AGENDA
Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals
Thursday, May 28, 2020 – 6:00 p.m.
Remote Electronic Meeting

According to the Attorney General, interrupting a public meeting in Michigan with hate speech or profanity could result in criminal charges under several State statutes relating to Fraudulent Access to a Computer or Network (MCL 752.797) and/or Malicious Use of Electronics Communication (MCL 750.540). According to the US Attorney for Eastern Michigan, Federal charges may include disrupting a public meeting, computer intrusion, using a computer to commit a crime, hate crimes, fraud, or transmitting threatening communications. Public meetings are monitored, and violations of statutes will be prosecuted.

Please go to [http://www.ght.org/boards/meeting-packets/](http://www.ght.org/boards/meeting-packets/) to view the complete packet for tonight's Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

I. Call To Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of the November 26, 2019 ZBA Meeting Minutes

IV. New Business
   A. ZBA Variance Application No. 20-01 – Grand Haven Custom Molding

If you would like to comment on Agenda Item Only, you may submit your comments via Facebook Live stream found at [https://www.facebook.com/GHTownship/](https://www.facebook.com/GHTownship/); email sfedewa@ght.org; or call (616) 260-4982 when prompted. Comments through the phone are limited to three (3) minutes.

V. Reports

VI. Extended Public Comments (*Limited To Four (4) Minutes Please*).

If you would like to comment on a Non-Agenda Item, you may now submit your comments via Facebook Live stream found at [https://www.facebook.com/GHTownship/](https://www.facebook.com/GHTownship/); email sfedewa@ght.org, or call (616) 260-4982 when prompted. Comments through the phone are limited to four (4) minutes.

VII. Adjournment
I. CALL TO ORDER
The regular meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Voss.

II. ROLL CALL
Board of Appeals members present: Voss, Slater, Loftis, Behm, and Hesselsweet
Board of Appeals members absent: Rycenga (alternate)

Also present: Assistant Zoning Administrator Hoisington, and Community Development Director Fedewa.

Without objection, Hoisington was instructed to record the minutes for the meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Without objection, the minutes of the June 25, 2019 ZBA Meeting were approved.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Motion by Voss, supported by Slater, to remove ZBA Case #19-01 from the table for reconsideration. Which motion carried.

1. ZBA Case #19-01 – Dimensional Variance – Rust

   Party Requesting Variance: Dale and Mary Jo Rust
   Applicant Representative: Curt Hall, LandTechwmi LLC
   Address: 1939 Koehling Rd, Northbrook, IL 60052
   Parcel Number: 70-03-32-331-017
   Location: 18165 Shore Acres Rd

   Dale and Mary Joe Rust, represented by Curt Hall, are seeking a variance to construct a series of retaining walls and decks that would violate Sections 21.02, 20.22.1, and 20.22.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

   Hoisington provided an overview of the application through a memorandum dated November 21st.

   The applicant provided supplemental information pertaining to scope of the project.

   The Board discussed the application and noted the following:
   • Verified the information requested from the May meeting has been provided.
- A simplified site plan and relevant height and setback details were provided.
- An EGLE Permit has been issued for the project.
- Based on further discussion the western most deck is no longer a concern.
- Confirmed the scope of work has not changed since the time the application was first presented.
  - The variance items have been identified and reduced from what was anticipated based on the initial application because of details provided.

**Standard No. 1** – Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances:
- Exceptional changes in topography.
- Located within the Critical Dune Areas.

Ayes: Voss, Slater, Loftis, Behm, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 2** – Substantial property right:
- Many homes along Lake Michigan have a series of decks to provide views.
- The proposed retaining walls will help preserve and stabilize the house.

Ayes: Voss, Slater, Loftis, Behm, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 3** – Will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent parcels, or material impact on the intent and purpose of the Ordinance:
- The Board noted that no opposition was received from adjacent parcels.

Ayes: Voss, Slater, Loftis, Behm, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Standard No. 4** – Request is not of such a recurrent nature as to make reasonably practical the formulation of a general regulation:
- Case is unique and does not present a concern that the situation will reoccur and make reasonable the formulation of a general regulation.

Ayes: Voss, Slater, Loftis, Behm, Hesselsweet
Nays: None

**Motion** by Slater, supported by Behm, to approve a dimensional variance from Sections 21.02, 20.22.1, and 20.22.2 of the Zoning Ordinance to construct a series of retaining walls and decks. The details are as follows:
1. Dimensional variance from Section 20.22.2 to allow a 4’ tall retaining wall to be built to the property line that will result in setback variance of 2’.

2. Dimensional variance from Section 20.22.1 and 20.22.2 to allow a series of retaining walls totaling 11’ in height that will result in a height variance of 3’ and a side yard 2 setback variance of 6’.

3. Dimensional variance from Section 20.22.2 to allow a retaining wall (not to exceed 8’ in height) to be built to the property line that will result in a front yard setback variance of 19’ and a side yard 1 setback variance of 15’.

4. Dimensional variance from Section 21.02 to allow a deck that will result in a side yard 1 setback variance of 15’.

5. Dimensional variance from Section 21.02 to allow a deck that will result in a side yard 2 setback variance of 6’.

Approval of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have been affirmatively met. Which motion passed, as indicated by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Slater, Loftis, Behm
Nays: Voss
Absent: Hesselsweet

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. Housekeeping Duties – Appointment of Officers & 2020 Meeting Schedule

Hoisington provided an overview of the topic in a memorandum dated November 21st. Current appointments include:

- Chairperson Voss
- Vice Chair Slater
- Secretary Loftis

Motion by Hesselsweet, supported by Behm to reappoint current members. Which motion carried unanimously.

The meeting calendar was reviewed and no conflicts were noted.

Motion by Slater, supported by Loftis to approve the 2020 Meeting Date Schedule as presented. Which motion carried unanimously.

2. 2018 ZBA Report

Hoisington provided an overview of the report in a memorandum dated November 21st.

It was requested that Staff seek out additional training opportunities for the Board.
The Board affirmed the findings and information provided in the report.

VI. REPORTS - None

VII. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassandra Hoisington
Acting Recording Secretary
Community Development Memo

DATE: May 22, 2020

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals

FROM: Cassandra Hoisington, Associate Planner
Stacey Fedewa – AICP, Community Development Director

RE: 14016 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue – Dimensional Variance Application No. 20-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Location for Loading Docks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Location for Loading Docks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Slope for a Stormwater Basin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Slope for a Stormwater Basin</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The owner is proposing to construct a new warehouse for storage of their products. The proposed building features 6 loading docks located in the front of the building. Additionally, the proposed layout includes a stormwater basin with a 5:1 slope.

Section 8.12.G of the Overlay Zone prohibits loading docks to face a public street and requires them to be located in the rear yard. Where that is not practical, they may be permitted in the side yard as long as walls, landscaping, and/or areas are recessed to minimize the negative visual impact. Section 5.08.C of the Parking Chapter, prohibits locating loading docks in the front yard of a property.

The applicant believes that due to the flag lot shape of the parcel, the area where the proposed docks would be located, could be considered a side yard. Staff have determined this area to be the front yard.

The applicant believes it would be more appropriate to place the loading docks in the proposed area for ease of access and suggested that the proposed building would not be highly visible from the road. The new building would be over 660 ft from 172nd Avenue with narrow frontage on the road itself.

The applicant has noted the existing non-conforming loading docks on adjacent properties. However, the purpose of the Overlay Zone is a long-term plan of improving the aesthetics of the US-31 corridor. One of the questions that arises—does the distance from the road coupled with the proposed landscaping meet the spirit and intent of the ordinance?

As you know, precedence is always one of the primary considerations for a variance. This case has enough specific circumstances for the ZBA to approve or deny the application.

First, as noted above, Section 8.12.G of the ordinance requires loading docks to be in the rear yard, and then gives a supplemental option of locating in a side yard if walls, landscaping, and/or a recessed area are provided. If the ZBA finds that it is not practical to locate the loading docks in the rear or side yard, staff strongly recommends requiring these specific enhancements to minimize the negative visual impact.

If approved, the precedence the ZBA is setting is two-fold, the flag lot and distance from the road coupled with the specific enhancements and landscaping would establish the threshold that other applicants would be tested against. A similar situation (flag lot adjacent to residential property) does not exist within the area.

Second, because the site could comply with the ordinance the variance can be denied. The applicant would have to flip the site and move the building west and move the loading docks east behind the building. When this was discussed with the applicant, the rebuttal focused on the loading docks abutting a residential property. The lot does back up to a Rural Residential parcel (compared to industrial on the other 3 sides), but the dwelling is more than 1000 feet farther east, so it appears the impact would be minimal.
However, the ZBA would need to determine the Township’s prerogative—loading docks abutting residential, or loading docks in the front yard abutting other industrial yet still semi-visible from US-31? Staff believes this decision on the Township’s prerogative will set the greatest precedence.

There is an option that complies with the Zoning Ordinance - the applicant has the option to change the location of the loading docks to a side or rear yard. The parcel has been cleared, so the site is a blank canvas. The applicant has the option to revise the site plan to comply with the Ordinance. Staff have suggested revising the location of the warehouse to accommodate the loading docks in a compliant location. The applicant and owner were advised of this alternative but chose to proceed with the variance application.

**Precedent Considerations for Basin Slope**

Section 4.02.A.3 requires stormwater basins to have a slope of 5:1 or varying gentle slopes and must promote a natural shape. The gentle slopes are required for safety purposes by making it more difficult to drown or become stuck in a basin because it’s not a quick drop-off at the top edge.

The applicant has indicated they would like to preserve the landmark trees but are unable to protect them AND create a natural shape with a 5:1 slope. To achieve those US-31 Overlay Zone goals the applicant is proposing a 4:1 slope, which will enable them to preserve the landmark trees and create a natural shape.

It should be noted, this basin design is intended to dispose of stormwater for an entirely built-out site, so it is larger than what is necessary for the first phase.

Staff and the applicant have been in contact with the OCWRC to discuss the natural shape and the impact on the stormwater calcs needed to issue a site drainage permit. There are no anticipated problems with obtaining such approvals with the redesigned basin.

**VARIANCE STANDARDS**

To authorize a dimensional variance from the strict applications of the provisions of this Ordinance, the ZBA shall apply the following standards and make an affirmative finding as to each of the matters set forth in the standards.
STANDARD 1
There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning classification.

**Loading Docks.** The subject property is a flag lot and a legal lot of record. The proposed building is setback over 660 ft from 172nd Avenue. The rear of the property abuts a Rural Residential parcel, compared to the front of the property which abuts other Industrial properties.

**Basin Slope.** The steeper 4:1 slope would allow the basin to have a smaller footprint and retain existing landmark trees. The design of the basin encompasses a total build-out of the site.

The ZBA will need to determine whether this standard is met.

STANDARD 2
The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and in the vicinity, provided that possible increased financial return shall not of itself, be deemed sufficient to warrant a variance.

**Loading Docks.** The applicant noted the land to the west side of the subject property are in the same zoning district. Industrial properties are required to have loading docks, but are required to be in the rear yard, unless it is not practical, in which case site enhancements can be required to minimize the negative visual impact.

**Basin Slope.** Stormwater basins are required to receive site drainage approval from the OCWRC. The 5:1 slope is intended to improve the safety by creating a gentle slope into the basin, but this slope would result in landmark trees to be removed, but the spirit and intent of the Overlay Zone is to preserve said trees.

The ZBA will need to make a determination whether this standard is met given the circumstances of this case.

STANDARD 3
Authorization of such variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property and will not materially impair the intent and purpose of this Ordinance or the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

**Loading Docks.** Would locating the docks in the rear yard be a detriment to the adjacent property zoned Rural Residential? Would locating the docks in the front yard be an aesthetic detriment or impair the intent and purpose of the Overlay Zone? Would requiring site enhancements like landscaping, walls, or recesses resolve potential detriments?

**Basin Slope.** Would allowing a steeper slope be a detriment to adjacent property or impair the safety of the community? The basin does not appear to be in a location...
that is traveled by foot or vehicle, so it seems unlikely that a steeper slope would result in safety concerns.

No correspondence was received for this application (as of May 22).

The ZBA will need to make the determination whether this standard is met given the circumstances of this case and the findings on standards 1 and 2.

### STANDARD 4

The condition or situation of the specific piece of property or the intended use of said property for which the variance is sought, is not of so general or recurrent a nature as to make reasonably practical the formulation of a general regulation for such condition or situation, a part of this Ordinance.

**Loading Docks.** Staff is aware of 1 other ZBA case where there was a request to locate the loading docks in a side yard. The variance was approved, but not built, so the approval expired and becomes moot on precedence. That said, the variance was approved for a multi-tenant commercial building because the loading docks in the rear yard would have required business owners in the suites to pick-up from the rear yard and walk their deliveries back up to the suites.

**Basin Slope.** Staff is not aware of any other variance applications related to the slope of a stormwater basin, and this is the first case staff is aware of to request a steeper slope. Other sites have not had an issue complying with the gentler slope.

The ZBA will need to make the determination whether this standard is met.

### SAMPLE MOTIONS

If the ZBA determines each standard has been affirmative met, one of the following motions can be offered:

- **Motion to conditionally approve** a dimensional variance from Section 8.12.G and Section 5.08.C to construct loading docks in the front yard of a new warehouse building at 14016 172nd Avenue.

- **Motion to approve** a dimensional variance from Section 4.02.A.3 to construct a retention basin with a slope of 4:1 for the parcel located at 14016 172nd Avenue.

  Approval of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have been affirmatively met.

However, if the ZBA determines each standard has not been affirmatively met, the following motion can be offered:

- **Motion to deny** the Section 8.12.G and Section 5.08.C to construct loading docks in the front yard of a new warehouse building located at 14016 172nd Avenue because an alternative exists that does not violate the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.
Motion to deny a dimensional variance from Section 4.02.A.3 to construct a stormwater basin with a slope of 4:1 because an alternative exists that does not violate the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance.

Denial of this variance is based upon this Board’s findings that all four standards have not been affirmatively met.

If the ZBA determines that more information is needed to make an affirmative finding, the following motion can be offered:

Motion to table the dimensional variance application for 14016 172nd Avenue, and direct the applicant and/or staff to provide the following information:

1. List items.

Please contact me with questions or concerns.
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Escrow*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance or Appeal</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Meeting</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Applicant/Appellant Information
Name: GH Custom Molding
Phone: (616) 935-3160
Address: 1500 S Beechtree, Grand Haven, MI 49417

Owner Information (If different from applicant/appellant)
Name: 14016 - 172nd Avenue, LLE (same as GH Molding)
Phone: (616) 935-3160
Address: 1500 S Beechtree, Grand Haven, MI 49417

Property Information (Include a survey or scaled drawing)
Address: 14016 - 172nd Avenue
Parcel No: 70 - 07 - 04  - 200 - 034
Current Zoning: I-1 Industrial
Lot Width: 71.56 feet
Lot Depth: approx 849.89 feet
Parcel Size: +/- 6.5 acres
Parcel Size: approx 275,807 sq. ft.
Lot Type: Typical Lot

General Information (Check one)
( X ) Application for Variance
(     ) Request for Interpretation
(     ) Notice of Appeal

NOTE: Please provide a scaled drawing with details of your proposed work including the dimensions of any structure(s) (i.e. height, width & length), building materials, the setbacks to all property lines, and other existing structures on the parcel, and any other relevant information, as needed.

VARIANCE REQUESTED (If applicable)
1. Attach a Narrative: Description of Request; Why it is needed; and Addresses each of the 4 Standards
2. Variance Requested From the Requirements of Section Number(s) Section 15A.10.6, Section 15.2405.3 & Section 15A.04
3. Relating to truck dock location and side slope of storm water holding area
4. Structure/Land Use (After Variance) storage building for Grand Haven Custom Molding
5. Overall Building Size (After Variance) 50,250 s.f.
6. Setbacks from lot lines (After Variance):
   a. Front Yard +/- 26 feet (off west yard)
   b. Rear Yard 50 feet
   c. Side Yard #1 +/- 74 feet
   d. Side Yard #2 +/- 320 feet

Last Revised 12/31/18
INTERPRETATION REQUEST (If applicable)
Description of requested interpretation(s) and relevant Section number(s):
   See Attached.

APPEALS AND OTHER APPLICATIONS (If applicable)
Description of action being appealed or other matter which is basis of application.
   See Attached.

GROUND FOR APPEAL OR OTHER APPLICATION (If applicable)
   See Attached.

IF THE SPACE PROVIDED ON THIS APPLICATION IS INADEQUATE
PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NEEDED

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

Signature of applicant

March 4, 2020
Date

Signature of Zoning Administrator

March 4, 2020
Date

For Office Use Only
Date Received ________________________________
Fee Paid? ________________________________
RELEASE FORM

The undersigned has applied to the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. The undersigned hereby authorizes the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and appropriate Township staff members to inspect the property *(address stated below)* at reasonable times, in regards to the consideration of my request for a variance.

Signature of applicant

March 4, 2020
Date

Owner’s Signature (if different from applicant)

March 4, 2020
Date

14016 - 172nd Avenue

Property Address

ACTION TAKEN BY TOWNSHIP BOARD OF APPEALS

(  ) Application Approved

(  ) Application Denied

Description of variance granted or other action taken including conditions imposed, if any:

Grounds for Board action including findings as to standards and requirements prerequisite to imposition of conditions under ordinance:

Signature of ZBA Chairperson

Date
Grand Haven Custom Molding
14016 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue
Grand Haven Township, Michigan

Zoning Board of Appeals Review

Overview

Grand Haven Custom Molding (GHCM) is in the process of purchasing property at 14016 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue. The property covers approximately 6.33 acres (excluding ROW) and is zoned I-1 Industrial.

GHCM is proposing to construct a 50,250 sf industrial building and related drives/parking areas on the property. The building will be used to store their product.

In order to develop the property properly, GHCM is requesting two variances as follows:

1). Variance from Section 15A.10.6 and Section 15.2405.3 to allow the truck docks to be located between the proposed building and 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue.
2). Variance from Section 15A.04 to allow the storm water holding area to have a side slope of 1 on 4 instead of the 1 on 5 mentioned in the ordinance.

Note that the standard for approval of variances have all been met for the request. Please note the following:

A. There are exception or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district.

The property is a flag lot. In a different setting, the west yard/setback in question could arguably be considered the side of the building as opposed to the front. The proposed building is approximate 670 ft off 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenue (at closet point). The proposed building is behind two large industrial buildings and one smaller building, and parking areas. The view of the property and building are greatly screened. – which greatly screen the view of the property. The property to the north and west is zoned industrial, while the property to the east is zoned residential.

For the 1 on 4 side slope for the storm water holding area, the basin is in the middle of an industrial setting. Therefore there will be little to no people visiting the holding area. The Ottawa County Water Resource Commission’s standard is a 1 on 4 slope, which will be held. The steeper side slopes will allow existing trees in the area to be preserved, while still allowing the required storage volume to be provided.
B. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district and in the vicinity, provided that possible increased financial return shall not of itself, be deemed sufficient to warrant a variance.

The industrial businesses to the west of the site have parking and truck docks located west of where GHCM’s docks would be located. Allowing the docks to be located west of the proposed building protects the residential property to the east, while keeping the proposed truck docks internal to the industrial district and in the vicinity of existing truck docks.

Allowing the 1 on 4 side slope for the storm water holding area allows existing trees to be preserved, while still providing the required storage volume. No other businesses in the area have on-site detention, but the county has indicated that the GHCM property does have to provide on-site detention.

The variance requests do not provide GHCM with an increased financial return.

C. The authorization of such variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property, and will not materially impair the intent and purpose of this Ordinance or the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

If the variance were NOT approved it would be a detriment to the adjacent properties to the east, as it would force the truck docks and parking to be adjacent to residential as opposed to being adjacent to industrial.

The existing businesses to the west have truck docks in the immediate vicinity, so the proposed location of the truck docks would not be detriment to those properties.

And the truck docks/building is over 700 ft off 172nd Avenue, behind existing buildings and parking areas that front 172nd. Therefore, the view of the property from 172nd will be very minimal.

The 1 on 4 side slope of the holding area is per OCWRC standards and is in line with other holding areas in different municipalities. The holding area will not be visible from 172nd at all, and with this being an industrial lot, there will be little to no one to ever ‘visit’ the holding area.

D. That the conditions or situation of the specific piece of property or the intended use of said property for which the variance is sought, is not of so general or recurrent a nature as to make reasonably practical the formulation of a general regulation for such condition or situation, a part of this Ordinance.

The property is very unique. The property is a flag lot, with the buildable area being located substantially off the public roadway. There are existing buildings/businesses located between the buildable area of the site and the public roadway. The property is zoned Industrial, with Industrial to the west/north/south, but residential to the east.
**LANDSCAPE NOTES**

**PLANTING NOTES:**

- **TIP**: Mulching is highly recommended to hold in moisture and avoid weed growth around plantings. Mulches must be wide enough to ensure topsoil is not exposed.

- **TIP**: All excavated soil should be returned to its original position. If it is not possible to return the excavated soil to its original position, it should be spread out to a minimum of 4' around the tree cavity. Tamped soil must be returned to each tree cavity to ensure proper depth and structure.

- **TIP**: Mulch should be spread out around the tree cavity, following the natural contour of the site. Mulch should be held in place with a ground stake for the first year.

- **TIP**: All overhead utilities, except for water lines, must be located in accordance with the engineering plans. All underground utilities, except for water lines, must be located in accordance with the engineering plans. If a conflict exists between proposed plantings, the landscape architect shall be consulted.

- **TIP**: All proposed plantings shall be fully approved by the landscape architect prior to planting. Any plant substitutions shall be approved by the landscape architect.

- **TIP**: All plantings shall be fully approved by the landscape architect prior to planting. Any plant substitutions shall be approved by the landscape architect.

**IRRIGATION NOTES:**

- **TIP**: Watering is highly recommended to ensure proper hydration of new plantings. Watering shall be done at least twice per week, with the majority of the water applied in the early morning.

- **TIP**: Irrigation lines shall be laid out prior to planting and shall be placed at least 3' away from all plantings.

- **TIP**: All irrigation lines shall be marked with a flag to prevent damage from equipment.

**TYPICAL TREE PLANTING DETAIL**

- **TIP**: Trees shall be planted at their root zone and shall be placed at least 3' away from all existing utilities.

**TYPICAL SHRUB / PERENNIAL / ORNAMENTAL GRASS PLANTING DETAIL**

- **TIP**: Shrub and perennial plantings shall be placed at least 3' away from all existing utilities.

**LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS**

**PLANT SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dogwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fescue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIORETENTION PLANT SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Grasses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGAL NOTICE:**

The landscape architect reserves the right to reject any plant material, for any reason before or after it is installed.

**CONSTRUCTION MANAGER**

The landscape architect reserves the right to reject any plant material, for any reason before or after it is installed.

**PREPARED FOR:**

Gh Standard Plan

**PROJECT NO:**

L-201

**SHEET NO:**

S OF 5
1. Dumpster Enclosure Plan

2. Front Elevation

3. Side Elevation

4. Rear Elevation

Grand Haven 50K PEMB Dumpster Enclosure Details

SPR: 5/21/2020

8-YARD DUMPSTER (6'-0" X 6'-0"

SEALED 1X6 CEDAR BATTENS OVER ENCLOSURE STRUCTURE.

5" DIAM. CONC-FILLED STEEL PIPE BOLLARD PAINT SAFETY YELLOW.

A4.2