



PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
February 16, 2010

DRAFT COPY

Present: Nicki Arendshorst, LeeAnne Jachim, Steve Schaftenaar, Bill Cole, Ed de Vries, Joseph Lampen, Bob Ellis, Dan Martin, attorney, Andy Bowman, planning consultant, and Eric Davis, Zoning Administrator

Absent: None

Nicki Arendshorst, Chairperson, called the regular meeting of the Park Township Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m.

MOTION

A motion was made by Cole and supported by Jachim to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

MOTION

A motion was made by Jachim and supported by Schaftenaar to approve the minutes for the January 19, 2010 regular meeting as presented.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jack Siebers, attorney representing the Macatawa Cottagers, went over a letter presented to the Planning Commission (PC) stating that they take exception to the way in which a revised density calculation was formulated.

AGENDA ITEMS

Item #1 – Site Plan Review – Bowerman Blueberries – 15679 James St.

Kelly Bowerman, owner, presented the site plan. He stated that they want to build a permanent building for selling their farm produce. In reply to questions from the PC members he gave the following answers. He stated that the store would be open approximately fourteen weeks of the year from July 4 through October 15. There would be one sign on top of the building. They would be selling products produced on their farm. The hours would be 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The building would be in the same location as their current stand. It would be placed slightly farther back and would have a slightly larger parking lot. The existing structure would be demolished. There would be approximately fifteen parking spaces. The parking lot would not be paved but it would be marked with cones or chalk. The building would have a 6'x6' handicap bathroom. The building would be on a

septic system. Municipal water is available at the site. The lighting would be under the porch only. There would not be any lights in the parking lot. There would be a designated trash receptacle site.

Arendshorst asked how much traffic the current stand gets.

Bowerman stated that there is no problem with traffic congestion. In a four hour time period they get approximately fifty vehicles.

Arendshorst asked about any nearby farm market stands.

Bowerman stated that there is a small self-serve stand nearby and that is all.

Schaftenaar asked about signage.

Davis stated that the GAAMP regulates signage on the property. The township is only allowed to regulate signage off the property. He reminded the PC about the agreement regarding the existing off-site signs.

Arendshorst asked if he had talked to the neighbors.

Bowerman stated that they had and no one had any complaints.

Jachim asked the timing.

Bowerman stated that it would take them approximately three weeks to demo and rebuild.

Arendshorst asked if he thought that other farms in Park Township would want to do this.

Bowerman stated that they had talked to some of the other farms and no one seemed to have any interest in doing the same thing.

Arendshorst went over the two standards for site plan review:

- (1) *The adequacy of streets, alleys, parking areas, loading zones, sidewalks, drainage, water and sewer lines, and traffic control for the proposed use, building, or structure:*
This has been adequately discussed during the meeting.
- (2) *The adequacy of protection afforded lands and the surrounding neighborhood from adverse impact:* There is no adverse impact. A market stand has been working well there for years.

Ellis asked about ingress and egress. He stated that pulling out from that lot isn't really a problem, but perhaps they could improve things somewhat.

A discussion ensued.

Bowerman stated that they would have one-way lanes. The building would be moved back. He stated that he would pull three pine trees out and that would improve the ingress and egress as well.

Jachim asked about employees.

Bowerman stated that they usually have a maximum of two employee vehicles there at one time.

MOTION

A motion was made by Ellis and supported by Schaftenaar to approve the site plan as presented.

Arendshorst reviewed the standards in 38-184 (10) of the Park Township Code of Ordinances. All of the standards are met.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

Item #2 PUD Preliminary – Pt. West I, LLC – 2365 S. Shore Dr.

Arendshorst is recused from this item at all meetings. She stepped down.

MOTION

A motion was made by Jachim and supported by Cole to remove the item from the table.

VOTE

Motion carried: 6-0

Lampen invited Bowman, township consultant, to join the PC for a study session and explained what they hoped to accomplish in the session. He stated that they would begin with a discussion on the document prepared by Bowman.

Bowman stated that there had been several meetings, in-house and at the site, which resulted in a revised density calculation for the site. This process and conclusion were explained in a document given to the PC. He stated that if the PC agrees with the proposed density then most likely the developer should be urged to present a different development layout before proceeding much further. He stated that the conclusion is an interpretive rationale as to how to handle commercial activities as being recommended in the master plan on this site when, in fact, the property is zoned differently than it is master planned. The portion master-planned for low density residential was calculated at three units per gross acre. The density for those two sections were added together to come up with a number of units that can be creatively spread throughout the property to accomplish a nice in-fill project. There are no strict lines where the density has to go. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is used for just such flexibility. He stated that he was confident in the approach taken and the final density number of forty-three (43).

Lampen wondered how the mix of uses fits into the density question.

Bowman stated that perhaps any commercial use areas would have to be “swapped out of” residential areas.

Lampen clarified that there will be boat and vehicular traffic coming to the marina.

Bowman stated that perhaps it makes more sense to have the commercial further in to the east by Eldeans’s rather than out here. He didn’t know what demand there would be for commercial in Macatawa.

A discussion ensued on density.

Ellis asked about removing the dune area when figuring a density calculation.

Bowman stated that it is his opinion that the density, per the zoning and master plan, is per gross acre. He stated that he wouldn’t take the dune out to figure density. He asked “Would this practice be applied to every situation in the future or just in this case because it is a dune?”

There was a discussion on density.

Schaftenaar asked how much land needs to be used for parking for the marina. Should the marina be part of the equation when use and density are considered?

Martin clarified an issue brought up by Lampen and Schaftenaar. If the entire acreage is used to calculate residential density, then can additional commercial uses be added on top of the maximum number of residential units or should less residential units be required in order to leave room for some commercial uses.

A discussion ensued about density, parallel plans, removing elements before calculating density, private roads, commercial uses, the marina as a commercial use, etc.

Bowman clarified that a clear density number needs to be agreed upon.

Schaftenaar asked if it was appropriate at this time to give guidelines regarding bulk, height of the hillside structure, etc.

Lampen stated that he felt that a density figure of forty-three (43) was well thought out. He stated that he thought that perhaps some reduction for the private roads might be appropriate, considering the normal use of the road. He stated that he thought that perhaps a density figure of forty (40) might be better.

Ellis agreed that some units should be taken out for the roads and that forty (40) seemed reasonable.

Jachim and de Vries agreed.

Lampen stated that he would like to talk about walkways, sightlines, the hillside unit, etc. He asked if the disuse of the existing hillside structure interferes with the non-conforming status.

Bowman stated that a PUD has the latitude to work around that.

Martin stated that that was correct. Also, there is no evidence of “intent to abandon”.

Bowman stated that he would like to see the proposed hillside structure limited to something similar in size and height to what is currently there. He stated that this is an in-fill development and it needs to defer to what is currently there and fit in well.

Ellis stated that he'd like to see the hillside building restricted to thirty-five (35) feet high, even though it is currently fifty-four (54) feet high. A discussion ensued. It was discussed that perhaps more height might be acceptable on the hillside structure if the spacing of units on the waterfront allowed views of the lake.

Lampen questioned if they could look at re-orienting the houses in the central area. This would seem to be safer and more aesthetic. A discussion ensued.

Ellis stated that he felt that thirty-five (35') feet was too tall for the structures on the lakefront. A discussion ensued about the view shed along Lake Macatawa. Perhaps the view through the buildings is more important than the height of the buildings. Perhaps a taller hillside unit would be acceptable as a tradeoff for a better view of the lake.

There was a discussion on the spacing of the units throughout the site. The PC members stated that using the entire space fluidly and having the elements evenly distributed is important.

Bowman stated that he wanted to have some discussion about the pedestrian walkways, the roadways, the number of parking spaces for the lighthouse and the lighthouse access. A discussion ensued including discussion on the existing agreements that are in place. There were suggestions on making changes to the agreements.

Martin stated that it would be difficult to rewrite the agreements and obtain all of the necessary signatures.

Greg Raad, Nederveld Associates, went over the list of recommendations that he felt had been given by the PC.

1. Overall density to be established at forty (40) units.
2. Keep the height of the hillside building the same as the existing hillside structure. An exception or trade-off might be possible if it would mean keeping some views clear on the lakefront.
3. Re-orient the condos with regard to pedestrians, reducing curb-cuts, etc.
4. Preserve the views along Lake Macatawa. This does not necessarily mean lowering building heights, but perhaps widening the spaces between the buildings.
5. An equal distribution of the units and elements throughout the project.
6. Do a deliberate job of separating pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
7. Lighthouse access.

Schaftenaar asked how many slips would be used by non-condo owners.

Raad stated that most of the slips would be used by existing or new cottage owners. They propose eighty slips and forty parking spaces.

There was a discussion on whether this should come back as a final or a preliminary. It was decided that it could be tabled and come back as a continuation of the preliminary.

A resident asked for clarification on the hillside building. Would the building be allowed to be longer and have more depth?

Lampen clarified that it should generally stay within the same footprint unless enlarging it allows less visual obstruction with the lakefront units.

MOTION

A motion was made by Cole and supported by Jachim to table the item.

VOTE

Motion carried: 6-0

Arendshorst returned.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Arendshorst reminded the PC that they have been asked to look at vacant pieces of property owned by the township and make decisions on the disposition of each piece. A subcommittee made up of Jachim, Cole and de Vries will meet to begin that process. Arendshorst will be an alternative member.
2. Arendshorst announced another Holland Community Sustainability meeting.
3. Arendshorst stated that the township is asking that the PC check their township email addresses more than once a month.
4. Amanda Price, township supervisor, forwarded an email to Arendshorst from the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) regarding setbacks in wind zones.
5. Arendshorst stated that the township board approved an \$85,900 contract at their last meeting for an integrated approach to looking at a master plan, a parks & recreation plan, a capital improvement plan and a strategic plan. Ellis stated that they are hoping for a seven to eight month time frame with completion by November 2010.
6. Arendshorst stated that she would like to know what other townships in the area are doing with new ordinances, etc. and so she will call around and present that at a future meeting.
7. Lampen stated that he was asked if one of the meetings could be held on the south side in deference to PW1. A discussion ensued. It was decided to try to hold the April PC meeting on the south side.

MOTION

A motion was made by Schaftenaar and supported by Cole to adjourn at 9:18 p.m.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

Sandy Brodie
Recording Secretary