

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held Wednesday, September 1, 2010**

Meeting called to order by Chairman Honderd at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Greg Honderd, Scott Blouw, Cornelius Huizinga, Don Hebler, Del South, Brad Lyons, Rebecca VanDenBerg

Absent: none

Also present: Mannette Minier, Zoning Administrator

**#100901-01 – Agenda for September 1, 2010**

Moved by Rebecca VanDenBerg, seconded by Del South, to approve the agenda as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#100901-02 - Minutes of the regular July 21, 2010 meeting**

Moved by Del South, seconded by Scott Blouw, to approve the minutes as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#100901-03 – Unfinished Business-(SUP1003) Wellspring Church-site plan (no new information is available)**

The zoning administrator presented a review as follows.

The site plan for the special use permit for Wellspring Church was tabled at the April 21, 2010 Planning Commission meeting. No new information has been provided from the applicants. During a phone conversation, the applicant indicated that it is unlikely that the project will proceed at this time due to the fact that the special use permit condition of using the second driveway only for emergency use is unacceptable after the church would incur a large expense to constructing the cul de sac on the church property and then dedicate the property to the Road Commission.

In the past, it has been the Planning Commission's policy to deny plans that have been under Unfinished Business for more than three months. At the April 21, 2010 Planning Commission meeting the item was tabled and that occurred about four and a half months ago. Therefore, the Planning Commission could take action to deny the site plan and the applicant would have to re-apply if they determined to proceed.

Moved by Rebecca VanDenBerg, seconded by Don Hebler, to remove the item from the table.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moved by Don Hebler, seconded by Cornelius Huizinga, to deny the site plan for Wellspring Church dated 3/16/10 due to the fact that no revisions have been submitted to comply with direction given and approved by the Planning Commission and Township Board.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#100901-04 – Site Plan (ST1004) Steve /Shelly Frody Investments-6501 Balsam ([application](#), [site plan](#))**

Todd Stuiwe, Exxel Engineering, represented the applicants and presented the request.

The zoning administrator presented a review as follows.

**REQUEST**

The request is for site plan approval for an existing house structure to be remodeled for an office use. The property has been zoned CS since prior to 1988. The house was obviously built prior to that time when the property was zoned for a residential use.

**SUMMARY**

- a. Setbacks meet ordinance requirements. Chapter 24 footnote (l) and (m) are applicable; however, both are met since there is no parking in the front yard setback and because the property to the south in the City of Hudsonville is zoned (LC) Light Commercial. Therefore, no greenbelt or distance requirement for residentially zoned property is applicable. The two new proposed additions of a covered porch and a storage building addition with a shed roof are both located within the building envelope. The additions must be architecturally similar as per Sec. 3.6(E) and note 5 in the Site Plan General Notes states that all building additions will be architecturally similar to the main structure.
- b. The landscaping requirement in Sec. 3.11 has been met with the number of trees; however, the **number of evergreens exceeds the maximum of 1/3<sup>rd</sup>**. In June 2009, the Planning Commission recommended approval and the Board approved a Zoning Ordinance revision as follows which gives the Planning Commission the opportunity to find that the larger number of evergreens provides better screening and better enhanced the aesthetics of the Community. The Planning Commission will have to make this determination.

Sec. 3.11(3) The streetscape shall contain one (1) tree for each twenty-five feet of frontage or fraction thereof, measured along the street right-of-way line, including driveway openings. **Up to one-third (1/3) of the required trees may be evergreens (unless the Planning Commission finds that a larger percentage of evergreens will provide better screening or better enhance the aesthetics of the community)**. The remainder shall be deciduous canopy or ornamental trees. (revised 6-8-09)

**All areas not covered by pavement or structures shall be landscaped with grass or similar ground cover.**

- c. **A Storm Water Drain permit (written approval) from the Ottawa County Drain Commissioner's office will be required at the time a building permit is submitted.**
- d. **A building permit/Zoning Compliance Certificate will be required for the demolition, remodeling and additions.**

The following demonstrates compliance with Township ordinances.

ID number	ST1004	Date	8/18/2010
Name	Steve and Shelly Frody		
Address	6501 Balsam		
Use	Office	SUP required	No

REQUIREMENT	PROVIDED	Needs or Comments
Date, north arrow, scale	X	
Name, address of preparer	X	
Name, address of property owner or petitioner	X	
Location sketch	X	
Legal description	X	
Size in acres of the property	X	
Property lines and required setbacks shown and dimensioned	X	a. setbacks
Location of existing structures, drives, parking areas within 100 ft of boundary	X	
Location and dimensions of existing and proposed structures	X	
Location of existing and proposed drives (dimensions and radii), circulation	X	
Sidewalks, non-motorized paths-select streets, accel, decel lanes	X	
Signs, exterior lighting	X	
Curbing, parking areas, dimensions of typical space, number of parking spaces	X	
Calculations of parking spaces, unloading areas	X	
Location, pavement width, ROW of all abutting roads, easements	X	
Existing zoning, and zoning and use of abutting property	X	
Location of existing vegetation-parkway association	NA	
Location, type, size of proposed landscaping, streetscape, greenbelt		b. trees
Location, height, type of existing and proposed fences and walls	X	
Size, location of proposed, existing utilities, connections to water/sewer	X	
Location, size of surface water drainage facilities		c. Storm Permit
Existing, proposed topo contours, max 5 ft intervals	X	
Rec/common areas, floodplain areas	X	
Special Use Standards, general and specific	NA	
Residential development extra requirements-attached garages	NA	

Rebecca VanDenBerg supported saving the two existing trees and questioned the sign location since it was set far back from the road.

The chairman opened the floor to public comments.

Shelley Frody said that she was concerned with the sign so far from the road and said that they preferred to have the ground mounted sign rather than a wall sign since the ground mounted was more visible.

Steve Frody said that they would love to be in line with the other signs that were closer to the road.

Rebecca VanDenBerg said that the trees overpower the sign.

Cornelius Huizinga asked about the proposed window well.

Todd Stuive said that the applicants intended to use the basement as office space.

Don Hebler said that he liked the fact that they were using an existing building.

Brad Lyons asked if they had contacted the Drain Commission and if they complied with Drain Commission standards.

Todd Stuive said that they were waiting for site plan approval first; however, there was a catch basin and they could prepare it for overflow.

Brad Lyons said that a permit is required for work in the road right-of-way and the plan does not meet commercial driveway requirements.

Todd Stuive said that they would like to propose the driveway as shown, but would change it if required.

Brad Lyons said that although the plan technically meets ordinance requirements, it is a very tight fit for practical considerations such as where snow would be stored.

Del South asked if this would be a multi-tenant building and was told no. He said that there should be no problem with the sign since people would know where the real estate office was and he was okay with the larger percentage of evergreens.

The zoning administrator said that the Planning Commission has no authority to approve a location for the sign other than in compliance with ordinance requirements and that applicants obtain site plan approval prior to a review with the Drain Commissioner because the Planning Commission may want changes to the plan. She said that a Storm Water Drain permit is normally required to be submitted at the time a building permit application is submitted.

Greg Honderd asked if cross access should be provided to the property to the south.

The zoning administrator said that the applicants had contacted the property owner to the north asking for cross access but were denied.

Steve Frody said that they wanted to keep the garage and had asked for access to the rear of the property through the property to the north, but were refused unless they wanted to purchase the lot. He said that they would love to have parking in the front, but it did not meet the ordinance.

Greg Honderd said that they have seen no plans for the property to the south.

Steve Frody said that it is located within the city limits of Hudsonville.

Greg Honderd said that it did not matter that the property was outside of the Township and if the two properties shared a driveway, they could make the driveway wider and have less curb cuts.

Todd Stuve said that they wanted their own driveway because they did not know what would happen in the City of Hudsonville and this was not the same as having cross access for commercial or retail uses. He said that it would not provide a big benefit.

Greg Honderd said that it would help with traffic flow.

Brad Lyons said that there is a two to three foot elevation change between the properties and cross access may not be practical.

Moved by Scott Blouw, seconded by Rebecca VanDenBerg, to approve the site plan dated 08/16/10 REV PER TWP, as presented based on the findings that all applicable standards of the ordinance have been met, with the finding that the number of evergreen trees better enhances the aesthetics of the community, and with the following conditions:

1. All areas not covered by pavement or structures shall be landscaped with grass or similar ground cover.
2. A Storm Water Drain permit (written approval) from the Ottawa County Drain Commissioner's office will be required at the time a building permit is submitted.
3. A building permit/Zoning Compliance Certificate will be required for the demolition, remodeling and additions.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#100901-05 – Proposed Draft Wind Energy Ordinance** (Ottawa County [Model Ordinance](#); [Proposed Draft](#) for Georgetown Township)

There was discussion on the Ottawa County [Model Ordinance](#) and the [Proposed Draft](#) for Georgetown Township. The consensus was to further review at the next meeting.

**#100901-06 – Adjournment**

Moved by Don Hebler, seconded by Scott Blouw, to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.