

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held  
Wednesday, August 21, 2019**

Meeting called to order by Chairman Smit at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Josiah Samy, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Richard VanderKlok, Donna Ferguson

Absent: None

Also present: Mannelle Minier, Zoning Administrator

**#190821-01 – Agenda for August 21, 2019**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the agenda as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#190821-02 – Minutes of the July 10, 2019 meeting**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the minutes as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#190821-03 – (PUD1902) and (PUD1902-52) West Michigan Development Company, Ottawa Land Investments LLC**, is requesting REVISED preliminary planned unit development plan approval and final development plan approval for single family detached home sites, attached and detached condominiums, clubhouse, open spaces and other amenities, on parcels of land described as follows, Ottawa County, Michigan ([application and plans](#))

1. 70-14-05-400-022
2. 70-14-05-400-023
3. 70-14-05-400-024
4. 70-14-04-300-030
5. 70-14-09-100-062
6. 70-14-04-300-036
7. 70-14-05-400-041
8. 70-14-09-400-040
9. 70-14-05-400-040
10. 70-14-05-489-001

The Zoning Administrator presented a [staff report](#).

Kelly Kuiper, Nederveld and Associates, represented the applicant and presented the request.

Richard VanderKlok and Jeannine Bolhouse said that they had no problem with the proposed change.

Josiah Samy asked why there were more condos than townhomes.

Kelly Kuiper stated the following. The project has been around for a long time, initially approved in 2004. There was one giant plan. During the last twelve years the market condition has changed. Now they want to provide more diversity and housing style options.

Tim Smit asked if the townhomes were planned for the future.

Kelly Kuiper explained that the plan could change again, even with major PUD amendments and noted that the condos were more of a ranch style and the townhomes were multi-story.

Donna Ferguson asked when there would be more entrances.

Kelly Kuiper said that the entrance from Taylor St. was open now and the accesses had been discussed with the Township and the Road Commission.

Tom Healy stated the following. This makes the setbacks more uniform with having all be 7 feet to the side lot line or 14 feet between buildings for all the condos. This will be more aesthetically appealing. He asked about the additional unit and setbacks.

Kelly Kuiper said that this protects the original approval number of total units. She said that if construction costs increase, there could be more attached units.

The zoning administrator explained the following. There are some townhouses completed. The entire PUD was approved with setbacks less than required for a conventional development. The reason was because the PUD had at least 20% of open space for the use of the residents. Rather than having larger lots, the lots were smaller and the cumulative extra land was open space for all the residents. They have many amenities, including a pool and clubhouse, plus a lot of passive open space.

The chairperson opened the floor to public comments. No one was present to speak on this topic. The chairperson closed the floor to public comments.

**Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve (PUD1902) the revised preliminary development plan for West Michigan Development Company, Ottawa Land Investments LLC, to have a planned unit development (preliminary development plan) for single family detached home sites, attached condominiums, clubhouse, open spaces and other amenities, on parcels of land described as**

1. 70-14-05-400-022
2. 70-14-05-400-023
3. 70-14-05-400-024
4. 70-14-04-300-030
5. 70-14-09-100-062
6. 70-14-04-300-036
7. 70-14-05-400-041
8. 70-14-05-400-040
9. 70-14-05-489-001 to -010 (condos)

**Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan, as shown on the following:**

- a. [The same preliminary development plan 1](#) dated 7/31/12 previously approved on September 19, 2012;
- b. [The same preliminary development plan 2](#) dated 6/14/12 previously approved on September 19, 2012;

**Except with the changes as noted below:**

<u>2012 Plan</u>	<u>2019 Revisions</u>
lots with 75' min width - 110 lots	92 (-18)
lots with 85' min width - 106 lots	96 (-10)
112 townhouse units	156 (+44)
122 units	118 (-4)

**With the total units of 834 and with the possible total number of overall units to not exceed 852, as previously approved.**

**And with the major change of revising the setbacks between all condo units (including single detached and attached) to a minimum of 14 feet. (The previously approved preliminary plan already allowed a minimum of 14 feet between the single detached condos, but required a minimum of 16 feet between multi-family condos.)**

Note that Chapter 24 footnote (j) requires a minimum of 25 feet between contiguous buildings. The previously approved preliminary plan showed:

- 1) a minimum of a 7 foot side yard setback for the single family homes;
- 2) a minimum of 14 feet between the single detached condos; and
- 3) a minimum of 16 feet between the attached multi-family condos, **now revised to a minimum of 14 feet between the attached multi-family condos.**

Including a REVISED final development plan for phase 2 of the condos to include an additional unit.

**On the basis that the following are met:**

- a. **Qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2.**
- b. **The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development.**
- c. **The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.**
- d. **The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.**
- e. **The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Sec. 22.8, D.**
- f. **The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided.**
- g. **The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10.**

**And with the following conditions:**

- a. **The previously approved landscaping plan remains in effect.**

- b. **The previously approved minimum of 900 square feet is required for the area of the attached condominiums and townhomes.**
- c. **The eyebrows on the street layout are not required and the street may have the eyebrows provided at the developer's discretion.**
- d. **Previous approval for signs remains in effect. Sign permits must be obtained for ALL signs. Any signs not expressly approved with the PUD MUST meet ordinance requirements. No sign shall be located within the road right-of-way. Any sign not approved with the PUD and not allowed by the ordinance must be removed immediately or changed to a conforming sign. All signs other than the plat entry waterfall sign must meet ordinance requirements because the approval does not include any signs.**
- e. **All other previous approvals not explicitly changed with this new approval remain in effect.**
- f. **The PUD agreement shall be recorded and provided prior to the issuance of any building permits.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to approve the final development plan for (PUD1902-52), West Michigan Development Company, Ottawa Land Investments LLC, to have attached and detached condominiums, on parcels of land described as follows, Ottawa County, Michigan.**

1. **70-14-09-100-062**
2. **70-14-04-300-036**

**as shown on the following:**

- a. **Final development [plan](#) sheet C-102, dated 05/30/19,**
- b. **Final development [plan](#) sheet C-101, dated 07/05/19.**

**On the basis that the following are met:**

- a. **Qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2.**
- b. **The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development.**
- c. **The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.**
- d. **The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.**
- e. **The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.**

**And with the following conditions:**

- a. **A recorded PUD agreement (according to Sec. 22.11) is submitted prior to the submission of a building permit application for this phase.**
- b. **Sign permits must be obtained for ALL signs. Any signs not expressly approved with the PUD MUST meet ordinance requirements. No sign shall be located within the road right-of-way. Any sign not approved with the PUD and not allowed by the ordinance must be removed immediately or changed to a conforming sign. All previous approvals for signs remain in effect.**

- c. **The location, type and size of all proposed landscaping and site amenities (art work, fences, gateway features, etc.) were approved with the previous approvals and remain in effect.**
- d. **Approval from the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission is required.**

#### **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **#190821-04 – Public Comments**

There were public comment about distributed antenna systems installed near Georgetown Shores.

The Zoning Administrator stated the following. The Township Board regulated the use of these antennas through a resolution and the Planning Commission had no authority to regulate them in any way, including adopting an ordinance, because they were in the road right-of-way. These antennas on light poles were completely different from the cell towers that were regulated in the ordinance with approval from the Planning Commission.

#### **#190821-05 – Other Business**

The Zoning Administrator brought two items to the attention of the Planning Commission at the request of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

1. Solar Panels. The ZBA, at its last meeting, denied a variance for a large array of solar panels to be located in the front yard. The ZBA asked the Planning Commission to review revising the ordinance to allow them in the front yard. The Planning Commission discussed revising the ordinance to allow solar panels in a front yard.

The unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission was to not revise the ordinance to allow solar arrays or panels to be located in a front yard for the following reasons: 1) they were currently allowed as an accessory use in the non-required side yard and in the rear yard; 2) they were allowed on rooftops and on buildings; 3) when technology advanced to the stage of being smaller solar panels and arrays the Planning Commission could revisit amending the ordinance to allow them in the front yard.

2. Second freestanding sign. The ZBA, at its last meeting, tabled a request for a business on Chicago Dr. with over 900 feet of frontage to have a second freestanding sign. At this point, the property owner submitted an application to split the property and it was approved. Therefore, that property has half of the former frontage; therefore, the reason of the length of the property for the second sign is null and void. Comments included that it may be appropriate in certain instances, such as on Chicago Dr. and with a length of over 500 or 600 feet to allow a second sign, particularly if there are two driveway entrances.

The unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission was to leave the ordinance as it is currently written and to revisit it sometime in the future since no one else is asking at this point and it has become a moot issue for the variance applicant since he split his property.

Sidewalks. Tim Smit asked why the Board didn't waive sidewalk requirements for the business on Chicago Dr. There was discussion and it was noted that the Township Board was committed to making the community pedestrian friendly. Many times people say that it is a sidewalk to

nowhere. But the sidewalks have to start somewhere and if every sidewalk requirement in the commercial districts is waived, they will never start to have sidewalks. If the Board doesn't want sidewalks in the commercial districts or in certain instances, the ordinance should be changed for all to reflect this.

#### **#190821-06 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.