I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Pledge to the Flag

IV. Approval of the April 18, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

V. Correspondence

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

VII. Public Hearings:
   A. Rezoning – RP to AG – Bagley
   B. Rezoning – AG to RP – Brege

VIII. Old Business
   A. Rezoning – RP to AG – Bagley
   B. Rezoning – AG to RP – Brege

IX. New Business
   A. Pre-Application – Wesco – Proposed Development

X. Reports
   A. Staff Report
   B. Commissioner Comments

XI. Extended Public Comments & Questions (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.
MEETING MINUTES  
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
APRIL 18, 2022

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, Reenders, Mesler, Lemkuil, Wagenmaker and Taylor  
Members absent: Chalifoux, Cousins, Hesselsweet  
Also present: Senior Planner Thibault and Associate Planner Hoisington  

Without objection, Wilson instructed Hoisington to record the minutes.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
Without objection, the minutes of the March 21, 2022 meeting were approved.

V. CORRESPONDENCE  
Jim Koerner – 14975 Duneswood Drive  
• Supportive of removing the Terry Trails Subdivision from the Short Term Rental Overlay Map  

Mario Kyriakides – 17756 Brucker Street  
• Concerned regarding impact of Hecksel group day care facility on neighborhood.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS  
Laura Jahsen — 15155 163rd Ave., Grand Haven  
• Shared concerns over design of parallel plan for Eastbrook Development.  
• Prefers the development matches the density of the surrounding neighborhood.  
• Inquired about status of traffic study by developers.

Thibault clarified the purpose of the parallel plan is to provide a base density for a development based on the dimensional and net lot area requirements of the underlying zoning district.

Erin Purdy — 15105 163rd Ave., Grand Haven  
• Noted the parallel plan setbacks do not match the R-2 required setbacks in Eastbrook’s parallel plan.  
• Shared concerns over water features.

John Kemme – 15142 Pine St., Grand Haven  
• Interested in results of traffic study to be performed by Eastbrook.
• Expressed support of sidewalk extension and sewer line from Robbins Road to the proposed development by way of Pine Street.

Lori Riksen — 15143 163rd Ave., Grand Haven
• Concerned with how the parallel plan was developed
• Inquired if the Planning Commission could limit the size of lots

VII. PUBLIC HEARING
A. Removal from STR Overlay Zone – Rezoning – Terry Trails Subdivision
Wilson opened the hearing at 7:20pm.

Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated April 12th.

There being no further comments, Wilson closed the hearing at 7:26pm.

B. Special Land Use – Group Day Care - Hecksel
Wilson opened the hearing at 7:26 pm.

Hoisington provided an overview through a memorandum dated April 14th.

The applicant, Jade Hecksel, was present and provided the following information:
• Increased demand for day care facilities in the past few years, would like to provide care for additional children.
• Rear yard in not entirely fenced in due to existing tree line.

There being no further comments, Wilson closed the hearing at 7:28pm.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS
A. Removal from STR Overlay Zone – Rezoning – Terry Trails Subdivision
The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:
• Supportive of the proposed rezoning to respect the HOA’s regulation.
• Agreement to remove Parcel 70-07-05-201-016 from motion due to lack of communication and the parcel not being incorporated in the HOA.

Motion by Taylor, supported by Wagenmaker, to recommend the Township Board approve the rezoning application for 14341 Duneswood Drive (70-07-05-201-003); 14323 Duneswood Drive (70-07-05-201-009); 14291 Terry Trails (70-07-05-201-010); 14255 Terry Trails (70-07-05-201-015); 14367 Duneswood Drive (70-07-05-201-019); 14279 Terry Trails (70-07-05-201-020); and 14267 Terry Trails (70-07-05-201-021); within the Terry Trails Association to be removed from the Short Term Rental (STR) Overlay Zone based on the application meeting the standards of the Short Term Rental Ordinance.

Which motion carried unanimously.
B. Special Land Use – Group Day Care - Hecksel

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Discussed how a fence may be beneficial to business but was not required by State.
- Noted need for additional child care in the Township.

Motion by Wagenmaker, supported by Mesler, to approve the Special Land Use application to allow Group Day Care Home at 17766 Brucker 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 report.

Which motion carried unanimously

REPORT OF FINDINGS – SPECIAL LAND USE – GROUP DAY CARE - HECKSEL

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.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Site Plan Review – MACkite – Building Addition

Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated April 15th.

Denny Dryer, project architect for the project, provided the following information.

- Requested to locate snow storage adjacent to the parking lot into the retention basin.
• Described light fixtures as having an option to be fully cut off.
• Expressed desire to have a steeper slope into retention basin.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:
• Agreement to allow snow storage into the stormwater basin and not requiring landscaping on the northern side of the parking lot.
• Direction to staff to review retention basin sloping requirements.

Motion by Mesler, supported by Taylor, to conditionally approve the MACkite Site Plan Review application for an addition located at 16881 Hayes St. based on it meeting the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. This motion is subject to, and incorporates, the following report. Approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. Provide staff with the results of the flow test for review by DPW and F/R to ensure sufficient service
   a. Label and size fire protection line connection on plan sheet, ensure 5” Storz fitting.

2. A compliant landscaping plan to be administratively approved by staff
   a. Revise “Natural connections” to “Native Connections” for seed mix
   b. Replace “dry-mesic pollinator seed mix” for Zone 3&4 in Stormwater basin to “wet-mesic pollinator seed mix”
   c. Show tree protection fence around existing vegetation to remain on demolition plan

3. Photometric plan to be administratively approved by staff
   a. Light fixture to be verified as full cut-off

Which motion carried unanimously

REPORT OF FINDINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW – MACKITE BUILDING ADDITION

1. 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.
   B. 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.
   C. 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.
   D. 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.
E. 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.

F. 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.

G. The site plan provides reasonable visual and sound privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Landscaping shall be used, as appropriate, to accomplish these purposes.

H. All buildings and groups of buildings are arranged so as to permit necessary emergency vehicle access as requested by the fire department.

I. All streets and driveways are developed in accordance with the Ottawa County Road Commission specifications, as appropriate.

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 stormwater, 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 and consists of sharp cut-off fixtures.

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

B. STR Overlay – Update - Polak

Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated April 12th.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Thanked staff for clarification on short term rental standards.
- Supportive of the rezoning proceeding to the Township Board for approval.

B. Pre-Application Update – Eastbrook Homes – Proposed Development

Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated April 14th.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Clarified that the parallel plan is not required to provide stormwater retention ponds or other features (greenspace, landscaping, etc.) that a development plan would include.
- The established base density is based on R-2 dimensional regulations. Dependent on the design and individual development, additional units may be earned up to a 30% density bonus.
- Noted that road connections would be mandated by the Ottawa County Road Commission.

X. REPORTS
   A. Staff Report – None
   B. Commissioner Comments - None

XI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS
Laura Jahsen — 15155 163rd Ave., Grand Haven
   - Asked for clarification on maximum density allowed at Eastbrook development.

John Kemme – 15142 Pine St., Grand Haven
   - Inquired about road connection from Eastbrook development to Comstock Street.

XII. ADJOURNMENT
   Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 8:34p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassandra Hoisington
Acting Recording Secretary
Community Development Memo

DATE: May 12, 2022

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Rory Thibault – Senior Planner

RE: Bagley – RP to AG

BACKGROUND

The applicant, John Bagley, is requesting to rezone 20-acres located at 16552 Winans St (Parcel No. 70-07-27-300-026), from Rural Preserve (RP) to Agricultural (AG).

The request to rezone to AG sets the minimum lot area at 20-acres and 300-ft lot width per Section 2.08 of the Zoning Ordinance, for which the current lot is compliant. The property currently does not have a residence nor structure on it. The applicant desires to build a large pole barn prior to building a personal residence on the property. A pole barn may be considered the main building on a lot zoned Agricultural only when the principal use of the lot is conducted in it (i.e. it’s an agricultural structure, storing only agricultural and farming related items).

The rezoning application was tested against the “Three C’s” evaluation method.

COMPATIBILITY

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

The adjacent zoning is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RR/AG</td>
<td>Res./Zelenka Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Zelenka Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Vacant/ Residential Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2016 Future Land Use Map has master-planned the subject parcel for Rural Preservation (RP) which is more intensive than the applicant’s proposal. This would not create an instance of “spot-zoning” since the usage is compatible with the surrounding properties.

For this reason, **staff is supportive of the application to move through the rezoning process.**

### 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?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR AG ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>SITE CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open area with primarily rural activities; housing is subordinate to other ag. use on property</td>
<td>Abuts land used for agri-business, large forested homesteads without agricultural use in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure not required</td>
<td>Winans St. is paved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENT FOR AG FUTURE LAND USE</th>
<th>SITE CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri-business and large vacant lots; rural character</td>
<td>Abuts agricultural land, large homesteads without ag. use, and vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires a minimum lot size of 20 acres to ensure land is not further split</td>
<td>Future splits would not be possible if rezoned AG; applicant has expressed not wanting to split or sell land; heavily impacted wetland area would make future lots difficult to build upon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rezoning is consistent with Agricultural purpose in the Zoning Ordinance. The intended future land use for agricultural land in the Master Plan does not prioritize residential usage of the land, however since the current future land use of the property (Rural Preservation) is oriented toward a residential use, Staff is of the opinion the proposed usage of the property is less intensive and more oriented toward the Master Plan’s goals than what would otherwise be allowed.

### 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?*

Parcels in AG are not intended to have public utilities or even paved roads. Winans Street is paved, public utilities are not available.
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 rezoning application for 16552 Winans St. from Rural Preserve (RP) to Agricultural (AG) 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 rezoning application for 16552 Winans St. from Rural Preserve (RP) to Agricultural (AG) based on the application not meeting the rezoning 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 the 16552 Winans St. 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.
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP

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.ght.org/zoning](http://www.ght.org/zoning)

Applicant Information

Name: John Bagley
Phone: 616-745-6703
Address: 12342 Lakeshore Dr., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Email Address: johntombagley@gmail.com

Owner Information (If different from applicant)

Name: 
Phone: 
Address: 
Email: 

Property Information

Address/Location: 16552 Winans St., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Parcel Number: 70-07-27-000-026
Current Zoning: Rural Preserve
Master-Planned Zoning: Rural Preservation
Zoning Requested: Agricultural
Size (acres): 20.13

Other Information

Reason for Rezoning Request: To build barn before house
Present Use of the Subject Property: None
Number & Type of Existing Structures: None
Subject Property Located on a Paved Road: Yes
What Utilities are Available? Electric available at road

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.

Signature of applicant: 
Date: March 30, 2022

* 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.

Signature of applicant

March 30, 2022

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 Chair

Date

Last Revised 7/15/20
Community Development Memo

DATE: May 12, 2022
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Rory Thibault – Senior Planner
RE: Brege – AG to RP

BACKGROUND

The applicant, Nichole Brege, is requesting to rezone 10.5-acres located at 10441 152\textsuperscript{nd} Ave. (Parcel No. 70-07-26-400-021), from Agricultural (AG) to Rural Preserve (RP).

The request to rezone to RP sets the minimum lot area at 5-acres and a 250-ft lot width per Section 2.08 of the Zoning Ordinance, for which the current lot is compliant. The property currently has a singular residence on it. The applicant has expressed a desire to split the property into (2) 5-acre lots to build a house next to her family. This was brought before the Planning Commission in September, 2021, requesting a change to the future land use of the property from Agricultural to Rural Preservation (called Rural Residential at the time). This change was adopted.

The rezoning application was tested against the “Three C’s” evaluation method.

COMPATIBILITY

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

The adjacent zoning is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agricultural fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Crossroads/Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2016 Future Land Use Map has master-planned the subject parcel for Rural Preservation (RP) which corresponds with applicant’s proposal.

For this reason, staff is supportive of the application to move through the rezoning process.

**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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR RP ZONING DISTRICT</th>
<th>SITE CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate uses for large parcels not suited for agricultural</td>
<td>Hasn’t been used for agricultural usage since 1962, heavily wooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low density development in areas with limited infrastructure</td>
<td>152nd is unpaved, property does not have water/sewer access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENT FOR RP FUTURE LAND USE</th>
<th>SITE CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family homes on lots from 5 – 20 acres</td>
<td>Intended split is to be 5 acres, residential in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve large areas of rural land from premature development</td>
<td>Only one split (2 lots) would be possible if rezoned to RP, as the minimum lot size is 5 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rezoning is consistent with the current purpose in the Zoning Ordinance and the intended future land use in the Master Plan.

**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?

Parcels zoned RP are not intended to have public utilities or paved roads. 152nd Ave. is not paved, public utilities are not available, and are not anticipated.
SAMPLE MOTIONS

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 rezoning application for 10441 152nd Ave. 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 rezoning application for 10441 152nd Ave. from Agricultural (AG) to Rural Preserve (RP) based on the application not meeting the rezoning 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* the 10441 152nd Ave. 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.
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.ght.org/zoning](http://www.ght.org/zoning)

Applicant Information

Name: Richard C Brege  
Phone: 616-994-3388 
Address: 123 20 Katherin e Cr 
Email Address: nibrege8@gmail.com

Owner Information (If different from applicant)

Name: Richard A Brege 
Phone: 616-610-0371 
Address: 10441 152nd Ave West Olive MI 49460

Property Information

Address/Location: 10441 152nd Ave West Olive MI 49460 
Parcel Number: 70-07-26-400-021 
Current Zoning: Agricultural 
Master-Planned Zoning: Rural Preservation 
Zoning Requested: Rural Residential 
Size (acres): 10.50

Other Information

Reason for Rezoning Request: Building / Splitting Property 
Present Use of the Subject Property: Primary Residence 
Number & Type of Existing Structures: House / Garage / Shed 3 
Subject Property Located on a Paved Road: No 
What Utilities are Available? 

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.

Signature of applicant: Richard Brege  
Date: 4/8/22

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

Lytl Revised 7/15/20
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.

Signature of applicant

Date

For Office Use Only

Date Received

Materials Received: Site Plans

Survey

Location Map

Legal Description

Fee Paid?

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 Chair

Date

Last Revised 7/15/20
Community Development Memo

DATE: May 12, 2022
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Rory Thibault – Senior Planner
RE: Pre-Application Presentation – Wesco SLU

BACKGROUND

JJ Westgate, of Wesco Inc., is interested in building a gas station at 16770 Ferris St., down the street from the Township Hall where the current driving school is.

This parcel is 3.2-acres, is in the US-31 Overlay District, and is zoned C-2, General Commercial. The proposed Commercial use of a gas station is permitted in a C-2 district by a Special Land Use Permit, with additional considerations as noted in Section 12.18 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Proposed Concept

Wesco is proposing to develop a gas station with drive-thru food service similar in nature and character to the facility they operate in Muskegon on Apple Ave. This drive-thru is to facilitate customer pickup orders through their mobile application.
Site access is proposed through (2) entrances off of Ferris St. A right-in only access drive is located near the intersection of US-31 and Ferris, and a full service driveway to the east of the existing curb cut. The applicant has contacted OCRC who have given their tentative approval if the turning radius can accommodate a semi-truck. The plan illustrated below shows this accommodation.

The proposed building is roughly 5-6k sf., with 5 gas pumps offering recreational fuel. Drive-thru access is proposed on the West side of the building. A free air station and dumpster enclosure, along with a propane fill tank are anticipated.

**PURPOSE OF PRE-APPLICATION PRESENTATION**

At a pre-application presentation, the Planning Commission and property owner shall have an opportunity to exchange information and provide guidance that will assist in the preparation of materials. Also, it is noted that no formal action will be taken, nor will statements made be considered legally binding commitments.

**Considerations**

- Respective of Section 12.04 of the Zoning Ordinance: Special Land Uses shall not cause traffic that will be hazardous, or inconvenient to the neighborhood, nor conflict with the normal traffic of the neighborhood; considering: safe and convenient routes for pedestrian traffic, 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.
  - Does the Planning Commission feel the access routes are acceptable or should they be altered?
  - What traffic calming solutions are acceptable to the Planning Commission?
  - Does the Planning Commission feel a traffic study is warranted?
- Are there any requirements that the Planning Commission feels would be relevant to the health, safety, and welfare of the Township?
  - If they are providing grocery service, does the Planning Commission feel that there should be access to fresh food?
Becky Page

From: Jerry Kuiper <jkuiper@ottawacorc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 9:07 AM
To: Becky Page
Subject: RE: 16770 Ferris Street - Driveways

Becky,

I spoke with Fred Keena, our traffic engineer, again. His preference would be only the one entrance off Ferris St., but understands the desire for that second entrance, especially for the delivery trucks. He said we would allow it, if you can make sure it will work for a semi-truck.

Jerry

From: Becky Page <bpage@hollandengineering.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 10:50 AM
To: Jerry Kuiper <jkuiper@ottawacorc.com>
Cc: JJ Westgate <jjwestgate@wescoinc.com>; Stacey Whalen <swhalen@wescoinc.com>
Subject: RE: 16770 Ferris Street - Driveways

Good morning Jerry,

Per our phone conversation this morning, please see attached for a conceptual layout for the proposed Wesco to be located on the southeast corner of US-31 and Ferris Street. For this layout, we are proposing a right-in only access driveway near the intersection of US-31 and Ferris Street and a full service driveway off of Ferris Street at the easterly edge of the property. Please review the proposed driveway locations and configurations and let me know if the proposed driveways would be acceptable to the OCRC. Thank you.

Becky

Rebecca K. Page, P.E.
Senior Project Manager
bpage@HollandEngineering.com
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