I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Pledge to the Flag

IV. Approval of the June 7, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

V. Correspondence

VI. Brief Public Comments & Questions – Agenda Items Only (Limited to 3 minutes)

VII. Public Hearing
   A. Rezoning – Stillwater Development – Winans Street – AG to RR

VIII. Old Business
   A. Rezoning – Stillwater Development – Winans Street – AG to RR
   B. Discussion – Text Amendment – Minimum Floor Area per Dwelling Unit
   C. Discussion – Text Amendment – Outdoor Storage

IX. New Business
   A. Training Video – Roles & Responsibilities (16 minutes)
   B. Training Video – Housing (30 minutes)

X. Reports
   A. Attorney Report
   B. Staff Report
   C. Commissioner Comments

XI. Extended Public Comments & Questions – Non-Agenda Items Only (Limited to 4 minutes)

XII. Adjournment

Persons wishing to speak at public hearings, on agenda items, or extended comments, must fill out a “Speakers Form” located on the counter. Completed forms must be submitted to Township Staff prior to the meeting.
I. CALL TO ORDER
Cousins called the meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00pm.

II. ROLL CALL
Members present: Cousins, Wilson, Taylor, Reenders, Hesselsweet, Wagenmaker, Mesler and Lemkuil
Members absent: Chalifoux
Also present: Community Development Director Fedewa, Associate Planner Hoisington, and Attorney Bultje

Without objection, Cousins instructed Hoisington to record the minutes.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Wagenmaker, supported by Wilson, to approve the amended minutes of the May 3, 2021. Which motion carried unanimously.

V. CORRESPONDENCE
A. Received between 5/4/2021 and 6/1/2021:
   - Anonymous – No Address Provided – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Mary Doane – No Address Provided – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Russ Doane – 13462 Hidden Creek Ct – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Richard Edwards – 13224 Hidden Creek Dr – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Israel Hildebrandt – No Address Provided – Support vandenBerg application
   - Nathan Hoffman – No Address Provided – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Brandon & Sarah Kaines – 13257 Hidden Creek Dr – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Scott LaRue – No Address Provided – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Jim & Sandy Miller – 13465 Hidden Creek Ct – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Thomas O’Bryan – 16979 Buchanan – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Don Reis – 13213 Hidden Creek Dr – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Susan Robertson – 13252 Hidden Creek Dr – Oppose vandenBerg application
   - Michael Voss – No Address Provided – Traffic Info on vandenBerg application
   - Curtis D. Walburg – No Address Provided – Support vandenBerg application
   - Shannon & Doug Mulder – No Address Provided – Oppose vandenBerg application
B. Received after 6/2/2021:
   - Don Reis – 13213 Hidden Creek Drive
   - Bob & Julie Koning – 13210 Hidden Creek Drive
   - William & Bonnie Trap – 13497 Hidden Creek Court
- Norma Wieringa – 13454 Hidden Creek Court
- Dan & Laura Bradbury – 13490 Hidden Creek Court
- Theron & Bonnie S. – Name Illegible – 13563 Hidden Creek Court
- Jeremy Heavilin – 13545 Hidden Creek Court
- Michael & Geralyn Lamkin – 13221 Hidden Creek Drive
- Gary – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Jason & Abbei Monme – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Sadi Ragus – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Paul & Brenda Curtis – No Address Provided
- Sharri & James McCarr – No Address Provided
- Patricia & Joseph Elenbaas – No Address Provided
- Russ & Mary Doane – 13462 Hidden Creek Court
- Derek – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Jordan Nyhof – No Address Provided
- Howard & Linda Mulder – 13498 Hidden Creek Court
- Emily & Matt Mooa – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Sam & Julie – Name Illegible – 13445 Hidden Creek Court
- Michael Sweet & Rocio Gomez de Segura – 13238 Hidden Creek Drive
- Mary Kolkr – No Address Provided
- Michael Bielinski & Helena Flannagen – No Address Provided
- Roger & Ruth Joslin – No address Provided
- Ben Wieringa – 13454 Hidden Creek Court
- Tim & Janet Walker – 13475 Hidden Creek Drive
- Craig & Jenna Curtis – No Address Provided
- Joan Fandler & Brian Anderson – No Address Provided
- Sharon Barton – 13583 Hidden Creek Court
- Deane Hatt – No Address Provided
- Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Jim & Sandra Miller – No Address Provided
- Dil & Kerr S. – Name Illegible – 13302 Hidden Creek Drive
- Tricia & Tim Gardner – 13334 Hidden Creek Drive
- Kathryn Apostle – No Address Provided
- Joan Tradlu & Brian Anderson – No Address Provided
- Alex Craigmile – 13473 Hidden Creek Court
- Pamela & Edward Tysman – No Address Provided
- Bernadine & Ray Cibor – No Address Provided
- Jeff Babbitt – No Address Provided
- Delores Stalper – 13500 Hidden Creek Drive
- Joe & Deb Sutherland – 13450 Hidden Creek Ct
- L.S.K. – Name Illegible – No Address Provided
- Shannon & Dacy Mulder – 13476 Hidden Creek Court
- Ben Lillmans – 13263 Hidden Creek Drive
- Richard & Carol Brook – No Address Provided
- J.D. – Name Illegible – 13307, No Street Name Provided
- Sarah Kains – No Address Provided
- Carol & Gary TenHagen – No Address Provided
VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Russ Doane – 13462 Hidden Creek Ct, Grand Haven, MI 49417
- Opposes the vandenBerg Excavating application due to an anticipated adverse impact on the Hidden Creek Neighborhood.
- Opposes the proposed text amendment for outdoor businesses.

Mary Doane – 13462 Hidden Creek Ct, Grand Haven, MI 49417
- Opposes the vandenBerg Excavating application.
- Wants to preserve quiet neighborhood.
- Questioned if Planning Commission had received electronic petition in opposition of vandenBerg Excavating’s application.

Bob Koning – 13210 Hidden Creek Dr, Grand Haven, MI 49417
- Claims the opposition electronic petition was sent to the full Township Board.
- Questioned the ordinance requirements for the vandenBerg Excavating application.
- Does not feel the zoning ordinance should be amended.
- Suggested alternate solutions to increase business.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Special Land Use – Accessory Building in Front Yard – Gabel

Cousins opened the hearing at 7:12pm.

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated May 28th.

The applicant, Blake Dedoes of DeDoes Homes & Renovations and property owner, Russ Gabel, were present to answer any questions.

There being no further comments, Cousins closed the hearing at 7:14pm.

B. Special Land Use – Accessory Building in Front Yard – Rauschert

Cousins opened the hearing at 7:14pm.

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated May 28th.

The applicant, Casey Van Dyke, and property owner, Stephen Rauchert, were present to answer any questions.
There being no further comments, Cousins closed the hearing at 7:16pm.

C. Text Amendment – Minimum Floor Area per Dwelling Unit

Cousins opened the hearing at 7:16pm.

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated May 27th.

There being no further comments, Cousins closed the hearing at 7:17pm.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Special Land Use – Accessory Building in Front Yard – Gabel

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Clarified accessory buildings can be permitted in the front yard when the owner wants to protect valuable natural resources and the building is aesthetically compatible with the dwelling.

Motion by Wilson, supported by Wagenmaker, to conditionally approve the Special Land Use application to allow a 1,200 square foot accessory building to be located in the front yard of 15996 Winans Street. This approval is based on the application meeting the standards set forth by the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance. This motion is subject to, and incorporates, the following conditions and report:

1. Accessory building shall maintain the 85-foot setback from Winans Street as shown on the site plan dated 5/28/2021.
2. Tree removal shall be the least amount necessary based on the applicant’s desire to preserve natural features.
3. Building shall contain at least 1 window per wall (white vinyl), a service door, and overhead doors which shall be to the same quality as the dwelling. Including the Gallery Steel with grooved panel design, Sandstone color, and minimally the Plain Short Glass windows.
4. Three decorative lighting fixtures are required. Shall be sharp cutoff, downcast, maximum kelvin color of 4,000 or less per luminaire. Maximum lumens are 635 based on the amount of impervious surface in Lighting Zone 2. Staff will verify compliance prior to the building and/or electrical permit is issued.
5. Siding shall be D4 vinyl and match the color of the existing dwelling.

Which motion carried unanimously
1. This approval is based on the affirmative findings that each of the following standards of Section 12.04 have been fulfilled:
   A. The proposed use is consistent with and promotes the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.
   B. The proposed use is of such location, size, density, and character as to be compatible with adjacent uses of land and the orderly development of the district in which situated and of adjacent districts.
   C. The proposed use does not have a substantially detrimental effect upon, nor substantially impair the value of, neighborhood property.
   D. The proposed use is reasonably compatible with the natural environment of the subject premises and adjacent premises.
   E. The proposed use does not unduly interfere with provision of adequate light or air, nor overcrowd land or cause a severe concentration of population.
   F. The proposed use does not interfere or unduly burden water supply facilities, sewage collection and disposal systems, park and recreational facilities, and other public services.
   G. The proposed use is such that traffic and assembly of people relating to the use will not be hazardous, or inconvenient to the neighborhood, nor unduly conflict with normal traffic of the neighborhood.
   H. The proposed use is consistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the Township.
   I. The proposed use is such that traffic to, from, and on the premises and the assembly of persons relation to such use will not be hazardous, or inconvenient to the neighborhood, nor unduly conflict with the normal traffic of the neighborhood, considering, among other things: safe and convenient routes for pedestrian traffic, particularly of children, the relationship of the proposed use to main thoroughfares and to streets and intersections, and the general character and intensity of the existing and potential development of the neighborhood.

2. The application meets the site plan review standards of Section 18.07.G of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:
   A. The uses proposed will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare. Uses and structures located on the site take into account topography, size of the property, the uses on adjoining property and the relationship and size of buildings to the site. The site will be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this ordinance.
   B. Safe, convenient, uncontested, and well defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation is provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. Drives, streets and other circulation routes are designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points.
   C. The arrangement of public or private vehicular and pedestrian connections to existing or planned streets in the area are planned to provide a safe and efficient circulation system for traffic within the Township.
   D. Removal or alterations of significant natural features are restricted to those areas which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance. The Planning Commission has required that landscaping, buffers, and/or greenbelts be preserved and/or provided to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.
   E. Areas of natural drainage such as swales, wetlands, ponds, or swamps are protected and preserved insofar as practical in their natural state to provide areas for natural habitat, preserve drainage patterns and maintain the natural characteristics of the land.
F. The site plan provides reasonable visual and sound privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walls, barriers, and/or landscaping shall be used, as appropriate, to accomplish these purposes.

G. All buildings and groups of buildings are arranged so as to permit necessary emergency vehicle access as requested by the Fire/Rescue Department.

H. All streets and driveways are developed in accordance with the Township Subdivision Control Ordinance, the Ottawa County Road Commission and/or Michigan Department of Transportation specifications, as appropriate, unless developed as a private road in accordance with the requirements for private roads in the codified ordinances of the Township.

I. Sidewalks or pathways shall be deemed to be required along all public and private roadways unless the applicant provides compelling evidence, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, that they are not necessary for pedestrian access or safety.

J. Appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. Provisions have been made to accommodate storm water, prevent erosion and the formation of dust.

K. Exterior lighting is arranged so that it is deflected away from adjacent properties and so it does not interfere with the vision of motorists along adjacent streets. Lighting is minimized to reduce light pollution and preserve the rural character of the Township.

L. All loading and unloading areas and outside storage areas, including areas for the storage of trash, which face or are visible from residential districts or public streets, are screened.

M. Entrances and exits are provided at appropriate locations so as to maximize the convenience and safety for persons entering or leaving the site.

N. The site plans conform to all applicable requirements of County, State, Federal, and Township statutes and ordinances.

O. As appropriate, fencing has been required by the Planning Commission around the boundaries of the development to minimize or prevent trespassing or other adverse effects on adjacent lands.

P. The general purposes and spirit of this Ordinance and the Master Plan of the Township are maintained.

B. Special Land Use – Accessory Building in Front Yard – Rauschert

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Questioned placement of existing easement.
  - Rauschert clarified the placement of the easement and the location of the proposed building would not be impacted. The survey showing the easement will be emailed to staff.

Motion by Wilson, supported by Wagenmaker, to conditionally approve the Special Land Use application to allow a 1,948 square foot accessory building to be located in the front yard of 12977 152nd Avenue. This approval is based on the application meeting the standards set forth by the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance. This motion is subject to, and incorporates, the following conditions and report:

1. Accessory building shall maintain the 243-foot setback from 152nd Avenue as shown on the site plan dated 5/17/2021.
2. Applicant shall provide evidence from the utility company establishing the setback requirement from the overhead lines prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. Tree removal shall be the least amount necessary based on the applicant’s desire to preserve natural features.

4. Building shall contain at least 1 window per wall (Anderson 400 series or comparable), at least 1 service door, and overhead doors which shall be to the same quality as the dwelling. Including the Wayne Dalton insulated 9605 Sonoma style with Stockbridge window glass design.

5. 6 decorative lighting fixtures are required. Shall be sharp cutoff, downcast, maximum kelvin color of 4,000 or less per luminaire. Maximum lumens are 1,081 based on the amount of impervious surface in Lighting Zone 2. Staff will verify compliance prior to the building and/or electrical permit is issued.

6. Siding shall be vinyl shaker and of the same material and color family as the existing dwelling.

Which motion carried unanimously.

REPORT – SPECIAL LAND USE – ACCESSORY BUILDING IN FRONT YARD – RAUSCHERT

1. This approval is based on the affirmative findings that each of the following standards of Section 12.04 have been fulfilled:
   A. The proposed use is consistent with and promotes the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.
   B. The proposed use is of such location, size, density, and character as to be compatible with adjacent uses of land and the orderly development of the district in which situated and of adjacent districts.
   C. The proposed use does not have a substantially detrimental effect upon, nor substantially impair the value of, neighborhood property.
   D. The proposed use is reasonably compatible with the natural environment of the subject premises and adjacent premises.
   E. The proposed use does not unduly interfere with provision of adequate light or air, nor overcrowd land or cause a severe concentration of population.
   F. The proposed use does not interfere or unduly burden water supply facilities, sewage collection and disposal systems, park and recreational facilities, and other public services.
   G. The proposed use is such that traffic and assembly of people relating to the use will not be hazardous, or inconvenient to the neighborhood, nor unduly conflict with normal traffic of the neighborhood.
   H. The proposed use is consistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the Township.
   I. The proposed use is such that traffic to, from, and on the premises and the assembly of persons relation to such use will not be hazardous, or inconvenient to the neighborhood, nor unduly conflict with the normal traffic of the neighborhood, considering, among other things: safe and convenient routes for pedestrian traffic, particularly of children, the relationship of the proposed use to main thoroughfares and to streets and intersections, and the general character and intensity of the existing and potential development of the neighborhood.
2. The application meets the site plan review standards of Section 18.07.G of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

Q. The uses proposed will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare. Uses and structures located on the site take into account topography, size of the property, the uses on adjoining property and the relationship and size of buildings to the site. The site will be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this ordinance.

R. Safe, convenient, uncontested, and well defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation is provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. Drives, streets and other circulation routes are designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points.

S. The arrangement of public or private vehicular and pedestrian connections to existing or planned streets in the area are planned to provide a safe and efficient circulation system for traffic within the Township.

T. Removal or alterations of significant natural features are restricted to those areas which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance. The Planning Commission has required that landscaping, buffers, and/or greenbelts be preserved and/or provided to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.

U. Areas of natural drainage such as swales, wetlands, ponds, or swamps are protected and preserved insofar as practical in their natural state to provide areas for natural habitat, preserve drainage patterns and maintain the natural characteristics of the land.

V. The site plan provides reasonable visual and sound privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walls, barriers, and/or landscaping shall be used, as appropriate, to accomplish these purposes.

W. All buildings and groups of buildings are arranged so as to permit necessary emergency vehicle access as requested by the Fire/Rescue Department.

X. All streets and driveways are developed in accordance with the Township Subdivision Control Ordinance, the Ottawa County Road Commission and/or Michigan Department of Transportation specifications, as appropriate, unless developed as a private road in accordance with the requirements for private roads in the codified ordinances of the Township.

Y. Sidewalks or pathways shall be deemed to be required along all public and private roadways unless the applicant provides compelling evidence, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, that they are not necessary for pedestrian access or safety.

Z. Appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. Provisions have been made to accommodate storm water, prevent erosion and the formation of dust.

AA. Exterior lighting is arranged so that it is deflected away from adjacent properties and so it does not interfere with the vision of motorists along adjacent streets. Lighting is minimized to reduce light pollution and preserve the rural character of the Township.

BB. All loading and unloading areas and outside storage areas, including areas for the storage of trash, which face or are visible from residential districts or public streets, are screened.

CC. Entrances and exits are provided at appropriate locations so as to maximize the convenience and safety for persons entering or leaving the site.

DD. The site plans conform to all applicable requirements of County, State, Federal, and Township statutes and ordinances.

EE. As appropriate, fencing has been required by the Planning Commission around the boundaries of the development to minimize or prevent trespassing or other adverse effects on adjacent lands.

FF. The general purposes and spirit of this Ordinance and the Master Plan of the Township are maintained.
C. Text Amendment – Minimum Floor Area per Dwelling Unit

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Wagenmaker indicated the Township Board’s preference is to revert the minimum dwelling sizes back to the 1999 figures. Acknowledged the prior compromise with sizes, but the Board is concerned if homes burn down in existing neighborhoods it will create a visual imbalance.
  
  - Shared concern over smaller minimum for two-family dwellings resulting in single family homes being demolished and replaced with duplexes.

- Other Commissioners noted extensive research and consideration was conducted during the ordinance re-write, and do not believe eliminating the 800 sqft in all districts is appropriate.

- Discussion on re-creating the R-3 district to establish appropriate areas for smaller dwellings.
  
  - Staff clarified that the R-3 District exists, but few properties are zoned R-3. More can be incorporated into the Future Land Use map when it is amended this year.

**Motion** by Wagenmaker, supported by Reenders, to **table** the text amendment, and direct staff to make the following revisions.

1. Revise the language to a minimum 1100 sqft for R-1 and 960 sqft for the R-2 district.
2. Require 140-feet minimum lot width for two-family special land use applications in the R-2 district.

**Which motion carried**, as shown by the following roll call:

- **Ayes:** Wilson, Hesselsweet, Wagenmaker, Reenders, Mesler, Lemkuil
- **Nays:** Cousin, Taylor
- **Absent:** Chalifoux

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Site Plan Review – Addition + Food Truck – Southtown Market

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated June 1st.

The applicant, Brandon Hartel of 4U Construction, LLC, and the property owner Tony Singh and his father were present to provide information:

- Proposed addition would include a beer cave.
- Proposed food truck is already on site and has food license from the County Health Department.
- Intend to add gas station later this year.
• No food preparation on site at any phase within the building, only the food truck will have prepared food.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:
• Need to see the entire project on the plans, showing phases of development if needed.
• Questioned dumpster location and enclosure
  o Hartel noted the dumpster enclosure on the plans were included in error.
• Asked how parking would be impacted by the proposal.
  o No proposed changes to parking.
  o Commissioners noted the need for parking to be striped and include ADA compliant spaces.
• Discussed impact of proposal on existing restrooms. Need to discuss implications of project with Township Building Official to determine impact on restrooms.
• Concerns over site circulation. Need to see site circulation on plans, including food truck and phase with gas station.
  o Need to define loading area on plans.
• Questions over what requirements are applicable to the food truck.
  o Bultje clarified that many municipalities regulate food trucks through a general ordinance, rather than the zoning ordinance.

Motion by Taylor, supported by Wilson, to table the Site Plan Review application, and direct the applicant to make the following revisions:
  1. Provide a full site plan including the following details:
     a) Include food truck, building addition, and future gas pumps. This may be shown in development phases.
     b) Provide loading area information and location.
     c) Provide dumpster enclosure location and details.
  2. Provide curb details for the site.
  3. Provide occupancy information for staff to review for restroom requirements.

B. Discussion – Text Amendment – Outdoor Business Uses & Outdoor Storage

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated June 2nd.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:
• Noted the text amendment was sent back at the Planning Commission from the Township Board to address concerns raised by residents.
• Debated purpose of amendment.
• Asked about existing restrooms and if more would be required.
This would be left to Building Code requirements based on the structure.

- Discussed how proposed ordinance would be applied to the vandenBerg Excavating SLU application.
  - If the text amendment is amended to allow customers onsite around heavy machinery the proposed business could be located in the rear yard, which may address some concerns of adjacent property owners.

- Comparisons were made between roadside farm stands and outdoor storage. The differences were questioned.
  - Fedewa explained Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development has established Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices for Farm Markets, which may impact certain regulations. Therefore, it may not be a good comparison.

- Discussed other possible outdoor businesses. Determined the Planning Commission may need the ability to use discretion in making decisions.

*Without objection,* staff was directed to amend the proposed text amendments based on the discussion, which will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

### X. REPORTS

A. Attorney’s Report – none
B. Staff Report – none
C. Commissioner Comments
  - Taylor shared concerns over increasing the minimum floor area.
    - Most new homes are not being built at the minimum floor area, just leaves the option open.
    - Fears long-term impact may keep people out of the community.
  - Reenders brought up a new housing development in Port Sheldon Township.
    - Questioned if Ottawa County’s sanitary sewer on Fillmore Street could also be used for a future GHT project.
      - Bultje explained the County has agreements in place with other municipalities. Potential connections would have to be negotiated.
        - Fedewa will inquire and report back.

### XI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

### XII. ADJOURNMENT

*Without objection,* the meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassandra Hoisington
Acting Recording Secretary
Community Development Memo

DATE: June 15, 2021

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director

RE: Stillwater Development (Kuiper) – AG to RR

PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winans</td>
<td>70-07-27-300-003</td>
<td>40-acres</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Infrastructure</th>
<th>Existing Site Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Paved Road (Winans)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master-Planned Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Blueberry Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Vacant &amp; Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>RR, RP, AG</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

In May, staff received an application for the rezoning of a 40-acre parcel fronting on Winans and Pierce. The request is to rezone from AG (20-acre minimum) to RR (45,000-sf or 1.03-acres).

Prior to receiving the application, staff did not have communication with the applicant. An email was sent post-receipt that inquired why RR was selected and not RP (5-acre minimum).

The response was providing a tentative land division map, which appears reasonable based on surrounding uses and lot sizes. However, **once the property is rezoned the applicant is free to develop in any way allowed by the zoning ordinance**.

The Township **cannot add conditions or restrictions** to property being rezoned (**only available in contract rezonings**). The **PC will need to determine if RR is the right district, or if RP is best.**
Compatibility

Is the proposed rezoning compatible with the existing developments or zoning in the surrounding area?

There are approximately 55 parcels shown in the above zoning and master-plan maps.

- Parcel sizes range from: 0.47-acres to 228-acres
- The average parcel size: 11.8-acres
- The median parcel size: 2.38-acres

Diving into the details a bit further:

- The average size by zoning district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range (Low)</th>
<th>Range (High)</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.9-acres</td>
<td>0.5-acres</td>
<td>228-acres</td>
<td>16.25-acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7-acres</td>
<td>4.75-acres</td>
<td>31-acres</td>
<td>16.1-acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.58-acres</td>
<td>0.77-acres</td>
<td>14-acres</td>
<td>2.27-acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83-acres</td>
<td>0.47-acres</td>
<td>4-acres</td>
<td>0.58-acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land use by district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>PUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Creek School House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consistency**

Is the proposed rezoning consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and does it coincide with the Future Land Use Map in terms of an appropriate use of the land?

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR RR DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-open areas where agriculture and other rural-type activities may co-exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-tract residential housing and related facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate open and semi-open spaces are essential to the health and welfare of the Township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intended to be served by municipal water or sanitary sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be served by paved roads, if available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR RP DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate district between AG and other residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large lots with residential uses, low-density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks municipal water &amp; sanitary sewer due to its proximity to agricultural uses and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide uses on large parcels not suited for agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum infrastructure, such as unpaved roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use map it does not mean the property is ripe for the Rural Residential district. It may be more appropriate for this area to be rezoned/developed at a slower pace. If the PC determines the land is not ripe, the sequence could be:

1. Currently zoned AG.
2. Next step for a rural area should be Rural Preserve.
3. In 10-years when division rights are available again the area may be ripe for Rural Residential rezoning.
   - The applicant would be encouraged to site the 5-acre lots in a way that would allow future owners to divide/rezone into 45,000 sf minimum lot sizes.

**CAPABILITY**

Does the proposed rezoning require an extension of public sewer and water, roadway improvements, or enhanced fire and police protection, and if so, is it in an area capable of being provided with such services?

Winans Street is paved, but of the 6 lots proposed only two front on that portion. The other 4 lots front on Pierce Street, which is unpaved. Due to the low-density rural character of the area it seems highly unlikely that Pierce would be paved.

Public utilities such as water and sewer are not nearby and highly unlikely to extend to this area in the foreseeable future.

**PROPOSED DIVISIONS + NATURAL FEATURES ON SITE**

As noted, the applicant has supplied a tentative map of proposed land divisions (see left). However, the applicant is not obligated to follow-through with this proposal. The Township cannot mandate follow-through. The applicant is free to apply for any land uses allowed in the RR district.

The Assessor reviewed the division rights and found that 7 lots are possible.

However, it is likely to be affected by the extensive floodplain and wetland (see right).

Full size maps are included with the packet materials.
# PERMITTED USES – RR vs. RP

(P = Permitted; S = Special Land Use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Group</th>
<th>RR Uses</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>RP Uses</th>
<th>P/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Government Buildings</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Buildings</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agri-Tourism</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Agri-Tourism</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse/Nursery</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Greenhouse/Nursery</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadside Farm Stand</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mineral Mining</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wineries</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Roadside Farm Stand</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wineries</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Family Daycare Home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Family Daycare Home</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Daycare Home</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Group Daycare Home</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Composting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Home Composting</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Businesses (Minor/Major)</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>Home Bsns’ (Minor/Major)</td>
<td>P/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing or Convalescent Home</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Child/Adult Daycare Center</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Child/Adult Daycare Center</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Dining</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Outdoor Dining</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pet Daycare</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Pet Daycare</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Clinic</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Veterinary Clinic</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Storage</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Outdoor Storage</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the Planning Commission finds the rezoning application meets the standards, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion** to recommend the Township Board **approve** the Stillwater Development rezoning application of Parcel No. 70-07-27-300-003 from Agricultural (AG) to **Rural Residential (RR)** based on the application meeting the rezoning standards of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan.

- or -

**Motion** to recommend the Township Board **approve** the Stillwater Development rezoning application of Parcel No. 70-07-27-300-003 from Agricultural (AG) to **Rural Preserve (RP)** based on the application meeting the rezoning standards of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan.

If the Planning Commission finds the rezoning application does not meet the standards, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion** to recommend the Township Board **deny** the Stillwater Development rezoning application of Parcel No. 70-07-27-300-003 from Agricultural (AG) to Rural Residential (RR) because the application does not meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan.

If the Planning Commission finds the rezoning application is premature or needs revisions, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion** to **table** of the Stillwater Development rezoning application, and direct the applicant to address the following items:

1. *List the items…*

Please contact me prior to the meeting if you have questions.
May 25, 2021

Ms. Stacey Fedewa
Community Development Director
Grand Haven Township
13300 168th Avenue
Grand Haven, MI 49417

Dear Ms. Fedewa:

Included with this cover letter, please find the following documents to support the request for a rezoning at “0” Winans Street (east of 168th Avenue, situated between, and with frontage on both Winans Street and Pierce Street, PPN: 70-07-27-300-003).

1. Application
2. Location Map
3. Legal Description
4. Narrative

These items are being submitted for consideration at the next regular Planning Commission meeting. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (616) 485-5321.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kelly Kuiper
REZONING APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Escrow*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning Ordinance can be found at [www.cht.org/zoning](http://www.cht.org/zoning)

Applicant Information

Name: Stillwater Development (Kelly Kuiper or Curtis Moran - Agents)

Phone: Kelly Kuiper - (616) 485-5321 Curtis Moran - (616) 893-1930

Address: 6719 Pine Ridge Dr., Jenison, MI 49428

Email Address: Kelly Kuiper - kmkuiper@outlook.com Curtis Moran - curtis@moranpropertiesmi.com

Owner Information (if different from applicant)

Name: Elsie V Hildebrant (*Stillwater Development has purchase agreement on property)

Phone: 

Address: 1531 Concord Ave, Westchester, IL 60154

Property Information

Address/Location: "0" Winans Street

Parcel Number: 70 - 07 - 27 - 300 - 003

Current Zoning: AG

Master-Planned Zoning: Rural Residential

Zoning Requested: RR

Size (acres): 40.59

Other Information

Reason for Rezoning Request? Utilize land divisions for single family residential

Present Use of the Subject Property? Vacant

Number & Type of Existing Structures? none

Subject Property Located on a Paved Road? Winans = paved Pierce = gravel

What Utilities are Available? none

NOTE: The architect, engineer, planner, or designer shall be responsible for utilizing the Township Ordinance books and following requirements for zoning amendments and procedures as stated in Chapter 16. Please submit fourteen (14) copies of the required information with the application.

I hereby attest the information on this application is, to the best of my knowledge, true and accurate.

Kelly Kuiper

Signature of applicant

5/25/21

Date

* To cover cost of legal and consulting fees, may be increased as necessary
NOTICE

IF I PLAN TO SPLIT THE PARCEL(S) AFTER THE ZONING APPROVALS ARE GRANTED, I REALIZE THAT I MUST APPLY FOR A LAND DIVISION WITH THE ASSESSING DEPARTMENT. ALL LAND DIVISION REQUIREMENTS MUST BE CONFORMED TO BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH FURTHER DEVELOPMENT.

Kelly Kuiper 5/25/21
Signature of applicant

Date

For Office Use Only

Date Received Fee Paid?
Materials Received: Site Plans Location Map
Survey Legal Description

Dated copy of approved minutes sent to applicant? Date Sent

PLANNING COMMISSION USE ONLY

Approval

Tabled

Denied

Conditional Approval

The following conditions shall be met for approval:


Signature of Planning Commission Choir Date
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

"0" Winans Street

E 1/2 of W 1/2 of SW 1/4 SEC 27 T7N R16W 40 A
Stillwater Development, contract purchaser of “0” Winans Street, located east of 168th Avenue, situated between (and with frontage on both) Winans Street and Pierce Street, requests the property be rezoned from AG, Agricultural to RR, Rural Residential. The following responses to the rezone criteria, per Section 20.03 of the Grand Haven Township Zoning Ordinance, are included to provide supplemental information regarding the rezone request.

1. **The purpose, intent, policies, goals, objectives, and action plan of the Township Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and other Township planning documents, and applicable state and federal statutes.**

The proposed amendment will be consistent with the goals of the Grand Haven Township Future Land Use Plan and Master Plan which states, “Areas planned for Rural Residential (RR) are characterized by single-family homes on lots that range from 1-10 acres. This “rural development” pattern is typically integrated, with or adjacent to, agricultural activities and generally there is significant separation distance between homes.” The proposed rezone will allow the property to utilize more land divisions granted through the State of Michigan Land Division Act than currently able to utilize with the AG zoning district standards. However, the property will still be consistent with adjacent rural residential zoned single family residential properties, while still providing a necessary transitional quality to nearby agricultural uses.

2. **The adequate and efficient provision of utilities and public services for property which is or will be affected by the proposed amendment or supplement to the Ordinance.**

The uses permitted in both the agricultural and rural residential districts are similar and therefore, there is no anticipated change in the capacity of Township utilities and public services that would compromise the health, safety and welfare of the Township.

3. **The uses permitted in the proposed zoning district, including the permitted density of dwelling units, and the potential impact of those uses on the surrounding area.**

The uses permitted in both the agricultural and rural residential districts are very similar, however, the rural residential district is primarily residential as it does not include agricultural uses as permitted uses. The immediately adjacent properties are currently utilized for single family residential, therefore, the proposed rezone will make the subject property more consistent and compatible with these uses. Although the rural residential district only requires a minimum lot size of 45,000 square feet (0.97 du/ac) as compared to the 20-acre (.05 du/ac) requirement of the agricultural district, the subject property is bisected by the Little Pigeon Creek and therefore, wetland and 100-year floodplain constraints limit the ability to develop this property. Therefore, the proposed end use of
the property: utilizing land divisions granted through the State of Michigan Land Division Act, will be consistent and compatible with the surrounding area and limit any potential negative impacts.

4. **The impact of the potential developments under the new zoning district on the environment, economy, health, safety, welfare, and quality of life of residents and visitors to Grand Haven Township.**

The rural residential district only requires a minimum lot size of 45,000 square feet as compared to the 20-acre requirement of the agricultural district, however the subject property is bisected by the Little Pigeon Creek and therefore, wetland and 100-year floodplain constraints limit the ability to develop this property. Therefore, the proposed end use of the property: utilizing land divisions granted through the State of Michigan Land Division Act, will be consistent and compatible with the surrounding area and limit any potential negative impacts on the environment, health, safety, welfare and quality of life of residents. However, since rezone will allow additional potential parcels to be created than currently allowed under the agricultural zoning district standards, the rezone will likely have a positive impact on the economy bringing in additional tax dollars and consumers of Township establishments.
Proposed Rezoning Surrounding Zoning
Winans (70-07-27-300-003) AG to RR

Legend
- Stillwater Development Parcel
- (AG) Agricultural
- (RP) Rural Preserve
- (RR) Rural Residential
- (PUD) Lakeshore Woods Sub
Proposed Rezoning
Surrounding Master-Planning
Winans (70-07-27-300-003)
AG to RR
Community Development Memo

DATE: June 17, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director
RE: Text Amendment Discussion – Minimum Dwelling Sizes

BACKGROUND

In 1999, the following sizes were established and enforced for the next 21 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Ground Floor Area*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>1,240 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1,240 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dwellings containing more than 1 story shall have a building footprint of at least 800 sqft.

In March 2020, the minimum dwelling unit sizes were reduced to 800 sqft because the minimum building footprint the Township permitted was 800 sqft (with the balance of the minimum floor area being made up in the second story).

Section 2.12

MINIMUM RESIDENTIAL UNIT SIZE.

The following minimum dimensional requirements shall apply to residential dwelling units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Minimum Floor Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Minimum Ground Floor Area*</th>
<th>Minimum Dwelling Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>600 sf + 100 sf per bedroom</td>
<td>600 sf</td>
<td>24 feet per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>500 sf + for studio efficiency unit + 100 sf per bedroom</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
<td>24 feet per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Even if the dwelling is more than one story.
At the June 7th public hearing, the following schedule was provided, and was unanimously agreed upon at the May 3rd meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>950 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>800 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the agenda item was tabled, and staff directed to increase the sizes of R-1 and R-2.

**TIMELINE OF DISCUSSIONS**

April 19th  Special joint meeting with Board and Planning Commission. Split positions.

April 26th  Township Board meeting, Committee Reports. Majority want larger sizes.

May 3rd  Planning Commission discussion. Draft text amendment included the 1999 minimums. Through the discussion, a potential compromised was reached. Staff was directed to schedule the public hearing.

June 7th  Public hearing. Tabled, staff directed to increase sizes for R-1 and R-2.

June 21st  Discussion.

**PROPOSED MINIMUM FLOOR AREAS**

A roll call vote was held on June 7th after a motion to table was supported, which directed staff to increase R-1 and R-2 sizes along with increasing the minimum lot width for two-family special land uses.

As directed, staff produced the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1,100 sf (rather than 950 sf, 15.8%↑ larger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>960 sf (rather than 800 sf, 20%↑ larger)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text amendment discussion for two-family lot width is anticipated to be on the July 6th agenda.

**SAMPLE MOTIONS**

Because the Township bears the full costs of text amendments, staff requests the Planning Commission be confident in whichever version of minimum floor area schedule is selected. The publication costs average $150 each. Staff wants to be cognizant of the Township’s budget.
Motion to direct staff to schedule a public hearing for the proposed zoning text amendment ordinance concerning Minimum Floor Areas for Dwelling Units. For which the selected size schedule will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

If the Planning Commission finds the text amendment is in need of revisions before a recommendation can be made, the following motion can be offered:

Motion to table the text amendment, and direct staff to make the following revisions:

1. List the revisions...

Please contact me if this raises questions.
Community Development Memo

DATE: June 17, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director
RE: Text Amendment Discussion – Outdoor Storage

BACKGROUND

May 3rd Hearings for the vandenBerg application and a text amendment for Open Air Businesses. Application tabled. Text Amendment recommended for Board approval.

May 10th Township Board returns the text amendment to the Planning Commission citing concerns raised by nearby residents.

June 7th Revised text amendment for discussion purposes. Resident concerns addressed with new land use known as Outdoor Business Uses. Tabled and staff directed to address the issue of heavy equipment passing through customer areas and provide discretion for placement in conjunction with the main building and existing screening.

June 21st Discussion.

PROPOSED REVISIONS

Per the direction of the Planning Commission, staff refocused attention to the Construction Material Storage and/or Landscape Contractor’s Operations to address the prohibitive regulations.

- A.1 Store within building or 8’ fence with evergreens.
  - Added discretionary text to limit or waive screening based on the existing site features.
- A.2 No changes.
- A.3 No changes.
- A.4 No changes.
- A.5 Store in rear yard behind main building.
  - Added discretionary text to adjust the location if the site allows, hardship, etc.
• A.6 Storage area must meet same setback as main building.
  o Was part of A.5, now its own provision.
• A.7 Storage areas abutting residential districts must be setback 100’.
  o Was part of A.5, now its own provision.
• A.8 Display areas to be enclosed with decorative fence.
  o Proposing it be removed because display/storage areas are now relegated to the rear yard.
• A.9 No heavy equipment passing through customer areas.
  o Proposing it be removed because it is prohibitive and found to be uncharacteristic of similar businesses.

SAMPLE MOTION

If the Planning Commission finds the above text amendments acceptable, the following motion can be offered:

  Motion to direct staff to schedule a public hearing for the proposed zoning text amendment ordinance concerning Outdoor Storage.

Please contact me if this raises questions.
Section 12.34
OUTDOOR STORAGE.

(A) Construction Material Storage and/or Landscape Contractor’s Operations.

(1) All materials and equipment must be stored within an enclosed building(s) or within an area completely enclosed by a sight obscuring fence at least eight (8) feet in height, lined with evergreen trees planted three feet on center. Materials may not be stacked or piled so be visible above the fence. Equipment (including vehicles) may only be visible above the fence if the equipment is greater than eight (8) feet tall and cannot be dis-assembled for storage. The Planning Commission has discretion to limit or waive, some or all, of the screening requirements if the existing site has natural features that can adequately substitute.

(2) The area in which vehicles, material, or equipment is stored must be kept in a smooth, dust free condition. The area must be swept daily to keep it free of loose materials.

(3) Materials shall be stored in a manner that prevents the material from blowing outside of the storage area or onto adjacent premises.

(4) A permanent Main Building of at least five hundred (500) square feet must be constructed on the property.

(5) Whenever possible, the storage areas shall be located in the rear yard behind Main Buildings. The Planning Commission has discretion to adjust the location based on the conditions of the site, whether it imposes an undue hardship, if better alternatives exist, and similar reasons.

(6) The storage area shall meet setback requirements applicable a Main Building in the District.

(7) Storage areas shall be setback at least one hundred (100) feet from any R-1, R-2, R-3, or R-4 district.

(8) Material may be displayed outdoors (rather than stored). Displayed material is designed to be viewed by customers of the facility. Display areas must be enclosed with a decorative fence at least four feet in height, and no display material shall exceed the height of the fence.

(9) Customer/display areas must be kept separate from storage areas, and no heavy equipment shall pass through the customer or display area.
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Community Development Memo

DATE: June 17, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director
RE: Training Videos – Course Descriptions

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

City Councils, Township Boards, Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals. Who is supposed to do what? This workshop reviews roles and responsibilities to ensure that everyone stays in their lane and goes in the same direction.

HOUSING

Housing is a hot button issue in many communities. This presentation covers how a community should assess its housing needs as well as strategies for ensuring those needs are met. State and federal housing laws are also addressed in this comprehensive workshop. Next steps for implementation are also included.

ALTERNATIVE OPTION

The Township has purchased 3 training sessions, which must be watched by August 1st. Topics selected by Chair Cousins are:

1. Roles & Responsibilities (16 minutes)
2. Housing (30 minutes)
3. DDA’s & TIF’s (35 minutes)

In the interest of time, if the rezoning application and text amendment discussions take quite a while, staff recommends the Housing video be delayed until one of the July meetings.

Please contact me if this raises questions.
Build Your Own Workshop

Next Steps / Resources – Housing

Step 1: Understand the housing needs of your community

Step 2: Remember location, affordability and accessibility

Step 3: Amend the zoning ordinance to provide housing choices that are affordable, accessible, and manageable, regardless of age

Step 4: Have open discussions with the community with benefits in mind: attracting and keeping residents who will be engaged in community neighborhoods and civic life

Step 5: Understand concerns and apply zoning standards to mitigate those concerns (commonly traffic, parking, ownership)

Step 6: Strive to include renters in community conversations, wherever they live. Renters may be your neighbors, your children, your parents, or even you.