

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

March 3, 2020

Present: Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Dennis Gebben, Randy Kortering, Norm Nykamp, and Miska Rynsburger. Also present were Community Development Director John Said, Assistant Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

Absent: Chairman Marion Hoeve and Member Ed Zylstra.

Public Comment: None.

** Motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of February 4, 2020, was made by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Nykamp. Motion carried.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for a Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) submitted by Robert Edson and Randall Schipper – Select Genetics LLC for property located at 232 N. Franklin Ave. described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-13-300-020. The applicant is requesting an amendment from AG Agricultural to I-1 Light Industrial.

The proposed rezoning has been withdrawn for tonight's meeting due to a clerical error in the notice that was published and mailed to the neighbors. Staff has apologized for the error. Applicant is requesting to be on the agenda for the April 14, 2020, meeting. This will give Staff ample time to publish and mail corrected notices.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a Special Use request submitted by Philip Tran and Giap Tran of Puppy Parlor, for land located at 76 E. Lakewood Blvd., Suite 10, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-265-001. The applicant is seeking permission for animal services including kennel. The property is currently zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

There was no one present to speak to this request.

** It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Kortering to close the hearing. Motion carried.

Mr. Gebben suggested to table the hearing until the end of the public hearing to see if the applicant comes to present their request. The Commission agreed.

** It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Kortering to table this discussion. Motion carried.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a Special Use request submitted by Miska Rynsburger of Holland Christian Schools (Rose Park School), for land located at 556 Butternut Drive, described more specifically as Parcel Numbers 70-16-18-400-099, 70-16-18-400-105, 70-16-18-400-112 and 70-16-18-400-118. The applicant is seeking permission for Farm Animals at a School. The property is currently zoned R-1 Low Density Residential and C-2 Community Commercial.

The proposed special use approval will be for two pygmy goats and three chickens at the subject school property, which contains approximately 8.15 acres. The proposal includes construction of a barn and

outdoor pen for the animals, to be located in the yard area west of the school building. The barn structure will be about 200 feet from the nearest home (to the west), with heavy vegetation along the school's west property line. The school also plans to install some garden areas adjacent to the barn area. Crushed asphalt walkways are proposed to connect these areas to the school.

Ms. Rynsburger excused herself from the Public Hearing for this request.

Mr. Tim Elzinga and Mr. Nate Boyce from Midwest Construction were present to speak to this request on behalf of Rose Park Christian School.

Mr. Boyce stated that they are proposing 3 small 12' x 12' buildings. One of the buildings would house the 2 goats, the second building will house the 3 chickens and the third building will be for storage of hay and feed for taking care of the animals. Included in the plan are garden beds for the children to grow food, a greenhouse, an outdoor natural play area as well as a butterfly garden. The butterfly garden will simply be an area of native plants/flowers that attract butterflies.

Mr. Gebben inquired about the ball field in the back corner of the property. Mr. Elzinga answered that the field is rarely used and will most likely be filled in with grass as added play area for the children at recess time.

Mr. Nykamp asked about the gazebo structure that looks to be connecting the three buildings and if that structure would pose a square footage problem for the school. Staff stated that if the buildings share common support posts then it would be considered one building. They will be nowhere close to the 25% lot coverage limitation.

Mr. Nykamp then asked if the hoop structure for the greenhouse would be allowed in the township. Staff answered that the township would normally not allow a hoop structure; however, all buildings will be subject to state approval because of it being a school project.

Mr. Kortering ask how the animals would be taken care of on the weekends. Mr. Boyce answered that families will be signing up to take care of the animals each weekend. There are plans for the animals to be cared for off-site during the summer. They also will have 24-hour security cameras on the animals.

Mr. Gebben asked Staff why the hoop structure would be a problem. Staff answered that it is a combination of township building code and the zoning ordinance in terms of the school not being a farm or farm operation. Staff reminded the Commission that this special use request is only for the animals not for the buildings that are being proposed. Mr. VanderMeulen pointed out that Holland Public Schools has a greenhouse on their property on E. 24th Street where the kids grow plants.

Mr. Boyce stated that the butterfly garden would add 2 trees, a variety of plants and pathways in that area.

Public Comments: None.

Staff read into the record an email sent to the township by Mr. Robert Gaunt of Rose Park Baptist Church on March 2, 2020. The church has no objections to the addition of the animals and sees this as a good opportunity of learning for the children of the school.

** It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Kortering to close the hearing. Motion carried.

The Commission reviewed the Standards of Approval for a Special Use request.

** It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Kortering to approve the request with the conditions that 1) The applicant shall obtain Staff approval for any changes to the proposed makeup of the types of farm animals to be present on the site. 2) Chickens shall be limited to hens (females); no roosters (males) shall be allowed. 3) Proof of combination of all lots of record and tax parcels shall be complete prior to any Township release of permits (building or utility). Motion carried.

Ms. Rynsburger rejoined the public hearing.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for a Special Use request submitted by Jonathan Israels of JSI Warehouse, for property located at the northwest corner of 12255 Felch Street, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-16-200-048. The applicant is seeking permission for a contractor's facility with outside storage. The property is currently zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

The subject property consists of an existing +/- 15,00 square foot building on a site of +/- 2.17 acres. There are in excess of 90 parking stalls to the south and east of the building. The site is the former location of an indoor recreational facility (Crazy Bounce), which has now closed. To the north and west of the subject property is a commercial use (self-storage), while to the south, across Felch, is an existing commercial use (Kohl's), and proposed future attached single-family residential (part of the Commons at Westshore PUD). East of the subject site is a proposed multi-family residential property (HOM flats PUD).

Ms. Becky Paige with Holland Engineering along with Jon Israels and Brandon Israels, the owners of JSI Warehouse were present to speak to this request.

Ms. Paige stated that they are proposing to add storage bins to the parking lot as they do not need all of the parking available. The services provided are for landscaping and snow removal services. The storage bins will be located in the northwest corner of the property which is the furthest spot away from any residential buildings.

Ms. Paige indicated that after the survey had been completed, they realized that the landscaping they thought was on their property actually was not, so in light of that they will comply with all township landscaping requirements. Due to the fact that they are in the landscaping business they want to have their property well landscaped and looking nice so they have no problem meeting requirements.

Ms. Paige noted that they are requesting that hours not be limited due to the fact that they run a snow removal business in the winter and will need to get snow removal equipment out of the buildings during the night time hours in order to service their customers. JSI stores all equipment in the building so the starting up of the equipment will be done inside reducing any noise. Ms. Paige pointed out that the equipment is all new and they do not produce a lot of noise since they are able to reduce the RPMs. These are also low emission vehicles that will not produce a lot of smoke and smell into the air.

Ms. Paige did note that if the Commission would like to limit hours of operation during the summer months that is a possibility, as their typical work day runs from 6:30 am until around 7:00 pm. They have very little traffic on-site during the day. The majority of the traffic would be at the beginning and end of the day as workers return from the job sites and leave in their own vehicles.

The bins they are requesting would be loaded only 1-2 times per year when they are filled with landscaping products.

Mr. Gebben asked about where the equipment is parked. Mr. Israels answered that the equipment would be parked inside the building using the 3 large overhead doors.

Mr. Kortering inquired about their customers. Mr. Israels stated that they have 250 customers in the greater Holland area.

Mr. Gebben asked if there would be additional equipment in the summer. Mr. Israels stated that there will be mowers and skid steers that would remain on job sights during the summer and will not be parked at their location.

Mr. Nykamp reiterated that due to the snow removal business they will have movement on-site before normal 7:00 am business hours but they are not creating a disturbance on-site because the work is done off-site. Mr. Israels stated that most of their customers are very close to this sight so they do not have to travel very far. Staff stated that most plowing is done during the night but there will be limited movement on-site. Staff asked if there will be any loading and re-loading of salt hoppers on-site. Mr. Israels stated that there will not be any salt hoppers on-site.

Staff stated that contractor facilities are allowed as a special use. They may or may not include out-door storage. The storage area will be fenced with an 8' solid wood fence. Mr. Israels stated that their goal is to keep the area looking nice.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if they bring back to the property any grass clippings. Mr. Israels stated that most of their mowers mulch the grass and therefore they do not bring anything back to the property.

Ms. Rynsburger asked about landscaping in the buffer along the east where it adjoins a residential property. Ms. Paige stated that they would like to work with Staff to meet landscaping requirements along that border. Mr. Israels stated that they did not want to come up with a landscaping plan until hearing from the water resource board. Mr. Nykamp inquired if they have room to put landscaping with the knowledge of how close the boundary is to the water retention pond. Ms. Paige stated that they would work to find landscaping that could be possibly planted near the edge of the basin.

Public Comment: None.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to close the hearing. Motion carried.

The Commission reviewed the 7 Special Use Standards and the Staff comments presented in the Staff Report.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to approve this request with the following conditions 1) The applicant shall provide all landscape buffers, equivalent to Buffer Type B as specified in the Zoning Ordinance, especially for the east edge of the property, and shall show such on a revised plan to be approved by Staff prior to the release of any permits for this site. 2) The applicant's landscape plan shall also indicate front yard landscaping to be approved by Staff prior to the release of any permits for the site. 3) The hours for on-site operations of equipment shall be limited to no earlier than 7 am on weekdays and 8 am on weekends, and no later than 9 pm on weekdays and 10 pm on weekends; this does not include entering and exiting the site with equipment. Motion carried.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for a Special Use request submitted by Joe Vongkaysone of Holland Poker Club, for property located at the 218 N. River Ave., Suites 228 and 230, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-20-301-015. The applicant is seeking permission for an indoor commercial recreation facility (Poker Club). The property is currently zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Consideration of a special use request for a commercial recreation facility consisting of a proposed private poker club submitted by Joe Vongkaysone of Holland Poker Club for the above-referenced address. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial. The proposed gaming room will contain approximately 2,500 square feet within tenant space at this existing shopping center.

The applicant will be required to obtain approval for this request from the State of Michigan Gaming Board.

Mr. Vongkaysone was present to speak to this request. He stated that this will be a private club where a membership is required. They will pay an hourly fee to enjoy playing poker at the facility.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if there are qualifications to become a member. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that the only requirements would be 18 years of age, according to the state of Michigan because of no alcohol, and pay the membership fees. He will be providing free food and non-alcoholic beverages for customers as they are playing.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if the patrons would be able to bring alcohol to the facility. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that there will not be any alcohol on-site at all.

Ms. Rynsburger asked what time they would be closing. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that the current plan is to close at 2:00 am. He stated that most poker facilities are open 24 hours a day but he would like to first see the interested and what the patrons are requesting. He also would like to close at 2:00 am for safety reasons. They will provide armed security 30 minutes before opening and 30 minutes after closing.

Mr. Kortering inquired how this is different from a casino. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that he cannot profit from any gambling that is done. He can only make money from the membership fees and the hourly rental rates. Mr. Kortering followed up by asking if players can win or lose money. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that yes, they can. They will not be playing with cash. Rather they will buy chips from the cage and play with chips. Mr. Kortering asked how they pay for the hours they are there. Mr. Vongkaysone answered that they can pay a daily rate, monthly rate, or a \$15 hourly rate; the patrons will get a card to keep track of their time. The cage will keep track of how long they are playing and charge accordingly by 30-minute increments.

Mr. Nykamp noted that in the Staff Report it was stated that the minimum age would be 21 years of age and now Mr. Vongkaysone is stating 18 years. What is he looking for approval for? Mr. Vongkaysone stated that originally, he stated 21 years because he was not sure about having alcohol or not. Now, he is not planning on have alcohol on-site so then 18 years can be the minimum age. He also stated that these types of clubs typically attract an older crowds of poker fanatics. However, he would like to allow the younger players to be able to come in and learn how to play.

Mr. Nykamp asked if the cage will be locked. Mr. Vongkaysone said that it will be locked. Mr. Nykamp also inquired of Staff if Mr. Vongkaysone will have the option to obtain an alcohol permit at a later date?

Staff stated that would ultimately be up to the Liquor Control Commission and not up to the township. Mr. Nykamp then questioned the Commission if we should consider raising the minimum age to 21 years due to the fact that they could at some point apply for a license to serve alcohol. Staff stated that Mr. Vongkaysone could voluntarily raise the age requirement but we would need to consult the lawyer if the Commission wanted to put an age restriction on the facility.

Mr. Vongkaysone said he is fine with the minimum age set at 21 years. He then questioned Staff about obtaining a liquor license if he ever wanted to get one to offer free alcohol to the members. Staff stated they should check with the Liquor Control Commission.

Ms. Rynsburger asked about their security plans. Will the security guards be armed? Will he be using an external security company? Mr. Vongkaysone answered that he has been in contact with the local police department to see if he would be able to hire an off-duty officer to provide security. If this is not possible then he will hire an armed security guard from a security company. He is trying to do everything legally and security is a very high priority for him. Mr. Gebben stated that he would like to see a written security plan that has been submitted to the Ottawa County Sherriff before approving the request. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that he also plans on installing security cameras all around the facility that he will monitor from his phone as well as having the armed guards. He really wants to make the customers feel safe. Mr. Gebben wants to make sure there is ample security for the neighborhood. Mr. Vongkaysone pointed out that this type of clientele would be the more serious players where security would not be as much of an issue. Inside the building it could potential be an issue because of the amount of money that can be lost and/or won but he doesn't see how security outside the building would be an issue. Mr. Kortering agrees with Mr. Gebben that he would like to see a written security plan approved by the Sherriff.

Mr. Gebben asked if they would be an owner or a tenant. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that they would be a tenant and that the landlord has signed the special use permit. Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if there has ever been a poker club in the Holland area before. Mr. Vongkaysone answered that there used to be two in the area but are not here at this time; currently the closest clubs have been in Grand Rapids.

Staff made a comment regarding the possibility of hosting charity events in the club. They stated that the Commission should consider stating if these types of third-party events will be allowed when offering the motion. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that he didn't want to have to turn down possible charity events; however, if the Commission is opposed to them, he would comply with that. He was going to allow the charity events provided they have all of the necessary licensing.

Mr. Nykamp asked how many people the unit is coded to hold. Mr. Vongkaysone did not know off hand. He did state that he would expect around 90 people maximum at one time in the building. Mr. Nykamp asked how many people could be in the building in the waiting area. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that there are typically not many people in the waiting area at one time they would have possibly 5-8 chairs in that area. There is a computerized system that will show when a table opens up via an app on their phone and notify them. He also pointed out that this is a serious game and there will be dealers at each table with computers keeping track of how long each player has been playing. This is not just for casual players to host their own games but for the serious players.

Mr. VanderMeulen is concerned about the number of restrooms in the facility. He stated that if there are over 15 people you need to have both male and female facilities. He stated that it was set up for commercial use and now this will be an assembly use and therefore a greater demand for restroom

facilities. Staff also pointed out that they would need to have a handicap accessible restroom available. Staff also stated that this would be a separate issue for the Building Department. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that he does not want to change the structure of the building and that actually there is another restroom available, he just wasn't going to make it a public restroom and therefore didn't show it on the plan, but he is able to make that a public restroom. Mr. Vongkaysone stated that he can move things around to accommodate two restrooms as he works with the Building Department.

Mr. Gebben asked if each table would have different stakes. Mr. Vongkaysone answered that it would depend on what the customers want. But in other clubs the stakes can range from \$1-\$2 hands with pots ranging from \$3 - \$9,000 at a table; it just depends on the clientele.

Public Comments: Mr. Vongkaysone's cousin, Kong Khammanivong, came to the podium and stated that his family runs local restaurant businesses in Holland and can help Mr. Vongkaysone with any building changes that may need to be done to comply with zoning requirements.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Nykamp to close the hearing. Motion carried.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that it sounds like the Commission still has security concerns. Mr. Gebben stated that security is his main concern. He asked if it is a legally permitted use? Staff answered it is allowed as a special use as a commercial indoor recreational facility. The Commission can deny the request if they feel the use does not meet the Special Use standards. Mr. Gebben asked if they are able tie the approval to a security plan approved by the Ottawa County Sheriff? Mr. Nykamp asked if they should table the request now pending an approval of the security plan by the Sheriff.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if they should make a condition of the approval that there be no alcohol allowed. Staff answered that the Commission can do that based on the applicants voluntary offering to not have alcohol.

Staff also stated that if there are enough gray areas Commission is able to table the request at this time and have the applicant address these areas and come back before the Commission at later date with those issues addressed. Mr. Nykamp asked if they could pass it tonight and then let Staff handle the security plans after approval from the Sheriff. Staff stated that is an option as well.

The Commission reviewed the Special Use Standards.

1. This business should not conflict with the other businesses in the shopping center due to the hours of operation being opposite of the hours of operation for the other businesses in that complex.
2. Public services - the only concern would be adequate police security at this location. This needs to be addressed by the Sheriff with a security audit. The applicant is comfortable getting that approval.
3. No issues.
4. This use fits the ordinance.
5. No changes to the environment.
6. Not a foreseeable problem with traffic.

7. Is the use needed and it would not be detrimental to the community? – The Commission would approve of the use provided they get an approval from the Sheriff's department on the security plan. Staff stated that they would like to have the applicant do their research as to the occupancy load in the building so that the Sheriff knows how many people they will potentially be dealing with at one time.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated there may be more to the general assembly requirements than the applicant realizes. They may need to get an architect involved or possibly have a meeting with a building inspector to make sure they are in compliance with all building codes.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff how they should word a motion to allow charity functions. Staff answered that they see charitable functions as a concern with a third-party lease. Staff's concern is with those parties and how they run their events.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff what they should state in a motion regarding alcohol. Staff answered that if they are ok with allowing alcohol, they do not have to state anything in the motion.

Mr. Nykamp stated that when the Commission has been unsure about a request in the past, they have motioned to table the request. They then ask the applicant to answer all of the Commissions questions and come back at a later date.

** It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Nykamp to table the recommendation to approve this request with the understanding of no alcohol in the facility, the applicant agreed to not hold any charity functions, and the age limit will be changed to 21 years as the applicant agreed too. Further, the applicant is to provide information on the occupancy load of the building, a plan showing the size of the room and a statement that they will not expand without additional Commission approval, a detailed drawing of where exactly in the building the club will be located in a printed document, and a written security plan that has been reviewed by the sheriff. Motion carried.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for a Special Use request submitted by Justin Koert of All State Crane and Rigging, for property located at the 500 E. 8th Street, Suite 1000, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-28-402-003. The applicant is seeking permission for a contractor's facility with outside storage. The property is currently zoned I-2 General Industrial and C-2 Community Commercial.

The subject property contains approximately 12.1 acres, with a large industrial building formerly occupied by Hart & Cooley. The building includes a number of smaller tenant spaces now being used for a variety of business operations, including the applicant. The applicant's specific request consists of construction equipment storage along with crane setup for training in the rear lot and trailer storage on the front portion of the lot.

Mr. Koert was present to speak to this request. Mr. Koert is also the owner of the building. He stated that they are asking for a special use for contractor storage. They also would like to be able to setup and display cranes in the rear of the building as well as use the front parking lot for a few trailers along with other tenants that use that space for parking of trailers. Their offices are in the back corner of the building closest to the rear parking lot where they would like to park the cranes, which is the farthest point away from any other businesses or buildings.

Mr. Koert stated that they will be adding more screening on the property and that the location of the crane in the back-parking lot is very well hidden. Mr. Nykamp asked if they would have any problem meeting code with their landscaping. Mr. Koert said they have no problem meeting code.

Mr. Gebben asked how does this affect the neighbors? He stated that this property is in a time of transition and wonders how does what they are proposing not hinder a larger more glorious plan? Mr. Koert explained that they believe they have already been beautifying the building and plan to continue to improve the facility by putting money into the property every year.

Mr. Gebben stated that he knows of other crane companies in Grand Rapids that have a lot more space than this. He asked if there really is enough space at this location for moving this large equipment around. Mr. Koert replied that they do not need semi-trucks or other larger equipment to move their equipment around as all of their equipment is self-driving. Therefore, they do not take a large amount of space to move around. They also do not require escort vehicles in order to move down the road.

Mr. Gebben asked if they see the business expanding. Mr. Koert replied that he didn't really see that happening. Mr. Gebben responded that he does not want to see this company taking over the whole building. Mr. Koert stated that they currently only use 20,000 sq. ft. of the 650,000 sq. ft. building so they are a very small portion of the building.

Mr. Gebben asked if they need special use for the trailer parking on the north side of the building where the semi-truck parking is located. Mr. Koert stated that this area has truck docks and has always been for semi-truck parking dating back to the Hart & Cooley days but that Staff had contacted them asking for additional screening for that area.

Mr. Gebben asked if there was really a need for a special use. Staff responded by stating that this is an outdoor storage use and is different than a typical loading dock, therefore does require a special use.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked how long they have been in that location. Mr. Koert answered they have been there for 5 years.

Mr. VanderMeulen pointed out that cranes are regulated by the state for safety.

Mr. Nykamp asked if they do sales out of that building. Mr. Koert said that they do not actually sell cranes from that location, so no customers come to their facility to purchase cranes. However, they do occasional training and testing for crane operators on-site for NCCO accreditation training for crane operators. He stated that there would not be cranes sitting there for sale.

Mr. VanderMeulen brought up the possibility of additional screening at this time. Staff stated that they would like to see an extension of the current screening further west. There were conversations regarding the addition of sidewalks in-front of this property, as well as unification of landscaping along the frontage of this building and the other businesses extending all the way to US-31 to get a walkable 8th Street corridor. Mr. Koert said that they would not object to any of those plans. They are all for enhancing the facility and 8th Street as well. His only concern would be for Tulip City Beauty School and making sure that they not block the visibility to the school from the road. Mr. Nykamp pointed out that it would be more like lower green space in that area but not a solid wall of landscaping. Staff was looking for larger canopy trees where there would still be visibility from under the tree line by passing traffic to the building. Staff indicated that they will be in conversations with DeNooyer Chevrolet and the Ditto property in removing

some of the concrete to create green spaces along the road.

Ms. Rynsburger noticed that the crane fall area extends past the property line. Mr. Koert stated that they actually own the property to the south so that area is actually owned by them as well. Staff is still concerned with the crane area as it relates to the other site operations, parking lot area, storage, circulation, as well as emergency access around the building. They also have concerns with the overall parking on the site as it already has very limited parking for such a large building. Mr. Koert stated that there is ample parking right now for the current uses. Most of the time only one row of parking is being utilized and the rest of the parking lot remains empty.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired as to what was in the rest of the building. Mr. Koert answered that most of the building is used for logistics storage by area companies and Tulip City Beauty School.

Mr. Nykamp stated that the parking requirements really do not apply to this use because of the fact that the building is being use mostly as warehouse storage. Staff indicated that if the full building was classified as warehouse, they would require 325 spaces. Potentially reducing the number of parking spaces brings concerns for Staff. Mr. VanderMeulen asked if there was an area that they could designate for differed parking. Mr. Koert stated that they could add parking in Phase 2 if that became an issue but that is not part of the request at this time.

Staff stated that when a special use comes before the board this is the opportunity that the Commission has to address some of these concerns as it relates to landscaping, screening, parking, circulation, etc. Staff mention that if a new business comes in and is employee intensive, we need to make sure there is enough parking for a business like that at this facility. Now is the time to handle this issue. Mr. VanderMeulen asked Staff if they would want the owners to put in more parking at this time. Staff answered that right now it doesn't look like the owners have the room to add parking. Staff would just like a more accurate inventory of the parking outside of the out-door storage area and an inventory of the uses inside the building and what kinds of uses are in the building currently. Staff is not comfortable with approving the western portion of the back-parking lot area as outdoor storage without something else being shown as differed parking. Mr. Nykamp suggested moving the storage area to the far east portion. Can they designate the south portion of their property as deferred parking even though that is not part of the request tonight? Staff responded that because they have not publicly noticed that property for tonight's meeting it can only be given as guidance tonight and if they came back, we could stipulate a portion of the property as parking. Mr. Koert is not interested in taking parking away, they just need the classification change to be able to park a crane in a small section of the property. They are very willing to put additional parking on their lot to the south when the need arises because their goal is to make money on the leasing of the building and if more parking is needed, they will provide that parking.

Staff would prefer to hold off on approving the western portion of the back-parking lot area as outdoor storage at this time.

Public Comments: None.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Nykamp to close the hearing. Motion carried.

The Commission went through the 7 Special Use standards and found no issues; providing ample screening was addressed.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to the approve this request with the following conditions 1) The approved storage in front of the building shall include that row of parking along the building only. 2) Phase 2 (“gravel area for contractor facility and outdoor storage”), located south of the proposed crane setup area, shall not be included with this special use. The applicant shall be required to obtain separate approval for Phase 2. 3) The applicant shall obtain Staff approval for required front yard landscaping along the entire 8th Street frontage, including providing room for a Township sidewalk, and outdoor storage screening, with extension of the landscape buffer all the way west to East Ave. Motion carried.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen asked if anyone had shown up to represent the special use request submitted by Philip Tran and Giap Tran of Puppy Parlor, for land located at 76 E. Lakewood Blvd., Suite 10.

There was still no one present to speak to this request and Mr. VanderMeulen indicated the matter would remain tabled.

Vice Chairman/Secretary VanderMeulen re-opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a Special Use request submitted by Matt Wickstra of Douglas Woods LLC, for land located at 455 Douglas, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-19-300-094. The applicant is seeking permission for a contractor’s facility with outside storage and warehousing. The property is currently zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

The subject property contains approximately 8.0 acres, and is connected to Douglas Ave. via a 66-foot wide access easement. The adjacent property to the south, which was approved for a special use in July, 2019 (for a boat repair and storage business) included plans for an access easement/drive to connect to the subject property. All on-site driveways will be private.

The proposal consists of a proposed +/- 9,000 SF contractor’s facility with outside storage located to the north of the building, as well as a separate storage facility that will contain 32 separate units for lease in either stand-alone or 2-unit attached structures, and that can only be accessed through a gated area. The storage units will range in size from approximately 1440 SF to 2,880 SF. The units will include heat and a restroom, and are intended for individual storage for items such as campers, boats, and trailers.

Mr. Bill Sikkel, attorney representing Douglas Woods LLC, was present to speak to this request. Also present were Matt Wickstra and Warren Westenbroek of Douglas Woods LLC along with Chris Ritsema of Canvas Innovations, the contractor for the contractor’s facility.

Mr. Sikkel described that there are two components to this plan. The first portion of the project will include a contractor’s facility with outdoor storage occupied by Canvas Innovations and the second portion of this project will be 32 storage units. Similar in use, but not appearance, to what you will find at Ottawa Beach Dry Docks, Bitternut Business Center or some of the buildings in front of Chris Craft. They are designed more for storage or toy barn storage. But the appearance will be very different. This project will not be one large building, rather stand-alone units or duplex buildings.

Mr. Sikkel pointed out that the surrounding businesses provide synergy of uses to this development with other marine type businesses and other storage facilities surrounding the proposed site.

Mr. Sikkel then addressed some of the questions brought up by Staff in the Staff Report. The first subject would be fencing the surrounding area around the outdoor storage by the contractor's facility. He stated that the ordinance allows for other types of screening than fencing. He pointed out that there is already screening along the majority of the area. The contractor's facility will provide the screening to the south. There will be a 6' tall row of fencing running 300' along the west side of the property toward the White Oaks subdivision in addition to the trees that are already there. To the north the property line is 350' away with a retention pond and about 100' of thick woods in between. To the back side there will be the storage unit buildings providing screening. They feel like there is not a need for additional screening. It will be completely out of view to all sides.

Mr. Sikkel then addressed the business operations question. He believes Staff's concerns were with the possibility at a later date there could be businesses in these units and there would not be the necessary parking available for those potential businesses. If the site would be modified at a later date, they could accommodate additional parking if at that point parking became a necessity for business use. At a later date they could amend the special use to accommodate the need to added parking. He stated that they would like to keep the flexibility of the possibility of amending the special use at a later date to accommodate business use.

Mr. Sikkel moved on to the sub-leasing issue. They are concerned with this restriction due to the fact that with these types of storage units many times you will have someone leasing the unit and then sub-leasing space to friends or family to store a car or something similar. They do not want to have restrictions placed on that type of thing happening here. He pointed out that this will be part of a condominium association and therefore will have a board that will be in place to police these types of situations.

Mr. Sikkel then address the storm water outlet. The developers are fine with preserving some trees with the relocation of the eastern storm water outlet. They feel that most of that area is woods and they feel it would be nice to maintain as much of that as possible.

Mr. Nykamp questioned the row of trees along White Oaks. Do they have control over that because it is on their property? They answered that yes that is the case. He also questioned if a business would want to go into the development how would they change the plan to accommodate additional parking? Mr. Sikkel answered that this is planned to be done in phases. So, if someone came in with a business, they could change the plan accordingly to add the needed parking and reduce the number of storage units in the next phase. However, if the development was completed and all units were built then the option of adding parking would no longer be there and therefore no businesses could operate in any of the units. Initially the condominium documents would state that businesses would not be allowed, but if market conditions change then they could make changes to the documents.

Mr. Gebben asked for a review of the phases. Mr. Sikkel stated that Phase 1 would be the contractor facility and the "L-shaped" portion on the east and the south portion of the storage unit area. The final phase would include the remaining storage units in the center of the property.

Mr. Nykamp questioned if the contractor's facility would be part of the condo association. Mr. Sikkel stated that yes it would be part of that.

Mr. Gebben inquired what type of work Canvas Innovations would do. Mr. Sikkel answered they do mostly custom canvas boat covers. No equipment storage, only boats sitting outside in the proposed outdoor

storage area to the north which will be well shielded from view. Parking will be to the south and the west. This will not be for outdoor storage for the storage units, not to be used for rental space for storage of boats etc., this will only be used by Canvas Innovations.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired about turning radiuses and accessibility for fire trucks. Staff stated that the fire chief has seen the plan and stated that his only concern is at the end of Phase 1 when the road does not go all the way around that there be a large enough space at the end of the cul-de-sac for the trucks to turn around. It was also questioned if there will be a 26' wide path to the outdoor storage area to have access to the north side of the building. Staff stated there needs to be less than a 300' gap between access points. Mr. Sikkel clarified that to leave a 26' wide path for fire trucks would leave a 40' space at the north point of the outdoor storage area to be used for storage. Mr. Wickstra agree to those conditions.

Ms. Rynsburger brought up sub-leasing and if there is a need to put the condition of #5 from the Staff Report in a motion. It was determined there was not a need to include that in a motion.

Public Comment: None.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to close the public hearing. Motion carried.

The Commission review the 7 Special Use standards. And found that this request meets all the standards. Staff did recommend that the applicant plant some additional trees in the self-storage area.

Mr. Nykamp question if the Commission is good with the screening that is in place around the property that Mr. Sikkel pointed out. Mr. VanderMeulen asked how much screening to do you need when you have similar uses right next to each other. Staff read the screening requirements that states screening can be buildings, privacy fences, vegetation, berms or any combination of these items. Mr. Sikkel reiterated the screening along White Oaks with the 6' tall fence that will be constructed for 300' as well as trees. To the east the on-site storage buildings will provide screening. There is also a berm with vegetation to provide screening as well as a fence along the west side of the property. To the north there is the retention area with 100' of woods which brings the storage area 350' away from the neighboring parcel, they feel additional screening would not be seen. They feel they are so isolated that they do not need any additional screening because they feel they meet all of the requirements. Mr. Nykamp inquired if they would be ok with the Commission putting in the motion that the wooded area stays there for the screening along the north portion of the property. Staff is concerned that there will only be a pocket of trees that could be left. They feel that most of the trees will need to be removed during installation of the water main and the storm water drainage. Therefore, Staff is requesting the Commission require the addition of screening to this side of the property.

Mr. Gebben asked if there will be grass around all of the buildings. They answered yes there will be grass around all buildings. He also asked if there will be dumpsters in the storage area. Mr. Wickstra answered that they currently use one dumpster that they share with Wyrick Leasing that is emptied once a week. They do not generate a lot of waste so only one dumpster will be on-site in that storage area.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked Staff if they had any comments on the sub-leasing issue. Staff stated that their concern would be who would be monitoring the sub-leasing. The Commission stated that he pointed out there will be a condominium board to manage that. Mr. Sikkel also pointed out that this will be a gated development.

** It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to approve this request with the following conditions 1) There shall be no business operations, including but not limited to, contractor's facilities and/or storage businesses, operating in the warehouse units at any time. 2) There shall be no outside storage of any kind at the individual storage units, including but not limited to, boats, trailers, vehicles, campers, RV's. 3) There shall be no overnight parking outside at the individual storage units. 4) There shall be no residential presence, including but not limited to, overnight stays at the individual storage units. 5) Any proposed staging of construction of the individual storage units shall require either completion of the entirety of the driveway loop, or a cul-de-sac bulb for each stage subject to the approval of the Fire Chief. 6) Prior to any permits, utility easements must be provided and approved by Township. Motion carried.

Comprehensive Future Land Use Plan Amendment

232 N. Franklin Ave. – Robert Edson/Randall Schipper of Select Genetics LLC. is seeking a re-designation of the Future Land Use Plan Map for the subject parcel from AG Agricultural to I-1 Light Industrial. This request has been withdrawn.

Other Business

Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) - Authentix Quincy Street (264-unit multi-family project) - submitted by Robert McCaigue of Continental 512 Fund LLC, for land located at Quincy Street, west of 120th Ave.

- Plans have been revised to address the following:
 - Revised parking layout as directed by the Planning Commission, with existing and deferred parking totaling the required 2.5 spaces per unit.
 - Signage as directed by the Planning Commission, with the monument sign meeting the 32 SF per side maximum allowed, and with the only exceptions consisting of the 7-square-foot addressing signage and the one clubhouse wall sign (containing 30.71 square feet).
 - Speed humps in key areas along driveways for traffic calming.
 - A single internal street name with north, south, east, and west for each corresponding segment of the street.
 - Rearranged landscaping to provide for more snow storage areas.
 - Revised gate locations for emergency access drive.

Mr. Robert McCaigue was present to speak to this request. He stated that there is a typo in Exhibit B of the resolution, it references 12 units and should be 24 units. He also had some clarifying questions in Exhibit B Item G, as it states that the township has the ability to impose additional conditions. He is wondering about the wording here. Staff stated that this was recommended by the attorney and in order to change the wording we would have to consult with the attorney. Mr. McCaigue stated that it was fine then, he just was looking for clarification if there was something specific it referred to. He also referenced Item J as saying easements "shall be" granted over the entire parcel, such as fiber optic. Can this be changed to easements will be granted "as needed"? Staff stated that the intent of the wording is only if they are present. They have not seen this wording raise any issues in the past. Item P is requesting the recording of a specific document. Mr. McCaigue asked if this resolution report and the ordinance going

to be what they need to submit to the County Registrar of Deeds? Staff stated that yes that will be what you need to submit to the county.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if December 2022 is a good date for them to be done. Staff stated that this can be altered at a later date if need be. Mr. McCaigue stated that they usually take 18-24 months to complete a project so this shouldn't be a problem. Staff stated that they can issue an extension at their level if need be.

Mr. McCaigue inquired as to the timing moving forward. Staff stated that the next step will be to bring the request to the Township Board. This will most likely happen in about a month due to the fact that we will need time to notice the meeting 15 days prior.

** It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Kortering to send the recommendation to the Township Board for approval. Motion carried.

Staff read into the record a letter from the Park Township Board regarding the preparation of their Master Plan.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if at the next meeting the Commission could get an update on the Master Plan meetings. Staff stated that they will add this item to the next meeting agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary