AGENDA
Planning Commission
Monday, October 18, 2021 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Community Engagement – Evert Court Neighborhood – Begins at 6:00pm

II. Regular Meeting – Begins at 7:00pm

III. Call to Order

IV. Roll Call

V. Pledge to the Flag

VI. Approval of the October 4, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

VII. Correspondence

VIII. Brief Public Comments & Questions (Limited to 3 minutes)

IX. Old Business
   A. Discussion – Text Amendment – SLU – Two-Family Dwellings
   B. Future Land Use Map
      1. Review Public/Quasi Public Designations
      2. Review Qualified AG parcels

X. Reports
   A. Staff Report
   B. Commissioner Comments

XI. Extended Public Comments & Questions (Limited to 4 minutes)

XII. Adjournment
I. CALL TO ORDER
Wilson called the meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00pm.

II. ROLL CALL
Members present: Wilson, Mesler, Lemkuil, Wagenmaker, Chalifoux, Taylor
Members absent: Cousins, Hesselsweet, Reenders
Also present: Community Development Director Fedewa

7:38pm Taylor arrived and joined the meeting

Without objection, Wilson instructed Fedewa to record the minutes.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Without objection, the minutes of the September 20, 2021 meeting were approved.

V. CORRESPONDENCE – None

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

VII. NEW BUSINESS
A. Pre-Application Presentation – Kittle Property Group – Multi-Family Housing PUD

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated September 30th.

The project Development Director Caroline Kimmel, Development Analyst Andrew Taylor, Development Analyst Kyle Stanley, and Engineer Andrew Rossell, PE were present and provided the following information:

- Kimmel provided an overview of the workforce housing project.
- Explained Tax Exempt Bonds through MSHDA. Workforce housing aspect would attach to the property for 30 years.
- Provided information on Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) and Municipal Services Agreement.
- Expressed safety concerns with connecting to the Walmart site.
The Planning Commission provided the following feedback:

- One member noted the desire for a “timeless” appearance by emphasizing brick and not vinyl siding. Shared concern for changing the master-plan designation because it would sacrifice the limited commercial land that is available. Disagrees with the Township’s parking rules, would prefer to have the applicant make the decision based on their experiences.

- Other members noted the commercial land has been available for years but has not resulted in development. The market determined the highest and best use.

- While the location is unexpected, it is well suited because of the existing screening along the highway and situated near the industrial properties.

- Agree that safety is a priority and can design the connection to Walmart to reduce potential conflicts.

- Keep as many trees as possible.

- Initial consensus on a parking ratio of 2 spaces per unit.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Future Land Use Map – Review Industrial Parcels

Kittle Property Group

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated September 30th.

Consensus: Master-plan for High Density Residential.

Light Industrial PUD Statement for Master Plan

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated September 30th.

Consensus: Proposed statement is acceptable, and do not recommend changes at this time.

Light Industrial Land Uses

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated September 30th.

Consensus: Remove uses and terminology related to “treatment” and “fabrication” and focus on very light and unobtrusive uses that can realistically locate near residential.

IX. REPORTS

A. Staff Report

   ➢ Meeting with Gardens Alive was informative and learned future plans are cohesive with Township plans.

B. Commissioner Comments

   ➢ Trustee Wagenmaker expressed the need to review text amendment language for two-family dwellings in the R-2 District. Current zoning ordinance deviates too far
from the last ordinance on regulating two-family dwellings. Desire to re-create the R-3 District to locate duplexes and multi-family buildings in appropriate areas.

- Fedewa noted the R-3 District is still in existence, but the Township has not zoned or master-planned land for the uses.

- Taylor noted the federal housing finance systems (i.e., Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac) are amending their rules because of the need to finance two-family dwellings. Becoming common for first time buyers to request a duplex to live in one unit and rent the other. As such, FHA has already amended their rules.

X. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 8:07pm.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Stacey Fedewa, AICP
Acting Recording Secretary
Community Development Memo

DATE: October 12, 2021

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director

RE: Discussion – Text Amendment – Two-Family SLU Minimum Lot Width

BACKGROUND

In July, the Planning Commission began to discuss incorporating special land use criteria for two-family dwellings. Staff have provided some sample regulations to consider as a future text amendment.

POSSIBLE REGULATIONS

Staff recommends incorporating the following provisions:

- Two-family dwellings shall only be permitted on paved public roads. Must be located so traffic generated will not tend to infiltrate and use streets running through any single-family areas.

- Two-family dwellings shall be connected to municipal water, and if available, sanitary sewer.

- Two-family dwellings shall be designed to look like a single-family dwelling and shall include architectural details found on the majority of dwellings in the neighborhood, so the two-family dwelling is consistent with the aesthetic character of existing buildings. Scaled elevations depicting the features shall be provided.

- Any garage(s) serving a two-family dwelling shall be (1) placed to the rear of the dwelling with side or rear entry, or (2) recessed at least ¼ of the depth of the garage.
  - For example, a 24’ wide x 30’ deep garage must be recessed at least 7½-feet from the front plane of the dwelling.

- Site plan shall include an area for outdoor garbage can storage that uses quality building materials similar to the dwelling.
In order to properly frame the potential changes and their impact, staff reviewed assessing data for residential lots and learned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>No. of Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you recall, two-family dwellings are allowed by special land use in the R-2 District, which accounts for 38% of residential lots.

**Option 1: Lot Width by Street**

The minimum lot width shall be as follows:

- **100’ Minimum** = Fronts on Mercury Drive, Comstock Street, Robbins Road
- **150’ Minimum** = Fronts on Lake, Groesbeck, 164th, 160th, 152nd, 144th
- **200’ Minimum** = Fronts on all other public paved residential streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>No. of Lots</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Duplexes Today</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Duplexes for Proposed Regs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 80’</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80’ &lt; 100’</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100’ &lt; 150’</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150’ &lt; 200’</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200’+</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,788</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to understand the exclusionary aspects of this change because it could lead to legal exposure by **reducing the number of lots eligible for two-family dwellings by 87%**.
Option 2: Greater Side Yard Setback

Another option to consider is simply increasing the minimum side yard setback. Recall, this method is an inverse way of establishing minimum lot widths as well because each dwelling unit must be 24-feet wide + side yard setbacks.

The minimum side yard setback shall be:
- 25-feet (i.e., 50-feet total) = 98’ minimum lot width
- 30-feet (i.e., 60-feet total) = 108’ minimum lot width
- 40-feet (i.e., 80-feet total) = 128’ minimum lot width
- 50-feet (i.e., 100-feet total) = 148’ minimum lot width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>No. of Lots</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Duplexes Today</th>
<th>No. of Eligible Duplexes for Proposed Regs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 98’</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98’ &lt; 108’</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108’ &lt; 128’</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128’ &lt; 148’</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148’ +</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a far more acceptable reduction that is defensible if accused of exclusionary zoning.

Option 3: Back to 1999 Regulations

Staff does not recommend reverting back to the 1999 regulations because they are more exclusionary than Option 1.

The 1999 regulations had 2 thresholds for eligibility—150’ lot width + 26,000 sqft lot area.
- R-2 District = 2,188 parcels
- 26,000+ sf lots = 596 parcels
  - 150’ width = 174 parcels

SAMPLE MOTION

Motion to direct staff to draft a zoning text amendment ordinance for review at the next regularly scheduled meeting. The contents of which will be reflected in the meeting minutes.
Community Development Memo

DATE: October 15, 2021

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director


BACKGROUND

One of the Future Land Use designations is Public/Quasi-Public, which is described as follows in the Future Land Use and Zoning Plan in the Master Plan.

PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC

Intended Land Uses

This designation accommodates schools, government facilities, public utilities, parks, natural areas, and public recreational uses. It also recognizes churches, private recreational uses, and other community-oriented activities located on privately-owned land. These uses positively contribute to the quality of life for Township residents and businesses. They foster interaction between neighbors and are important for the future stability of the community.

Corresponding Zoning Districts

All zoning districts that permit these types of uses either by right or as a special land use correspond with the Public/Quasi-Public land use designation. Specifically, schools, parks, recreation areas, and churches are permitted in most of the Township’s residential zoning districts as special land uses.

General Location

Public/Quasi Public land uses can be found throughout Grand Haven Charter Township and are closely tied to neighborhoods and conveniently located for residents. Because of the importance of these land uses, the Future Land Use Plan accounts for all such existing uses in the Township.

PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC

Corresponding Zoning Districts: All that Permit
Public/Quasi-Public Land Uses

Minimum Infrastructure Required: Varies

ADDITIONS

Staff have added a variety of new parcels to the map, which are shown in light blue. This includes, open space land set aside by PUD, land conservancy, or conservation easement; places of worship;
park land; land owned by other governmental agencies; and land anticipated to be donated to the Township.

Also, the former Standard Sand Corp. site is now showing ownership by Tacoma LLC and Tacoma Industries LLC. Staff is under the impression there is some type of reverter clause in the deed(s) that will ultimately transfer ownership to the Ottawa County Parks Department to expand the Rosy Mound Natural Area.

How does the Planning Commission want this land to be designated? Previously, it has been shown as Extraction for mineral mining.

**WHAT’S LEFT?**

What other parcels need to be included? Are there places of worship that have been left off? Is there other land that is expected to be donated?

Please advise if there need to be any revisions for the next draft map.
Community Development Memo

DATE: October 15, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Stacey Fedewa, AICP – Community Development Director
RE: Future Land Use Map – Review of Agricultural Designations

BACKGROUND

As you may recall, staff worked with the Assessing Department to compile a list of properties with active Qualified Agricultural Exemptions, PA 116, and Commercial Forest designations. The idea is to see where Agriculture is actively occurring and use that as a starting point to determine if any properties master-planned for Agricultural Preservation should be amended to a residential district.

AG PARCEL DATA

Qualified AG

There are 106 lots with the Qualified AG designation with all but 9 parcels being actively farmed. The other 9 parcels are under common ownership and contiguous with an actively farmed parcel, which means it is also afforded the tax benefits of a Qualified AG parcel. In addition, there are 2 parcels in the PA 116 program with one of them being Commercial Forest.

Most of the AG parcels are south of Buchanan Street and become more clustered as you move to the southeast corner of the Township.

Zoned AG

There are 264 parcels zoned AG, with several being dedicated to a Public/Quasi-Public use.

Master-Planned AG

There are 395 parcels master-planned as Agricultural Preservation and generally align with the Qualified AG parcels. That said, the area also includes large-lot single family residential uses, which align with the Rural Preserve Statement of Purpose.
WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF AG LAND?

Based on this information, how does the Planning Commission want to address the Agricultural Preservation designation on the Future Land Use map?

Suggestions include:

- Keeping it as-is with no changes
- Changing the designation to Rural Residential if it contains a dwelling
- Identify certain blocks of land between streets to keep as AG (i.e., within the M-45, 152nd, Winans, and 144th)

Please provide guidance to staff so another map can be drafted for the next meeting.

OPTION TO MASTER-PLAN FOR MORE RESIDENTIAL

If the Planning Commission wants to consider master-planning more land for Rural Preserve and Rural Residential it can be accomplished. The Master Plan’s Future Land Use and Zoning Plan does indicate the RR-designation correlates to RP and RR. The only update necessary to the text is revising 10-acres to 5-acres.

If the Planning Commission wishes to pursue this, staff needs general guidance on appropriate areas and types of parcels to prepare a new map for the next meeting. For example, does every parcel with a dwelling be changed to an RR-designation?

RP – Statement of Purpose in Zoning Ordinance

RP Rural Preserve. The RP Rural Preserve District is designed to provide an intermediate district between the AG Agriculture District and the other residential districts established under the Zoning Ordinance. It is intended to provide opportunities for development of large lots or parcels with residential uses and related accessory uses, where the lot or parcel is supported only by minimal infrastructure features, such as unpaved roads. It is intended to be a low-density type of use, on which minimal residential development is permitted because of proximity to agricultural uses and practices, and because of the lack of infrastructure such as municipal water and sanitary sewer. This district is intended to provide appropriate uses to large parcels that are not suited to be agricultural and have limited infrastructure.

Rural Residential – Future Land Use and Zoning Plan

Intended Land Uses

Areas planned for Rural Residential (RR) are characterized by single-family homes on lots that range from 1 to 10 acres. This “rural development” pattern is typically integrated, with or adjacent to, agricultural activities and generally there is a significant separation distance between homes. Unchecked, the indiscriminate application of this type of development can lead to an early or inappropriate transition of agricultural/rural land uses
If the Planning Commission wants to consider changing the future land use designation for some Ag Preservation parcels, do you feel the current description in the Future Land Use and Zoning Plan is accurate?
Comparison of Agricultural Land Designations

Current Future Land Use

Qualified AG Parcels

Current Zoning District