

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
May 12, 2020

Chairman Hoeve called the meeting to order via teleconference due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic at 7:00pm and asked for a roll call of members present.

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

Absent: None.

Public Comment: None.

** Motion to approve the minutes with one amendment from the regular meeting of April 14, 2020, was made by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. VanderMeulen. Motion carried.

Chairman Hoeve opened a hearing for a Site Plan Approval submitted by Westview Capital/Waverly Woods for property located at 2502 120th Ave. described more specifically as 70-16-15-300-028. The applicant is seeking Site Plan approval for a proposed 74-unit attached single-family residential project.

Mr. Dan Larabel and Mr. Kevin Kammeraad were present to speak to this request. Mr. Kammeraad expressed his gratitude that Holland Township is continuing to keep things moving during the states stay-at-home order as some of the other municipalities they also work with are not.

Mr. Kammeraad explained some of the history of this parcel to the Commission. He stated that back in 2018 this property was rezoned to R-2A and in 2019 they submitted Site Plan Approval for a development of 72 units. They are coming to the Commission with modifications to that original plan. The original plan consisted of 8-unit buildings with no attached garages. The new plan consists of 2-story townhomes with attached 1-stall garages. The proposed development would consist of 74 units verses the 72 units in the original plan. Mr. Larabel stated that engineering is essentially the same as far as the entrance, the deceleration lane, bus stop, sidewalk connectivity, utility placement, garbage collection, snow removal, mail station, utility plans, etc. This would be a condominium development governed by a condo board and bylaws.

Mr. Larabel explained that the previous site plan consisted of 9 buildings with 72 units. This new plan would be 74 units total consisting of 17 buildings that have 4 units each and 1 building with 6 units.

Mr. Larabel described the parking configuration proposed. He stated that the previous plan had car ports and a parking lot and now they are proposing attached private garages with private driveways along with additional parking areas through out the development. Mr. Larabel stated that 182 spaces are on the

plans, however, they will add the 3 additional spaces that are needed to meet township parking requirements.

Mr. Larabel addressed setbacks on the property. He stated that the plan shows 25' perimeter setbacks with 20' between the buildings. Mr. Larabel pointed out that this is 5' extra feet along the perimeter than the original plan. The driveways are proposed to be 25' long either from the asphalt or from the sidewalk, whichever is closer. He also pointed out that they are also planning additional tree preservation.

Mr. Larabel also stated that they will have public water, public sewer, sidewalks, public stormwater, and a private access drive. He feels this design is more desirable than the prior plan was to potential buyers. The attached garages are much more desirable especially in Michigan winters and when taking in groceries, etc. Mr. Larabel said that with the addition of private garages, private driveways that allow for the parking of one additional vehicle, private entrances and garden level patios they feel that these features really enhance the privacy. He also pointed out that the private garage creates a safer environment allowing residents to be inside in the winter resulting in less falls on the ice.

Mr. Larabel said that the units will be 1,200 sq. ft total consisting of 3-bedrooms with 135 sq. ft. of storage space. The design of the floor plans was completed last week and they will be happy to provide those to Staff. Mr. Larabel stated that they meet the minimum square foot requirements of 1,020 sq. ft. for a 3-bedroom unit as well as the 120 sq. ft. minimum storage requirement.

Mr. Larabel went on to describe the floor plan to the Commissioners. He stated that the plan shows 600 sq. ft. of living space on the main level which consists of a nook, great room, kitchen, slider to the outdoor patio and a bathroom. The second floor consists of 2 full baths, a laundry room, 2 bedrooms and a master bedroom.

Mr. Larabel addressed the exterior elements of the development stating that these elements would include a sidewalk along one side of the access drive and a bus stop with a concrete sidewalk leading up to it. He stated that a centralized trash area will be provided which would be managed by the HOA. They feel that this would be a more desirable option as it keeps all the trash in one location and then garbage trucks would not need to go all the way through the development to pick up trash.

Mr. Larabel then addressed landscaping. He said that trees will be preserved as much as possible to meet the buffer requirements. Mr. Larabel stated that they are requesting the tree survey be limited to the buffer zone on the plan. He also stated that they will be planting landscaping along 120th as well.

Mr. Larabel stated that they are working with the Ottawa County Resource Commission on planning drain dried detention basins.

Mr. Larabel stated that the HOA would manage the financial management of paved surfaces, landscaping, siding, roofing, snow removal, trash pickup, etc. for the development. They plan to prohibit recreational vehicles and equipment sitting outside of the garages in the Master Deed.

Mr. Larabel stated that they would like to start construction this year if they can get approval and all necessary permits.

Mr. Larabel addressed Staff's concerns over connectivity to the East. He asked that connection to the east not be mandated in the motion. They are providing a 40' easement for utilities and connectivity and are

asking that easement be enough. Mr. Larabel stated they feel they are accommodating what was previously approved in 2019.

Mr. Nykamp inquired about the 40' easement and stated that he thought it was a 30' easement. Staff clarified that it is 40' between buildings 9 & 10 but that the easement is 26' wide with 7' on each side of the easement where the proposed buildings start.

Mr. Nykamp asked if they intended to be owner occupied and how will they control how many will be rentals? Mr. Larabel stated that they are not specifying them to be owner-occupied. He pointed out that they want to target a broad segment of the population especially in what is going to be a post COVID market and with that brings the possibility of an increased need for leased units. Mr. Larabel stated they would like for the market to determine whether the units are owner occupied or leased. He pointed out that if there were leased units the HOA would have control over that and would maintain consistency over the properties.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if we want more rental units in the township right now. Do we want to state in the deed that this be owner occupied? Mr. Hoeve feels that it could be a problem to say a certain number will be owner occupied and a certain number are able to be rental units. He asked if this could cause legal issues down the road? Mr. Larabel answered that yes that could turn into a fair housing or discriminatory issue that they do not want to get into that. Therefore, they do not have any intent to put any restrictions on leasing in the deed. Mr. Larabel stated that they really feel they need to be able to adapt to whatever market comes their way. Mr. Kammeraad also pointed out that the HOA would be an oversight governing body to maintain the appearance of the development.

Mr. Gebben stated that he prefers to let the market decide about leasing or not. Ms. Rynsburger stated that she agrees with Mr. Gebben especially in this market.

Mr. Zylstra stated, that on the other side of the coin, if he owned a property in there, he wouldn't want to have rental right next to him. Ms. Rynsburger inquired if the HOA and the bylaws would make sure that there wouldn't be any deterioration due to renters? Mr. Larabel answered that yes, the HOA would be maintained by a professional management company and any complaints would rectify any issues. This would not be a township issue rather the management company would deal with any issues.

Mr. VanderMeulen pointed out that in the City of Holland many different people own different buildings along 16th street and non-desirable properties are now present due to the mix of rental units and owner-occupied homes. He doesn't want to see that happen here. Mr. VanderMeulen feels we do not need more apartments in the township.

Mr. Hoeve feels it needs to be determined to be either condo owner occupied or rental.

Mr. Larabel asked the Commission if the apartments that have been recently approved have the amenities that they are proposing here with private units, private attached garages, private drives, etc. and not just simply apartment complexes? They feel they are offering something different to the community. Mr. Larabel pointed out that what was already approved was more of an apartment complex and they feel this is actually a big improvement offering more private units. Mr. Larabel stated that if these changes are not approved as proposed they would just revert back to the original plan of the apartment complex and go with that.

Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if the Seven Pines development to the north is rental or if it is condos. Staff answered it was intended to be owner occupied, however, there may be some rental in there. Staff also noted that the applicant previously asked if there were any other developments similar to this development that has been approved recently. Staff stated that the Adams Ridge project is similar in nature to this proposal. Staff also pointed out the property at 1226 136th that was recently approved is similar with attached single-family units along a public cul-de-sac with a road connection to an existing single-family development.

Mr. Kortering asked if you are asking for owner-occupied how can you legally do that? Can you put that on the deed legally? How is that done? Mr. VanderMeulen answered that yes you can do that. He stated that Habitat for Humanity does that all the time. Mr. Kortering asked if it would be part of the bylaws as well? Mr. VanderMeulen stated he didn't know about that.

Mr. Kammeraad stated that Seven Pines is a mixture of owner occupied and rental. They are a good example of well-constructed units in a more residential style with a good mixture of occupants. He also pointed out that when you see more fragment things like in Holland City those are varied owners that are possibly not even in town and not under an HOA like this one would be. This development would have bylaws and a Master Deed to control the uniformity of how things were managed. Seven Pines is a great example of how this could look.

Mr. Kortering asked if one person bought the entire development to rent it out would they then control the HOA? Mr. Kammeraad stated that this could happen but that could happen in any neighborhood. Mr. Kammeraad stated that we don't typically see restrictions in neighborhoods on renting your own home. He pointed out that as homeowners we don't want restrictions on what we do with our homes; if our situations changes, we would want the freedom to possibly rent out our home if we need to.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the garbage area and if there would be recycling available for the residents. Mr. Larabel stated that there is room on the plan for 2 dumpsters and it is anticipated one would be for trash and the other for recycling. Mr. Hoeve inquired if there is room by the dumpsters for the garbage truck to back in, get the trash, then turn around right there and leave with out going into the development further to turn around. Mr. Larabel answered that yes, they can make a 3-point turn and leave right to 120th. Mr. Hoeve also pointed out that the dumpsters are quite far away from the back units and that would be a long way for them to bring their trash to the dumpster. Mr. Larabel answered that they do not anticipate any issues with this system. He stated that if it were him, he would just put the garbage in his trunk and drop it off on his way to work in the morning or if it was a nice day, take a walk along the sidewalk to dispose of it.

Mr. Hoeve asked about the applicable density requirements of 4,000 sq. ft. per-unit minimum. Staff stated that the applicant just needs to confirm this. Mr. Larabel stated that the calculation is on the plan and that the development is 7.44 acres which is 323,893 sq. ft., excluding the right of way. Staff did the calculation and said that this would then be 4,400 sq. ft. per unit (but that doesn't take out any public right-of-way accesses or easements) so as long as their calculations are on the plan that is great.

Mr. Hoeve asked about the access to the east. He asked if we should require an access to the east just like Seven Pines? Mr. Gebben also asked about the connectivity. He pointed out that the cul-de-sac is 1,150' which is longer than the maximum of 800' allowed. Mr. Hoeve pointed out that the update to the master plan would eliminate cul-de-sacs and wondered if we need to apply that to this project? Mr. Gebben asked if they could just run the cul-de-sac all the way to the end to have it connect to the property

in the back if that were to be developed in the future like was done with Seven Pines to the north? Mr. Larabel stated that the Road Commission would not allow a private public access drive and a public road to connect. He also pointed out that they have an easement planned for a walkway for connectivity. They are not opposed to future connectivity as a walkway but the Road Commission wouldn't allow the connection between and private drive and a public road. It was also pointed out that the 800' feet maximum doesn't apply here because this isn't a public road.

Staff pointed out that this is really a safety issue to have the connectivity. They stated that if there is no connection to any potential development to the east this creates a safety issue with fire trucks, police cars, and ambulances. Staff would like to at least have them put a driveway with a gate that emergency vehicles can get through. Mr. Nykamp would like to see, rather than a 26' easement as lawn, a gate with a paved driveway put in now. Staff proposed removing one unit to the north and south bringing the count down to 72 units to allow for a larger easement for the driveway and gate. Staff pointed out that with a 26' drive for emergency vehicles the current configuration would only leave a 7' buffer to the buildings on either side which is quite close. Mr. Nykamp asked if they could take one unit off building 9 and shift the building over a bit to give more space. Mr. Kortering inquired if we can make this a requirement and allow the developer to change the configuration however they see fit. Ms. Rynsburger asked if it was possible to resituate 9 and 10 to have them be street facing then there wouldn't be a need to reduce the number of units. Mr. Hoeve stated that the Commission shouldn't be designing the layout for the developer we should tell them the requirements and let them design it. Staff pointed out that the fire department needs either a T-on drive or a full cul-de-sac bulb to be able to turn a fire truck around.

Mr. Nykamp agrees we need to tell them we want the stub now and have them change the design. Mr. Larabel has seen the future fire department connections in other developments. He is suggesting a 12-15' wide drive with a break away lock on a gate. Staff stated that the fire department is going to want a 26' wide hard surface driveway based on the current equipment with potential stabilizers that may need to go down and the possibility of two-way ambulance traffic.

Mr. Hoeve asked if they have gotten Ottawa County Road Commission approval yet? Mr. Larabel answered that they have not gotten approval yet because they need site plan approval first. Mr. Gebben asked what the Road Commission does with a private road? Mr. Larabel answered that they look at just the connection to the public road and that they do not have any stipulations on length. Mr. Kammeraad also pointed out that the Road Commission did approve the deceleration lane.

Mr. Gebben asked if the township requires private roads conform to Road Commission standards? He asked, if that is true, then are we going to have to approve the road or make an exception to the standards? Staff answered that this is the crux of the whole issue with these private drives. If it is going to be one owner in an apartment complex with one person maintaining it that could be one way around it. However, if this is going to be a multiple owner development, should it be a private street with 74 different owners? Staff doesn't see an easement over the road and the connection to the east is labeled as a possible future connection. Staff noted that without an easement over the drive there's no guarantees that this could forever be an access way. Mr. Kammeraad answered that this would be controlled and maintained by the condominium association; therefore, the association is the single point of control and single point of maintenance. Staff stated that this can be a ticking time bomb if the HOA doesn't have enough money to keep up on repairs to the road and ownership has changed.

Ms. Rynsburger brought up the tree survey and how they asked for the tree survey to only include the buffer area and not the whole development. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he thinks that is reasonable.

He did point out that there is a history in the township where we have had tree surveys done before and then all the trees still go down. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that we need to make sure that does not happen here. Staff stated that they are concerned that the township gets credit for the buffer that is required to be there; whether that's through salvaging existing woodlands or with new trees being planted at a 2 1/2" caliper that's required. Staff stated that they could handle this at the time the building permits are issued; pointing out grading will be done at that point and then better decisions can be made.

Mr. Hoeve questioned who will be doing the building. Mr. Larabel answered these would be Allen Edwin homes. He stated that they are on board with the landscaping requirement and will work with Staff at the time of building permits being issued or if that needs to be done a different time, they can work with Staff on that.

Mr. Gebben brought up the concern of the lack of green space available for kids to play and throw a ball. He is also concerned about the number of cars that could be parked on the driveways, in the extra parking and potentially along the road causing a lot of congestion and safety concerns. He pointed out that they are also not close to any public parks.

Mr. Hoeve asked Staff if the Commission can give the developer guidance for revising the plans at this point. Staff stated that would be up to the Commissioners and that the Chairperson could take a poll of the Commissioners to see how they felt and go from there.

Ms. Rynsburger stated that she feels that the Commission is seeking a redesign for connectivity on the east end.

Mr. Hoeve stated they need to deal with rental verses owner occupied.

Mr. Kortering asked if they can add more green space for kids.

Mr. Zylstra stated that this is a very dense plan.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that they do have the 25' buffer in the back of the units but it is still not large enough space for kids to throw a ball. He would also like to see the floor plans.

** It was moved by Mr. VanderMeulen and supported by Mr. Zylstra to table the hearing. Motion carried.

Commissioners are asking the applicant to show access to the east between units 9 and 10, show floor plans and discuss phasing for the project.

Staff pointed out that the plans also show a non-motorized easement along the frontage and asked for clarification. Mr. Larabel stated that the engineers just wanted to point this out to show that there is an existing utility easement for a sidewalk and the township would have to work with Consumers Power in the future if they wanted to put a sidewalk in there. Staff was pleased with this arrangement and asked for the developer's agreement to provide room for and easement to be given to them in writing.

Other Business

198 Manufacturers Drive, Suite 10 – Roberto Arrendondo of Beto’s Garage – Tabled at the November 5, 2019 Meeting – The applicant is seeking Special Use approval for vehicle repair and outdoor storage. The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial District.

Mr. David Macias and Mr. Roberto Arrendondo were present to speak to this request. Mr. Macias stated that they are coming back to the Commission after addressing some of the requests from the November meeting and have worked with Staff in regards to landscaping and buffer requirements. He also pointed out that they have worked on the northwest corner to have this staked so when they add trees and shrubbery they do not hit any utilities. Staff requested that they be allowed to approve the revised landscaping plan with the applicant.

Mr. Gebben asked if the encroachment of the drive way needs to be resolved yet? Staff stated that they are proposing removal of that driveway.

** It was moved by Mr. Zylstra and supported by Mr. Kortering to approve the request with the condition that Staff approves the revised landscape plan. Motion carried.

12191 and 12199 Felch - Planned Unit Development (PUD) Final - Vishal Arora of Magnus Capital Partners LLC - The applicant seeks Final Development Plan and Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for a 114- unit multi-family rental residential project, to be called ‘HOM Flats at Felch Street’, on the north side of Felch, west of 120th Avenue. The applicant received Preliminary PUD approval at the January 2020 meeting, and previous rezoning of the property to R-3 High Density Residential. The Future Land Use Plan for this site designates the primary (eastern) portion as High Density Residential, with the western portion being designated as O-S Office and Service.

The applicant seeks to obtain a PUD density bonus to allow 114 units on this +/- 7.9-acre site. The project meets the minimum requirements for all dwelling unit sizes, including one-, two-, and three-bedroom units. Of the 114 total units, 20 will be 1-bedroom, 62 will be 2-bedroom, and 32 will be 3-bedroom. The project will consist of 3, 4-story buildings, an on-site leasing office, fitness center, bicycle storage, a walking trail, outdoor plaza, and other amenities.

A total of 200 parking spaces are proposed, with 87 more deferred spaces shown on the plan for possible future development. This meets the minimum required total meeting the 2.5 spaces per unit ratio of 285.

Mr. Vishal Arora was present to speak to this request. Mr. Arora comment on items listed in the Staff Report. He stated, in regards to the possible connection to the Falcon Woods driveway, that prior to this they were not able to make contact with management at Falcon Woods. Since that meeting, they have been able to connect with management and management was not initially opposed to the connection; however, with the current COVID climate Falcon Woods has been swamped and this was not a high priority item for them. Given this situation Mr. Arora stated that they pursued the Ottawa County Road Commission to get an OK from them for the 2 curb cuts. They have received an email from Jody Carter at the Road Commission, that they forwarded onto Staff. The emailed states that the Road Commission is OK with the plan and that they recommend the wide-back portion of the curb be 30’.

Mr. Arora stated that the unit counts will remain as proposed with 20, 1-bedroom and 60, 2-bedroom and 32, 3-bedroom units.

Mr. Arora also addressed the building's height. He stated the buildings measure 58' to the peak of the roof line and 50' 6" to the peak of the sloped roof line which makes them compliant with the ordinance.

Mr. Arora then addressed the landscaping plan. He wanted to address a Staff comment concerning a possible clearing of the northern tree stand and the planting of new trees. Mr. Arora stated this is not the case and instead they plan to keep as many of the existing trees as possible and in addition plant some new trees.

Mr. Arora also talked about the site plan dimensions and landscape plan dimensions and that they do not line up. He stated that the landscape plan was done in haste to be able to get it to the township by the deadline and therefore was not done entirely correct. He stated the site plan has the correct dimensions on it. Mr. Arora said they can provide a corrected landscape plan to Staff.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he was not comfortable with the number of deferred parking spaces. He feels like the number seems like a very high percentage of the total parking spaces. He is wondering if the Commission should require having them provide at least some of these spaces right away. Mr. VanderMeulen feels like it seems too tight right now with the number of multiple bedroom apartments which potentially raises the number of potential vehicles per unit. Mr. Hoeve wondered where Mr. VanderMeulen would like to put the additional parking spaces. Mr. VanderMeulen stated the only place would be in the green space, however, he would hate to see green space taken away. Mr. Nykamp asked how many spaces are deferred. It was answered 87 spaces are deferred.

Mr. Nykamp asked about the bus stop for school busses. He asked if there was any sort of covering or canopy for the kids to stand under. Mr. Arora stated that the kids would wait for the bus in the center of the building near the office. Mr. Gebben stated that seems quite far away from the bus stop and asked if the bus would wait that long for the kids to walk that far to the road. Mr. Arora also stated there are entry vestibules at the end of the other 2 buildings that the kids living in those building can wait in. Mr. Nykamp is concerned that this is an accident waiting to happen when kids are running toward a busy road like Felch.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked how it is determined when additional parking is needed. Staff answered that this will be determined by complaints coming into the office or by the Fire Chief stating that the roads are not clear for emergency vehicles to get through.

** It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Gebben to recommend approval of the HOM Flats Final PUD to the Board of Trustees with the condition that the applicant will need to submit and obtain Staff approval for a deferred parking agreement and landscape plan. The Commission directs Staff to a prepare a favorable Resolution and Report for the Commission's final review. Motion carried.

165 Greenly Street - Preliminary Site Condominium plan for the Bluejay Crossing Site Condominium Development - Dan Larabel of Allen Edwin Homes. The proposed site condominium consists of 19 detached single-family residential units with a private road, public watermain and sanitary sewer, and private stormwater retention facilities. The subject property is zoned R-2 Moderate Density Residential.

The subject parcel contains about 8.3 acres. The proposed development includes 19 single-family home lots, 17 of which are situated around a proposed private street cul-de-sac, approximately 450' in length. The two additional lots will front Greenly Street. The applicant proposes to have three additional single-family lots created, fronting Greenly Street, that are not part of this condominium. Surrounding properties that are developed contain single-family and two-family residential uses. The subject property, and surrounding properties, are zoned R-2 Moderate Density Residential and planned for Moderate Density Residential (R-2 equivalent).

Mr. Dan Larabel was present to speak to this request. Mr. Larabel stated that he submitted floor plans and renderings as well as vertical boundaries to the Planners. He also stated that they submitted a supplemental landscape plan which added trees to the entrance as they want to make that as appealing as possible; however, they have no intent to place shade trees or street trees. Working with the Ottawa County Water Resource Commission and Road Commission are all next steps after they obtain site plan approval.

Mr. Nykamp asked for clarification about working with the public works, and asked if they are referring to the easements between 7 & 8 and 8 & 9? Mr. Larabel answered, yes.

Staff stated that the proposed storm water retention areas take up a good section of the lots; therefore, making it very difficult to have accessory buildings on these lots. Especially with units 14-18 having such small building envelopes. Staff is recommending that this be pointed out in the master deed so that future buyers know this going into purchasing the property.

Mr. Nykamp asked about a sign easement and entrance plans. Staff answered that because this is a preliminary approval those items do not need to be handled now. Mr. Larabel stated that for now they don't have a sign and may not put one in, but if they do, they will put it on the final plan and submit a sign permit.

** It was moved by Mr. VanderMeulen and supported by Ms. Rynsburger to recommend the Board of Trustees approve the preliminary site condominium plan with the required approvals being obtained from the OCWRC and OCRC prior to review of the final request, and subject to a condition that one shade tree per lot, subject to the size and species requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, be provided and included on final plans. Motion carried.

Staff noted that the request submitted by Joe Vongkaysone of Holland Poker Club for the property located at 218 N. River Ave., Suites 228 & 230 has been withdrawn by the applicant due to them finding out that they would not be in compliance with state law. They applicant withdrew their request with an apology for wasting the time of the Planning Commission.

Staff also pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan is available for review on-line at hollandtownshipplan.com. Comments from the Commission are welcome before they enter the next phase. The next portion of the project will be to define graphs in the next month or two, after that the formal review and process will happen and that will take 2-3 months due to the need for public notices

and time for public comments. Mr. Hoeve stated that he feels a meeting needs to be done face-to-face possibly in a larger location like a school gymnasium. Staff pointed out that there have been many opportunities for residents to give comments and participate.

Mr. Gebben pointed out that we seem to be dealing with private roads and private access drives more and more. Is there a list of items that we need to pay attention to as we deal with these issues? Staff answered that the Commissioners should review Section 8.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff also noted that many applicants are using loop holes to get away with many things like not having setbacks and easements by using these private roads or private access drives. This creates parking issues when the driveways are so short that only one car can be parked in the driveway and this causes overflow parking on the roads causing other issues.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld
Recording Secretary