not pictured in detail here, but we do have wetland floodplain that we're dealing with. So, we're trying to maximize the developable area while still keeping it a safe area for motorists and pedestrians.

Mr. Frazier moved on to the permission to utilize a varying number of parking spaces per dwelling unit instead of the required 2.5 spaces per dwelling unit. The multifamily component is about 1.74 currently, but we do have ample parking on the site as a whole. It's our goal to put some deferred parking agreements in place and shared parking agreements, some of which are already in place and benefit the property to meet the requirement.

Mr. Broersma asked if you went ahead and did that, how far would people be on average walking to take advantage of that. Mr. Frazier answered it might be a couple of hundred feet. To the west in the business center, probably a couple hundred feet, depending on which building you're in. That's something we're going to look at to potentially reconfigure some of the lots to try to maximize parking adjacent to the 10 units.

Mr. Nykerk noted that the Jubilee site, per Steve Gross, the executive director, he used the verbiage stacked flats. The thought behind those is for it to be a for sale product and then there would be 8 units per building, two stories with, four in the main and four in the upper.

Mr. Nykerk stated what they like about Jubilee is they will put all their resources and effort to drive that price point down as far as possible and then they have so that the first time home buyer has a product they can afford and use something to build equity and then they have different agreements so that person doesn't necessarily flip it and they get all the equity out of it. So, they have a good program there that's they're developing that I just don't have all the details on it yet.

Chairman Kortering asked if there is anything else they want to make sure is covered. Mr. Frazier said that the only other thing Mr. Broersma mentioned in the Staff Report is that the landscape plan has not been provided. We're at the high level point right now and we haven't gotten into those details yet. It is our intent to comply with the ordinance. We have a lot of existing vegetation and screening with those natural features we're trying to preserve.

Mr. Becker asked how Jubilee fits into this plan. As we move forward, will they be coming together? Will we be looking at the Jubilee plans and these plans in one goal? Or are they separate initiatives? Mr. Nykerk stated that it really depends on what their pipeline looks like. They've got several things out there, but they kind of bring them up to a similar point. And then the one that looks the most viable, they'll put their building resources behind. So, they're not exactly sure if we do gain approval, if this will move to the front due to the parameters of this project or if there's other things that are approved or fit better with how the funding's available. But that would be the first thing we start to do next, and we could offer a little bit of insight to should our final PUD approval get there, where and what the timing might be with Jubilee.

Mr. Becker said he wants to make sure we fully support the donor. He wants to make sure we do this, but when we normally do PUDs, we have the plan laid out all the way for that, and not having that as a whole is why he made the point.

Mr. Nykerk said that, conversely, he thinks the risk here from their perspective is they don't approve a final plan unless they have everything and they're happy about it. The risk from them is there's an ambiguity between what we're saying and what they're thinking, and they come back with the full plan, and it turns out we don't like it. So, as long as we all acknowledge that that's the risk for us by having this conversation with the blank spot in the corner. I'll feel morally clear with that.

Mr. VanderMulen wondered if it would somehow be good to separate that parcel 3 from rest of what's going on.

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

**It was moved by Sharp and supported by Becker to close the public hearing. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried.

Mr. Broersma acknowledged, not to upset anybody here, but the conversation he's hearing tonight with things shifting and being unsure about one unit. We've got one that has undefined uses, used as a parking lot and are we comfortable approving a warehouse unit by itself? Those types of things, no floor plans, elevations. And they're at a disadvantage because they had a presentation before they had beautiful 3D graphics and all of that.

Mr. Broersma said if there's comfort level, that this will all get handled at final, then the Commission can proceed. He would caution that to really nail down some ideas because what you're doing tonight is you're setting that framework. Everything from the road right away, which

is going to adjust the property lines most likely. Not sure if you're ready to give a deviation from 66 feet down to 24 feet for a road right of way.

Mr. Becker asked if the Commission can even make them or is that Ottawa County Road Commission? Mr. Broersma stated that these will be private streets in order to establish these lots. And that's where this also gets very complicated, is each one of these red boxes can be bought and sold individually. They are a unit, a piece of property. And because of that, they need to meet proper frontage on an access way, which is called to be 66 feet wide, but that's where the deviations come in.

Mr. Becker asked Mr. Broersma if he is suggesting that we might want to consider tabling this so they come back with a more detailed point. Mr. Broersma said he's sense from discussions and the questions and staff's report, there's a hesitation to move forward with what is being presented here tonight. Staff is very supportive of this idea but at this point there are some details that haven't been ironed out yet. Mr. Becker said he would be more comfortable with that because he was a little on the fence.

Mr. Broersma also noted that there are two Commissioners that will be abstaining from the vote tonight which means that the vote would have to be unanimous.

Chairman Kortering noted that if the Commission is going to table the hearing we should then give the applicant a list of items that we would like them to work on before coming back before the Commission.

Mr. Sharp agrees with tabling and getting more clarity on some items. He mentioned the lot lines, specifically setbacks especially around the ambiguity for the Jubilee project. We discussed parking and green space. The other items we usually ask about would be snow plowing, mailboxes, traffic, garbage. The applicant stated that all the mail kiosks are now located inside the building and are not external.

Ms. Molotky asked if Jubilee does not become part of this project what would be the plan for that space. The applicant stated that initially it would most likely be green space and they would then look for another party that would bring that idea to fruition if it is not Jubilee.

Mr. Becker would like to know what happens if some of these groups pull out what the contingency plan is.

Mr. Broersma stated that they would like more clarification of lot lines, 4:1 lot ratio or lesser deviation of those setbacks. PACE Center's bus storage, and where would that be. Will that be unit 6 and will that be the sole use of the parking lot now? Are we comfortable with how many buses will be out there and stored and what is that number? The small warehouse building that is on unit 7, is the Commission comfortable with that being a stand alone use? Parking along the main drive, how wide should that drive be?

Ms. Huesman stated that she likes this project and thinks it is a good infill project. She would like to see this go through. She is curious if this does not go through tonight how does that decision affect the applicant and is there anything that hangs on this decision for them? Mr. Nykerk answered that they don't want to get into agreements and legal documents with the lawyers at this level of the planning process yet.

The Commissioners discussed their concern with various owners in one project and what does that look like if one of the owners pulls out part way through. Who is taking ownership of the PUD as a whole if there are multiple owners involved? Staff would like to possibly see a master association, similar to Macatawa Legends.

** It was moved by Becker and supported by Sharp to table the proposed preliminary development plan for "Woodlands Crossing" for 12330 James Street. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 4, No – 0, Abstain – 2, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

Planning Commission Discussion – Due to current staffing issues, Staff was unable prepare anything for a discussion on the Battery Energy Storage Systems Ordinance. Staff hopes to have something ready for discussion at the August meeting.

The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 11, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld & Sheila Webb
Transcription Secretaries