

**HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**August 9, 2022**

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, Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Leo Barajas, Doug Becker, Miska Rynsburger and Evan Sharp. Also present were Community Development Director Corey Broersma, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator Kate White and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

**Absent:** Steve Darrow.

**Public Comment:** None.

**Minutes:**

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Barajas to approve the minutes of the July 12, 2022, meeting with a couple minor changes. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Public Hearings:**

**Chairman Kortering opened a public hearing for consideration** of a special land use permit submitted by Mike Winkler of Building Safety Consultants LLC on behalf of Russ Shilander of Lightkeeper LLC. Said lands are located at 390 Douglas Ave., described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-30-201-006. Petitioner is seeking a permit for a Hotel/Motel. The subject property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

Present for this request was Mr. Mike Winkler of Building Safety Consultants LLC.

Mr. Winkler said that in 2004 the owners were issued a permit to convert a house on the property to an ice cream shop. At that time, the owners were unable to find another use that would comply within the restrictions of a C-2 zoned parcel. Maintaining the building as an ice cream shop is not viable with a larger ice cream shop just down the road. Mr. Winkler stated that his client is now looking to convert the ice cream shop to a single unit hotel. Mr. Winkler stated that in the zoning ordinance in section 22.1 4c, it states "words used in the plural number shall include the singular number."

Mr. Winkler stated that his client does not intend to make any alterations to the outside of the building, leaving it a lighthouse. This project is unique to this area as the property is zoned C-2 which is the appropriate zoning for a motel/hotel, however, the proposal is for a single unit hotel. Mr. Winkler noted that this use will produce less traffic than the ice cream shop did. He also said that they will have an accessible entrance as well as handicap and regular parking. Mr. Winkler noted that the change of use would require interior remodeling only.

Ms. Rynsburger asked if this would be a single-story unit? Mr. Winkler said that it would be. Ms. Rynsburger then asked what the square footage of the unit would be? Mr. Winkler said that the original building is 22' x 24' with an 8' x 20' addition put on at some point.

Mr. Becker asked how a single unit hotel would work since there will not be staff on site to check-in guests and take reservations. Mr. Winkler answered that this client would most likely advertise on sites such as Airbnb or VRBO. He noted that this is not like a regular short-term rental in the fact that they are not located in a residential neighborhood but are on a commercial property. Mr. Winkler also pointed out the unique situation of a trailer park located directly to the west of this property.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked what would need to be done to bring the building up to code for a hotel/motel? Mr. Winkler said that they would need to install a fire sprinkling system. Due to this and the fact that the main door will be located in the bedroom he doesn't think there will be a need for an egress window.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if there will be any landscaping or an outdoor courtyard area? Mr. Winkler answered that at this point there is not an outdoor courtyard planned. They plan to keep the beach grass that is around the building currently as they feel it adds to the novelty of the light house building.

Ms. Rynsburger asked if this will be managed like an Airbnb/VRBO or if the owner will manage the property with things like maintenance and cleaning? Mr. Winkler said that it will be owner managed.

Mr. Kortering asked if a motel can be a single room? Mr. Winkler said that the zoning ordinance states in section 22.1 4c "words used in the plural should also include the singular." Mr. Winkler also read the definition of a hotel/motel as "*A building under single management that provides rooms or suites intended primarily as sleeping accommodations for public rental on a daily basis for registered guests. Other supportive facilities may also be included such as, but not limited to, meeting rooms, incidental retail sales, restaurants, lounges, swimming pools...*" and so on.

Mr. Barajas stated that this is a different idea. He stated that he is not against it but is wondering what legal issues could arise from this? Mr. Winkler noted that the hotel/motel will share a curb cut with Beechwood Grill. The property is currently its own separate parcel but it could be combined with the Beechwood Grill parcel if necessary; however, the owner would prefer to keep it separate for accounting purposes.

Mr. Sharp said that consistency is good and stated that he is worried that if we allow this single unit hotel then how do we handle other single unit rentals in the future and stay consistent.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked how is this different from a VRBO/Airbnb? Mr. Barajas asked a follow-up question of how many residential buildings are currently on commercially zoned parcels? Staff answered that there are probably less than 100 in the Township. Staff did point out that this is different because it doesn't have a home on it currently. It is already a commercial building and they are asking to change the commercial use, they are not converting a residential building into a commercial special use.

Mr. Winkler noted that any property would have to obtain a special use from the Planning Commission, but agreed that this is a very unique situation.

Mr. Barajas asked if this is needed in the Township? He noted that they determined recently that the Township does not need any more hotels/motels.

Mr. Kortering said that he is sympathetic to the owner, but he is concerned that this will open the door to more requests like this.

Mr. Becker said that he too feels for the owner as there is not much they can do with the property. He stated that this is a creative solution, but he also agrees with Mr. Sharp and Mr. Barajas that it could open it up for others. Mr. Becker said that even given these potential issues, he is leaning toward approving the request.

Mr. Kortering is concerned that allowing this will open up the Township for VRBO/Airbnb rentals and they have already had the discussion about these and decided not to allow them in the Township.

Ms. Rynsburger likes the novelty of the light house, as Big Red is such an icon in Holland. She stated that she feels like we are trying to compare apples to oranges when talking about a full-size hotel and a single room hotel. Ms. Rynsburger feels this would be good for tourism and the community.

Chairman Kortering opened the meeting up for public comments.

There was no one from the public to comment on this item.

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

The Commissioners had some concerns and statements:

1. Mr. Kortering stated that he would like to know more about the set-backs, buffers, landscaping, etc.
2. Ms. Rynsburger noted that if this property is generating income, then it will be maintained better than if it just becomes a storage shed.
3. Mr. Kortering asked if the neighbors next door in the trailer park would want a hotel in their backyard?
4. Mr. VanderMeulen said that if they approve this special use for the property then if the building burns down, they could then build something larger with more units in it.

Staff responded to the Commissioners concerns and said that if the special use is granted, they would recommend the Commission set parameters in the approval of a 1-unit that would not be allowed to be upgraded to a 2-room hotel. Staff also noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals would need to be involved again if, say, the building burned down and they wanted to rebuild on the site.

Staff said that they do not believe the described 1-room facility constitutes a hotel and there is not enough information to adequately understand how the use will function. Staff would recommend tabling the matter and instruct the applicant to consider the following:

1. Add an additional room(s) and provide a floor plan in order to better understand occupancy;
2. Provide details about the facility's management and maintenance program;
3. Combine the subject lot with the restaurant to reduce nonconformities of the existing lot and increase the "mixed use" of the resulting property;
4. Secure variances to extend the life of the non-conforming structure and relief from parking setbacks and landing buffers (unless mandated as part of any Planning Commission approval).

Staff believes there are not enough details regarding the entrance, floor plans, outdoor amenities, parking, etc. to approve the request tonight.

Mr. Kortering asked how the Commission would handle the next applicant that comes with a similar request. What conditions can they put in an approval of this request that would help with any future 1-room hotels?

Mr. Sharp is uncomfortable with this for the sake of consistency.

Mr. Becker said that he understands the need for consistency but is still leaning towards approving the project.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked how do we handle the neighbors next door with possible traffic at 2:00 am.

Mr. Kortering went over the options for the Commission for this request. He then went through the standards of approval.

#### 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 use would not be harmonious because it's a motel/hotel and it wasn't originally intended to be that at first.

- 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.**

This is true. However, we don't know the floor plan.

- 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.**

This is not an issue. They are not intending to include any hot tubs or pools.

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

The Planning Commission will need to evaluate whether the single use supports the economic vibrancy, mixed use vision, and walkability of the surrounding area.

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

No exterior changes.

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

Agree as this use would only have at the most 2 cars at a time.

**7. There is need for the proposed use within the township.**

The Planning Commission shall determine if applicant has adequately addressed this standard or whether further study is needed.

Mr. Kortering then read Staff's recommendation from the Staff Report:

Staff does not believe the described 1-room facility constitutes a hotel per 22.1 4c. Staff would recommend tabling the matter and instruct the applicant to consider the following:

1. Add an additional room(s);
2. Provide details about the facility's management and maintenance program;
3. Combine the subject lot with the restaurant to reduce nonconformities;
4. Secure variances to extend the life of the non-conforming structure and relief from parking setbacks.

Mr. Becker asked why Staff would recommend combining the two lots. Staff said that at the Zoning Board of Appeals, when dealing with a non-conforming property, they try to get it to a more conforming place and with this property, by combining the lots, this would eliminate some non-conformities. Mr. VanderMeulen noted that combining the parcels would help with the shared curb cut as well. Mr. Kortering asked if they would combine the lots, would it be harder for them to sell the smaller lot later? Staff said they would have several options at that point.

Mr. Barajas said that he has seen jurisdictions approve something like this but put a condition on the approval that if they get 3 or more complaints/citations then their approval is revoked. Staff said that they would not advise going this route.

Ms. Rynsburger said at this point she is most comfortable tabling the request and having the applicant come back with more information.

The Commissioners asked if this would be covered under the Township's rental policies? Would they have to obtain a hotel license? Staff answered that the Township does not grant hotel licenses and that this would not fall under the Township's rental policies because the rentals would be less than 15 days.

Mr. Kortering asked Staff if they approve this, how does the Commission handle those questions regarding the fact that we don't allow Airbnb/VRBO rentals, but we allowed this? Staff said the difference here is this is on commercial property, not on residential property.

Mr. Kortering asked Mr. Becker if he could bring this up to the Township Board to get their initial opinion on this idea.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he would like to see some sort of outdoor space even if it's just a small patio with a couple of chairs for the guests to be able to sit outside.

Mr. Kortering noted that if the Commission moves to table the request, the items that they would like more information on would be feedback from the Township Board, a site plan based on a professional survey, boundary description if the two parcels are to be combined, circulation, parking, buffers, etc.

\*\* It was moved by VanderMeulen and supported by Sharp to deny the request for a special land use permit for a hotel/motel. A roll call vote was taken. Yes - 3, No – 3, Absent - 1. Motion failed, no majority vote.

\*\*\* It was moved by Rynsburger and supported by Becker to table the request for a special land use permit for a hotel/motel until the applicant provides a site plan, a floor plan, details regarding management and maintenance, and a decision if lots will be combined. Also, the Commission will obtain the opinion of the Township Board and find out from Staff the number of lots in the Township that could be in the same situation. A roll call vote was taken. Yes – 5, No – 1, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

#### **Other Business:**

**0 (Vacant) Greenly Street (70-16-10-100-048) – Hickorywoods Farm No. 6** – Preliminary Plat Request for Preliminary Plat approval submitted by DeYoung Developments, LLC for a residential subdivision consisting of lots 220-254 located along an extension of Elderberry Drive, south of Quincy and extending south to Greenly Street.

Applicant requested a postponement until the September 6, 2022 meeting. The Commission accepts the postponement.

**0 (Vacant) Ransom Street (70-16-04-200-018) – Future Land Use Map Amendment** – Request by Todd Johns of Blue Water Industrial Development LLC to amend Future Land Use Plan Map of the Holland Charter Township Comprehensive Master Plan. Petitioner is seeking to amend the subject land's Future Land Use designation from Public/Quasi-Public to Light Industrial.

Present for this request was Mr. Justin Longstreth of Moore & Bruggink and Mr. Steve Wilson of NorthStar Commercial.

Mr. Longstreth said that they have acquired this piece of land between Ransom and New Holland from West Ottawa Public Schools and they are looking to develop the land into light industrial. The land is currently zoned agricultural and in the Future Land Use Map it is zoned "Public/Quasi-Public" because of the fact that a public school owns the property.

Mr. Longstreth noted that the lands to the south and the west are zoned light industrial. This is a good piece of land for this use because there is easy access for semi-trucks from US-31. Mr. Longstreth stated that there are not many parcels available in West Michigan for light industrial uses.

Mr. Longstreth said that they have had conversations with the Ottawa County Drain Commissioner, Michigan Waterways and the Ottawa County Road Commission and there are no red flags from any of these entities. He stated that all utilities are adequate for the proposed use.

Mr. Longstreth said that they are looking to have 6 buildings on the property with a couple larger buildings and a few smaller buildings.

Mr. Wilson said that they are constantly getting inquiries for light industrial, but they are not able to find land in West Michigan. He said that this is a good location as it would allow them access to power, full seasons roads, etc. Mr. Wilson said that they have a client, with 450 employees, that is looking to consolidate multiple locations under one roof and need land for a 430,000 sq. ft. building and this parcel can accommodate this need. Mr. Wilson also noted that in other larger parcels, they have found there are quite often issues such as the slope of the land or drainage, not allowing them to develop the land.

Mr. Wilson said that West Ottawa Public Schools had some conditions for the new occupants of the land that they either provide jobs for the area or housing for local children, both which will benefit the school system.

Mr. Kortering asked if this client that is looking for a 430,000 sq. ft. building would use the whole property? Mr. Wilson answered that they would not and that there would be 5 buildings on the property. He noted that the drawing he was showing the Commissioners does show 6 buildings, however, since speaking with the government entities about the property they will have to eliminate one of the buildings. Mr. Bush, the Drain Commissioner, is requiring the developer build the drain and then the County would take over the maintenance of the drain.

Mr. Kortering stated that it is not really a problem to change the FLUM since this is currently designated as Public/Quasi-Public and it needs to change since the school will not be using the property.

Staff noted that there is a small strip of land that is not included within any parcel on GIS. Staff would like to see a survey done so that it can be determined who owns that strip of land or if it should be included in this property.

Staff clarified that tonight the Commission is only approving the intent to look into potentially amending the Future Land Use Map. Staff then went on to describe the subsequent steps in the process.

Mr. Kortering asked if a child care facility is allowed in light industrial? He is questioning this because this is being brought up by businesses that they would like to offer child care close to where the parents work.

Mr. Wilson said that they have developed TLE (The Learning Experience) Centers and feels that this could be a way to tie in with the school. Staff noted that daycare is not allow but training studios (such as karate, gymnastics, etc.) are allowed. Staff could look into the idea of group education further.

Mr. Becker wanted to make sure the applicant was aware that there will not be sewer available in that area until 2025. Staff agreed that this area will be challenging as sewer will be 5/6 years out yet.

Mr. Becker said that Future Land Use Map changes are a big deal and that the Township Board does not like making changes to the Future Land Use Map, but because this is zoned Public/Quasi-Public on the Future Land Use Map we will need to change it since the school will no longer own the land and he feels this is a good zoning to change it to.

Mr. Wilson said that in talking to the Road Commission, they are not looking to pave 124<sup>th</sup> and would be willing to give the developer the rights to the road. Mr. Wilson said that the plans only have the access point on New Holland and one other access point.

Staff stated that they have no problem moving forward tonight. Mr. Broersma did point out that the unidentified strip would be an issue at the next step, so they do need to get that figured out before the public comment stage.

Mr. Kortering read Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission's decision at this time is whether to authorize an intent to plan letter be drafted and sent to:

1. The County Board of Commissioners;
2. The Planning Commission or Legislative Body of each contiguous municipality;
3. Each public utility company, railroad company, and public transportation agency owning or operating a public utility, railroad, or public transportation system within the local unit of government; and
4. Any government entity that registers its name with planning commission for this purpose.

If the Planning Commission believes this idea is worth considering further, they may direct Staff to distribute the intent to plan letter.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Rynsburger to authorize the drafting and sending of an intent to plan letter by Staff. A roll call vote was taken. Yes - 6, No – 0, Absent – 1. Motion carried.

## **Tabled Items**

**0 James Street (70-16-16-300-011)** – Future Land Use Map Amendment – Mark Tomasik of Innovative Design o/b/o KAL Properties LLC. (Tabled April 12, 2022)

Present to speak to this request was Mr. Mark Tomasik of Innovative Design o/b/o KAL Properties LLC.

Mr. Tomasik said that he has submitted a new site plan that better shows what is buildable and what is not on this unusual parcel. The new site plan shows the road with a 3-lane approach. Mr. Tomasik indicated that the buildings will be laid out around the floodplain areas. He also noted that they have added a pedestrian walking path along the creek. Mr. Tomasik said that the new plan keeps a lot of the trees that are currently there along the creek side of the property which creates a large buffer zone to the adjacent residential area to the west.

Mr. Tomasik pointed out that there is not a lot of buildable area on this unusual shaped parcel, so they ended up with greater than 50' setbacks. He said that this makes for a better buffer allowing the creek and trees to create a natural buffer.

Mr. Tomasik said that they have quite a bit of parking on the site plan, however, they are finding that a lot of these types of businesses are now allowing their employees to work from home and therefore, they only need the majority of their parking space once or twice a week when all the employees come in for a meeting.

Mr. Tomasik then addressed the water service to the development. He said that the County doesn't want a dead-end water main, so they would have to use part of the east side of the property to provide circulation of the water service.

Mr. Tomasik said that they have been in talks with EGLE regarding storm water and they have several options to handle storm water including retention ponds, storing water in parking lots, and managing the grading of the property to allow it to flow into the creek. Mr. Tomasik said that his next step would be to get an official site plan with topographical details.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked if semi-trucks would be able to get back into the site of the northwest building for deliveries and if they have planned for fire access to each of the buildings. Mr. Tomasik said that they plan to provide 3-sided fire access which is what they understand is required, but if full access is required and they can't fit it in then they just won't build here.

Mr. Kortering asked Mr. Tomasik if he feels he can get tenants. Mr. Tomasik said that would not be a problem.

Mr. Barajas said that he feels the best use for this land is to be commercial because the creek feels like a natural buffer between residential and commercial. Where if the residential was also on the other side of the creek with commercial right next to it then the buffer would most likely be a fence and he would rather see this natural buffer area than a fence.

Mr. VanderMeulen wanted to remind the Commissioners that they are not approving the site plan tonight, they are strictly approving the Future Land Use Map amendment. Mr. VanderMeulen thanked Mr. Tomasik for coming back with a plan so that they could better see the vision for his development.

\*\* It was moved by Becker and supported by Barajas to recommend approval to the Township Board for the proposed FLU Map amendment, changing the subject land's designation from Low Density Residential to Community Commercial. A roll call vote was taken. Yes - 6, No - 0, Absent - 1. Motion carried.

**0 (Vacant) Campus Avenue (70-16-07-200-044) – 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue Apartments** – Site Plan Review Request for Site Plan Approval for a 48-unit multi-family apartment complex submitted by Kyle Friar of KMF Construction consisting of 2 buildings 3-stories in height for the dwellings and 2 buildings 1-story in height for garages. The subject property is zoned R-3 High Density Residential. (Tabled July 12, 2022)

This item is to remain tabled.

## **Planning Commission Discussion – Master Plan Sub-Area Overlay Zoning District(s)**

Mr. VanderMeulen recently visited some other cities in other states and has some ideas that he shared with the Commission from some of their developments that he feels could be integrated into this Federal District Area.

The Commissioners discussed the sample intent statement and wanted to add the verbiage “nodes of activities” to the statement.

They then discussed other items that should or should not be allowed such as surfaces, glazing, open air seating, lighting, and other items to unify the area. Consistency in building heights as well as surface finishes were discussed.

Next, the Commissioners discussed how much residential they would like in the area.

## **Planning Commission Discussion – One-Year Moratorium on Certain Residential Development**

Staff stated that at the August 4, 2022, meeting the Township Board extended the moratorium until the December 31, 2022.

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 6, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld  
Recording Secretary