



## **PARK TOWNSHIP**

### **MINUTES**

#### **PARK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Regular Meeting  
April 19, 2011  
6:30 PM**

Chair, Nicki Arendshorst, called the regular meeting of the Park Township Planning Commission (PC) to order at 6:30 PM.

Present: Nicki Arendshorst, Joe Lampen, LeeAnne Jachim, Bill Cole, Jeff Pfof, Bob Ellis

Absent: Steve Schaftenaar

Others: Andy Bowman, Planning Consultant, Dan Martin, Legal Counsel

At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Arendshorst welcomed new member to the Planning Commission Board, Jeff Pfof.

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

##### **MOTION**

A motion was made by Commissioner Ellis and supported by Commissioner Lampen to approve the agenda.

##### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 6/0

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **MOTION**

A motion was made by Commissioner Lampen and supported by Commissioner Jachim to approve the minutes for the March 15, 2011 regular meeting as submitted.

### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 6/0

## **AGENDA ITEM**

Chair Arendshorst noted her appreciation for the Planning Commission Board discussion last month and said the Township is at a good point in balancing the considerations of the Township ordinances with the Master Plan. She recused herself from discussion of Agenda Item #1 and Vice Chair Joe Lampen resided as Acting Chair for this part of the meeting.

### **Item #1      Preliminary PUD – Point West I, LLC Continued from March 15, 2011 meeting**

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Jachim moved and Commissioner Ellis supported removing Item #1 from the table.

### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 5/0

Mr. Greg Raad of Nederveld Engineering initiated the discussion of updated plans for the proposed Point West I. He outlined the four key points as followup to the March meeting. These open items include the Preliminary Plan, the architectural code and the boat slips.

- I.      **Circulation of Plan** – To limit traffic in the parking area the developer proposes a small section be eliminated. He displayed a REVISED copy of the site plan that showed ~~the flow of incoming and outgoing traffic in the parking lot with an added internal U-drive inside the lot.~~ THE RETURN OF A DRIVE ALONG INTERLAKE WALK. This should eliminate congestion problems and improve the traffic pattern. He also showed the location of on-street parking in two areas. The design will be less formal with natural areas along the sides rather than high-backed curves and gutters. It will also aid storm water drainage and be more sustainable with added permeability and the sand soaking up the water.

- II. **Building Separation** - The front 5' remains with proposed three simple rules: 1) 14' between buildings; 2) 25% of the side yard can encroach ~~on the~~ WITH a 14' separation); and, 3) 10' minimum between buildings. There will be some bumpouts which ~~will~~ go close to the 10' rule. He showed a color-coded diagram to show building spacing with the 14' separation and different sized buildings. With the addition of an overlay, he illustrated variations in frontages with an architectural mix and examples of "bumpout" areas.
- III. **Architectural Pattern** - An additional diagram illustrated how houses would be arranged on the site. The 5' frontage zone is the primary frontage requirement and a secondary frontage would occur on a corner. The build-to zone allows a stoop or porch with requirements of 6' for a porch and 4' for a stoop. 25% could show bump-outs and maintain the 14' requirement.
- IV. **Boat Slips** - He showed illustrations of the projected boat slip office and pool building, the view from the Interlake Walk Cottages, the view NW with Bay Road, a view toward Lake Macatawa and the boat slips, the view from the Lake toward the cottages, and the proposed boat slip plan of 80 slips ~~and the boxes~~ which are compatible with riparian limitations.

Acting Chair Lampen asked about the parking spaces and how the 20' wide road would impact those spaces. Mr. Raad said it is similar to what was proposed before. The building envelopes were squeezed a little to accommodate the road and sidewalk. Commissioner Ellis asked about the frontage zone of buildings and how additions of a porch or a stoop would cause a variation. Mr. Raad said the front of the house has to be in that 10' zone area. This allows flexibility for the designer. The front of the home or an added porch has to be ~~in~~ the line of 10' – it's not a build-to line.

Acting Chair Lampen asked about flexibility in design and the number of units. Is the Hillside building to be 12 units? Mr. Raad confirmed this. He showed a graphic of the buildings. With the requirement of a 14' separation it reduces the number of units. Acting Chair Lampen asked about the height of the flex area. Mr. Raad said it would be 35'. Only the Hillside unit would exceed that.

Commissioner Cole reviewed a list submitted by Commissioner Schaftenaar in his absence. His first concern is clarification of the Commissioners' agreement during the March meeting that the distance between buildings will be 10'. The number of units restricted to 40 and the number of boat slips need to be confirmed. Also, he asked for the height of the Hillside building. Mr. Raad said it is 55-56' now; the structure closest to the hill is 65'. About 1/3 of the buildings would be this high.

Commissioner Cole asked about the letters the Commissioners have received from Mr. Den Uyl and Mr. Eldean. Commissioner said Mr. Den Uyl has informed the Planning Commission that the northern part of the proposed development has a restriction. He asked Mr. Raad about a contingency if this is an enforceable restriction to building in this area. Mr. Raad confirmed there is a restriction in that particular area. However, he believes the developer's diagram of the area of the planned slips is accurate and valid for building. He pointed out the area in question on the illustration of the boat slip area.

Mr. Bowman said ~~that he understands~~ the deed restriction on the land portion ~~in question~~ extends into the slip that goes to the Lake. Mr. Martin added that the property owner states no boat slips can be built according to the deed without permission. It's a private matter the Township would not enforce but if there is a restrictive covenant or deed restriction that would be enforced privately through the court system.

Mr. Raad confirmed that the developer would not show the location of the boat slips in the plan if they did not think it was valid.

Commissioner Cole asked ~~where~~ IF the Commissioners are in agreement with the 10' separation between structures.

Commissioner Ellis asked for the elevation of the Hillside units. The elevation is 55' in front and 65' in back. The top of the hill is close to 90'. Acting Chair Lampen asked for the current width of Interlake Drive. Mr. Raad said it is currently 22' and the developer is proposing 20'. It will accommodate traffic from the cottagers only.

Mr. Ellis asked about the parking lot plan if the Parking Association agrees. Mr. Raad explained there is more than one option to getting to the parking lot but this current plan is the one the developer wishes to submit. The pedestrian path is still part of the plan if something different can be worked out with the neighbors. ~~the developer is willing to consider it. Acting Chair Lampen asked for an amended PUD on this matter.~~

Commissioner Ellis asked the other Commissioners if they were comfortable with the 10' separation between structures since this proposal appears to meet the guideline formula. Commissioner Cole reminded everyone that they had agreed to the 10' separation in March. Commissioner Jachim confirmed this was her understanding too based on her reading of the minutes. Commissioner Ellis ~~concurred that all of them~~ disagreed with spacing of 8'.

Commissioner Pfof asked the purpose of the separation. Acting Chair Lampen felt it was originally based on a safety standpoint. Commissioner Pfof asked about consideration of a shadow line to accommodate an eave, for example. Mr.

Bowman explained that is why we asked for specific form-based guidelines to allow for some flexibility. ~~We want an aesthetic look.~~ The overhang issue was when we had closer overhangs. Commissioner Cole did not understand the ~~issue with eaves with~~ the 8' or 10' separation, and he emphasize it was not an issue with the foundation but only with the structural element – the vertical wall.

Commissioner Pfost asked if a change in separation distance makes the buildings more narrow and changes the density. Are there any other impacts to the aesthetics of the plan? Mr. Raad noted that if the separation is always 10' then it will look like rowhouses. The plan creates some flexibility.

The Commissioners agreed to return to this subject. Acting Chair Lampen requested they move forward in the discussion and review the Staff Memo dated April 12, 2011.

### **Review of Considerations for Point West I PUD Planning Commission Preliminary Plan Recommendations**

**Ingress & Egress** – Acting Chair Lampen asked about the proposed width of Interlake Drive since he thought the 20' width as proposed is too narrow. Commissioner Ellis asked what the standards are. ~~—is there a minimum?~~ Commissioner Ellis asked if Park Township has a minimum in the zoning ordinance for a private drive. Also, has a speed limit been established? Acting Chair Lampen asked Mr. Raad to speak to this. Mr. Raad explained a speed limit has not been established. The road would be two 10' lanes with no curb. There will be a sidewalk with a landscape buffer and the setback would be 9'. The Commissioners agreed if the road were wider there would be a loss of green space of the landscape area. Michigan Walk remains two lanes.

**Parking and Loading** – Acting Chair Lampen asked if there is too much parking. He suggested in the Final Plan there should be a plan on the total number of parking spaces and what is actually required. Commissioner Elllis asked about the number of spaces planned currently vs. what was in the original plan. Commissioner Cole thought the spaces will be utilized with the number of boat slips. Acting Chair Lampen said there is a potential for more green space.

**Refuse and Service** - No further comment.

**Utilities** – No further comment.

**Screening and Buffering** – No further comment.

**Signs and Lighting** – No further comment.

**Setbacks/Yards** – The Commissioners discussed the various interpretations of the distance between buildings.

With regard to the proposal governing side yard setbacks, Acting Chair Lampen asked for an informal vote of the Commissioners. Commissioners Cole and Jachim voted for the 10' minimum; Commissioners Lampen, Ellis and Pfost supported the proposal presented by the developer at this meeting allowing for some flexibility using the 25% rule for bumpouts between buildings. Acting Chair Lampen summarized the Commission's recommendation at present is support of the applicant's proposal as laid out in this evening's meeting.

Mr. Bowman pointed out this is not final approval; it is just the next step. This represents a set of recommendations to move the process along.

Commissioner Cole asked if the Commission is approving 80 boat slips as indicated by #4 of this section of the memo. Mr. Bowman clarified this section does not refer to the boat slips – it is dealing with configuration on the land. This concerns setbacks only.

**Density** – Acting Chair Lampen asked for the expected range of units given the proposed “swapping” i.e., how the variance of buildings will be managed. Mr. Raad explained that the flexibility goes to the Hillside with a range of 8 to 18 units, depending on the size of cottages. What is shown in the diagrams reflects what the developer thinks people will buy. Cottages of 20' wide means fewer Hillside units. Acting Chair Lampen asked for greater understanding of a maximum for each section. This would be helpful for the Commission's evaluation of what is appropriate. Mr. Raad said they would present these ideas in the final plan. The density of 40 units does not include the marina building.

Acting Chair Lampen asked the Commissioners for guidance regarding the matter of the proposed 80 boat slips.

- \* Is the Commission comfortable with the layout and what should be the restrictions regarding utilization?
- \* How will this affect interaction with the existing neighborhood?
- \* If the Commission allows 80 slips will there be a greater usage of the property than we intended. Shall we restrict use of these slips?
- \* What will the percentage be for possible ownership by the neighboring Association?
- \* Will these slips serve as a personal boat dock for the Association?

Commissioner Jachim asked to hear from Legal Counsel. Mr. Martin said, at this point, as Mr. Bowman has already indicated, the Commission is to make recommendations on the *Preliminary Plan* to the Township Board. That Board will review those recommendations prior to development of the *Final Plan*. Conditions may be imposed and the Planning Commission can limit transient traffic at that time. There will be time to look at this before imposing such a

condition and then ask the developer about a reasonable percentage for rental or lease restrictions.

Acting Chair Lampen agreed the Commission need not make a recommendation now but might consider suggesting a guideline. Mr. Martin advised that the Commission makes recommendations to the developer regarding the *Preliminary Plan*. The Commission then makes recommendations regarding the *Final Plan* to the Township Board which has the ultimate approval. The Board could disagree with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission determines the density; the Township Board can't exceed that because of the way the ordinance is written. However, the Board could go lower with the number. So, it might be advisable to address the density issue now.

Commissioner Ellis said it is worth exploring Acting Chair Lampen's consideration of a formula. The Commission has discussed parking spaces and traffic and the traffic study includes the parking spaces. It's an impact issue, not a traffic issue. This is the context in which the discussion should take place. ~~What is our concern?~~ Can we address this with a formula and a number as a beginning point? Acting Chair Lampen added that another consideration is the amount of water space that will be utilized by the mix of small and large slips. Commissioner Cole agreed this is a significant part of the plan. The Commission should look carefully at the marina layout, its impact on the community, and establish a guideline rather than accept 80 and move forward. He mentioned the letter to the Commission from Mr. Eldean who indicated concern of proximity of one section of the boat slips to the Eldean Marina.

Acting Chair Lampen recommended discussion of the potential impact on the watershed and the utilization by outside traffic. He asked the developer about the possibility of widening the corners of the view shed into the Lake. He asked if the specific measurements would be given in the Final Plan. Commissioner Pfof said this may be a preferred layout; the DEQ may have a different view. You don't build all slips the same size. To be a viable marina entity there will have to be a consideration for some small slips and some large slips. He advised the Commission avoid going too far with details and try to strike a balance with recommended numbers. There is no crystal ball at this point.

Acting Chair Lampen asked if 80 makes sense to the Commissioners. What are we comfortable with? The DEQ can always come back to us with their recommendations based on their assessment. Commissioner Cole asked how the zoning code requirements for marinas matches the criteria. The Commission should look at those criteria. Mr. Bowman noted those are considerations for the land and water environment.

Commissioner Eillis said the big question for the Commission is: what is the impact to the whole area? Commissioner Jachim asked where the number 80 came from. She pointed out that the other marinas in the vicinity are not at

capacity. Commissioner Ellis said the developer's rationale was the economic viability issue and also the "build-out" plan – as demand calls for it. Our struggle is to reach a balance with all three factors: impact on area, economic viability, and the "build-out" plan.

Commissioner Pfof said there is another perspective to consider: what can the marina sustain if 100% of the boating population came from the outside. ~~How would that balance be handled? Is there a range? What is the number we can live with if they are leased to cottagers?~~ Another consideration is the size relationship with the Eldean Marina. This will limit the number of slips. ~~How many people do we want coming in from the outside?~~ There is a balanced ratio that we can come up with to make this workable. There is also navigability to consider which will be evaluated by the Army Corps of Engineers. Commissioner Pfof said sustainability of the development is important in addition to the impact on the area.

Acting Chair Lampen asked the Commissioners if they are comfortable with the proximity and relationship to Eldean's. Commissioner Jachim said this development encroaches on Eldean's with regard to navigability. Commissioner Ellis said the MDEQ will indicate to the developer what the requirements are. Commissioner Pfof suggested the concern is a matter of visual impact and how the Commission can influence the appearance aesthetically. Commissioner Jachim suggested the Commission obtain the input of the MDEQ.

Mr. Bowman said the Commission can structure these considerations in the form of a recommendation for the developers to work with MDEQ. You don't have to submit definitive numbers. Your analysis will go to the applicant which they have to submit in the Final Plan. The Township Board could change it but there will be an opportunity for more discussion with the Planning Commission. Commissioner Ellis said he is not in favor of "punting" to the Board on this. Mr. Martin added that the Commission makes the recommendations to the developer so they have some guidance to put it in the Final Plan. You don't have to be specific; you can recommend to the developer what you wish to have regarding impact, etc. They will work with the MDEQ on this then they will come back to you. Once the Final Plan comes back to you, you don't have to approve it before it goes to the Board for their review. He emphasized that this is a preliminary recommendation which is subject to change. You can suggest any ratio you wish at this point.

Acting Chair Lampen reviewed all the factors the Commission needs to consider in trying to establish a guideline. Commissioner Cole asked if 80 is the right number of boat slips. He suggested the Commission decide on a 60/20 split with the developer. He felt 80 was too high. Acting Chair Lampen suggested 40/20 that would allow buyers to have a slip and 20 for outsiders. Commissioner Jachim reminded the Commissioners that this is what was discussed before - 40 with no outside use. Commissioner Ellis said that is overly restrictive. He asked

if there is a way to do an impact study on this. Commissioner Jachim asked what would prevent the developer returning in five years to add more if the economy improves. Acting Chair Lampen suggested we think long-term and avoid the developer coming back to add more boat slips.

Mr. Martin said from a legal standpoint, ~~if the current marinas are at 65% capacity, using that logic, then consider that in the current market which has 35% of homes for sale, that no new homes could be built until those existing for sale homes are sold. Or, to look at it another way, if we have PUDs out there that haven't been developed we state we aren't going to approve any more PUDs until the existing ones that have been approved have been built, developed and sold.~~ using that logic would prevent people who have property that can be developed from developing it.

Commissioner Ellis said the important issue is what the impact means on this limited environment. We need to determine to what extent can the outside influences be managed, and whether we consider the 80/20 ratio or another option. Mr. Bowman said the developer's work with MDEQ should be part of the plan. Acting Chair Lampen added that the number of boat slips should be included in the plan as well. Commissioner Cole summarized the Commission's considerations on the boat slip issue: 20/60, 0/40 and 20/40 and agreed there is no easy solution because the guidelines are so subjective. Commissioner Pfof said this discussion should be an encouragement for the developer to tie the initial development of the marina to the existing land owners and to emphasize our concern about the sensitivity issue. Let's ask the developer to be creative and give us a number because it is so arbitrary at the present time. This will remove some of the gray area for us.

The Planning Commission supported this approach. Acting Chair Lampen asked Mr. Bowman about his comfort level to word the recommendation. Mr. Bowman said he understood the Commission's request is to ask the developer for clarification about the maximum number of slips with a better approach for cottagers' access to slips with limitations for non-cottagers' use. Sensitivity to the impact on the environment and the residents is crucial in the recommendation.

Acting Chair Lampen acknowledged the number of letters received which address the density question. The Commission has reviewed this from the beginning and has determined the agreed on number is appropriate.

Mr. Martin said that the way the zoning ordinance is written the determination of maximum density will be based on the parallel plan. The Planning Commission is charged to review that plan and determine the number of units that can be feasibly developed following the parallel plan. The parallel plan originally showed multi-family units that were changed to single family units, and this is why the number is significantly less. Again, the maximum number is determined by the Planning Commission based on your review of the parallel plan. You don't have

to follow the parallel plan in its entirety; there is a provision in the zoning ordinance that allows you to waive all the requirements of submission if you wish. There have been arguments about whether that parallel plan complies with the requirements of the zoning ordinance. This could be challenged by the developer and the residents in a declaratory judgment but we hope this won't be the case. The Planning Commission has reviewed this extensively for a long period of time now and have determined that 40 is the appropriate number. The Township Board will not be able to go above this number but could decide to go below the recommendation.

**General Compatibility** – Commissioner Cole asked if the developer will come back with specific numbers on the marina. Mr. Bowman said the developer will return to the Planning Commission with more specific recommendations for the Final Plan.

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Ellis moved and Commissioner Pfost supported to approve the Preliminary Plan recommendations and subsequent modifications.

### **VOTE**

Motion carried: 5/0

Mr. Bowman will prepare the recommendations as approved by the Commission and forward those to the applicant.

Acting Chair Lampen reviewed the Final Plan content requirements from the zoning ordinance for the Commission's information. Commissioner Ellis asked if the Final Plan would include all the Association agreements in addition to the construction agreements. Mr. Bowman confirmed it will reflect all that the Planning Commission has done to date.

Chair Arendshorst returned to the meeting at 9:25 PM.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dan Mitchell, 2433 Michigan Walk – Mr. Mitchell shared slides of the proposed area for the boat slips and marina area. He is very concerned about the view shed. In his opinion, there are some significant obstacles the developer will have to overcome. He asked the Commissions to be sure in the final PUD that there will be a boat slip plan the applicant must adhere to. Commissioner Lampen said the applicant will give the Commission a proposal with more specifics.

Richard Swaney, 30 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Holland – Mr. Swaney distributed diagrams accompanied with a memo concerning Bay Road. This road has been in the same location for 60 years and the residents, Mr. and Mrs. Olds, have always

had direct access to their garage. However, with the change in the proposed plan they will lose access to their driveway. If Bay Road is moved they will lose their easement. As Attorney for the Olds, he advised the applicant and Commission take this into consideration for the Final Plan. The Olds will not consent to the movement of Bay Road.

Larry Nix, Senior Planner with Williams and Works – Mr. Nix spoke to the impact of the proposed marina. The Planning Commission has determined that impact and density are important, but, in his estimation, have added another use in the C2 type of zoning. The applicant has also added another use without considering the impact of use in the parallel plan. By allowing 80 slips in the marina the Planning Commission has the responsibility of landside impact. The mix of dwellings and marina is the developer's responsibility but he understands in a future PUD there can now be mixed uses which will double or triple the environmental impact. That is something that won't be easily turned around – the die has been cast in his judgment.

Wade Eldean, 2305 S. Shore Drive – Mr. Eldean appreciated the Planning Commission acknowledging the letter sent to the Commission on behalf of the Eldean Marina. Unfortunately, to retain a clear line of sight from the development, as desired by the Township, will push the applicant to the sides of the available land. This will seriously impact the Eldean Marina which is the neighboring marina and the necessary changes to the boat slips and the water area will impact marina guests for Eldean and this new development.

Ward Walcott, 2421 Crescent Walk – Mr. Walcott expressed concern with fire safety and sparks from roofs in the event of fire if the building separation is changed to 8'. Also, there is another problem with designing a 20' wide road. If two service trucks with outside mirrors are on that road going in opposite directions one will have to back up because there is no room. Regarding street parking as it relates to the marina, diagonal parking along Bay Road will present a dangerous situation.

Ward Dobbin, 2430 Interlake Walk – Mr. Dobbin sent a letter in January to the Planning Commission listing the number of reasons why the Township's calculation regarding density was incorrect. Mr. Bowman responded to his letter and clarified the Township's position. Mr. Dobbin researched the zoning ordinances and found no justification for the alternative approach mentioned by Mr. Bowman. In his judgment, the parallel plan approach is not based on Township zoning ordinances.

Shirley Swaney, 2381 Interlake Walk – Ms. Swaney expressed disappointment with the Point West I proposal. She finds inconsistencies with the 10' property line, the incomplete marina plan, parking for the marina based on the assumption that cottagers will need boat slips, and the road configuration is still in question because the road is too narrow. The traffic studies show that the residents walk

and bike on the road so there is a safety issue. Also, the height of Hillside has changed from 55' to 65'. She thanked the Commission for their hours on this matter and urged the Commissioners to follow the Master Plan. In her estimation, this is all about lowering density; the obvious struggle is that the Commission knows this is not the right thing to do.

Jude Bergsma, 64 Bay Road – Ms. Bergsma asked the Commission to consider the neighboring community in planning such a large marina. This plan allows more density and congestion and doesn't allow for an adequate parking plan. This development is too big for the area.

Joel Welch, 679 Bosma – Mr. Welch has attended Commission meetings for the last year and a half and has heard a lot of ambiguity. He asked for flexibility, not unintended consequences. The residents who own existing property in this area deserve a well-defined plan. He feels the property owners deserve more consideration.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Arendshorst announced that the new ordinance books are available. On Thursday, April 21, there is a three hour workshop ON COMPLETE STREETS in Grand Rapids that she registered for but will be unable to attend because there is a conflict at the Township with the meeting of the Committee for the Future regarding the Master Plan. ~~Would anyone like to~~ Chair Arendshorst ASKED FOR SOMEONE ON THE COMMISSION WHO COULD TAKE HER PLACE AT THE WORKSHOP. She strongly recommended the Commissioners attend the Committee for the Future meeting.

Commission Secretary, Commissioner Jachim, will be organizing the past year's meeting activities and agendas. This should be ready by June.

She requested that the Commissioners should have a copy of Planning Commission Bylaws and a copy of contact information for each Commissioner.

Mr. Bowman asked about medical marijuana for an agenda topic at the next meeting. The City of Holland is about ready to adopt guidelines as is Holland Township, so it is probably time for Park Township to look at this topic again.

The next meeting of the Planning Commission will be May 17.

## **MOTION**

Commissioner Pfof moved and Commissioner Ellis supported a motion to adjourn.

**VOTE**

Motion carried: 6/0

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.  
Respectfully submitted,

Judith R. Hemwall  
Recording Secretary  
April 22, 2011  
Corrected May 19, 2011

---

**STAFF MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL**

---

**Subject:** Planning Commission Recommendations  
**Date:** May 14, 2011  
**To:** PW1 PD Applicants  
**From:** Andrew Bowman, PCP, Park Township Staff Planner

---

At their meeting of April 19, 2011, the Park Township Planning Commission adopted the following recommendations relative to your Preliminary Plan submission pursuant to Section 38-368 of the Park Township Zoning

**Ingress and Egress.** *Ingress and egress to the property and existing and proposed buildings and structures, with particular reference to vehicle and pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow and control, and access in case of fire or catastrophe.*

1. The Final Plan shall:
  - a. Retain all pedestrian walkway improvements as indicated on the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement, including both at-grade and raised walkway crossovers; barriers, curbs or other borders; and pavement markings and signage.
  - b. Retain proposed street widths, street markings and signage for improved bicycle passage as indicated on the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement.
  - c. Incorporate initial fire/emergency access recommendations made by the Park Township Fire Chief.
  - d. Include access provisions to lakeside parking areas and boat slips as indicated on the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement.
2. Internal circulation improvements are to be retained or enhanced in the Final Plan including the proposed gatehouse, the newly aligned road paralleling the hillside, the Michigan Walk loop providing rear access to dwellings, and the redesigned connection with Sunset Walk. Retain Interlake Walk as redesigned for vehicular access on the 4/8/11 Preliminary Plan supplement and plan dated 4/7/11.

**Parking and Loading.** *Off-street parking and loading areas where required, with particular reference to ingress/egress and the economic, noise, glare, or odor effects of each use in the proposed planned unit development.*

Residential parking spaces have been proposed at appropriate levels and should be retained on the Final Plan. The Final Plan shall show the number of required space and the number of provided spaces and attempt to include more green space as part of parking area both to break up wide paved stretches as well as provide for increased water infiltration.

**Refuse and Service.** *Refuse and service areas, with particular reference to the items relating to ingress/egress and parking/loading.*

**Staff Memo of Transmittal**  
**May 14, 2011**

The plan proposes refuse handling by individual unit hand carts with removal handled by contract through the Condominium Association. Other service vehicles will be able to access all uses by the proposed roadways or by temporary service-only use of the widened Interlake Walk walkway.

**Utilities.** *Utilities, with reference to locations, availability, and compatibility.*

Site utilities have been reviewed and tentatively approved with respective advisories. All recommendations of the HBPW email of 11/17/2010 and Drain Commissioner letter of 12/1/2010 are hereby accepted and transmitted to the applicant as recommendations for the Final Plan. Additional details indicating on-site stormwater handling and all other low impact development site features will be described in the Final Plan.

**Screening and Buffering.** *Screening and buffering, with reference to type, dimensions and character.*

Screening, buffering and site landscaping shall be retained as proposed. Additional enhancements buffering the attached hillside units shall include landscaping for buffering adjacent dwelling sites and measures to mitigate excessive visual and noise impacts of roof structures on hillside residents.

**Signs and Lighting.** *Signs, if any, and proposed exterior lighting with reference to glare, traffic safety, economic effect, and compatibility and harmony with adjoining properties and properties in the proposed planned unit development.*

The applicant has indicated appropriate lighting and signage schedules on their landscape plan. Further sign details should be provided on the Final Plan as needed. All lighting shall be designed and/or shielded such that there is no offsite glare. Internally, pedestrian or dwelling-site lighting shall be provided at low residential levels with light dispersion restrictions included in guidelines for site development.

**Setbacks/Yards.** *Required yards and other open spaces.*

1. For individual or unattached dwellings, a new proposal has been offered which will govern side yard setbacks (see page 2 of Architectural Patterns in the supplement to Preliminary Plan dated 4/8/11). Adjacent buildings will be required to maintain a total distance of 14 feet between the main part of adjacent buildings provided, however, that up to 25% of the building face between buildings may include bump outs, provided that at no point are any portions of buildings to be closer to one another than 10 feet. This approach allows side yard spacing as previously

**Staff Memo of Transmittal**  
**May 14, 2011**

determined by the Planning Commission while allowing both architectural variety and a minimum spacing between structures of 10 feet.

2. Front and rear yard setback and front build-to zones shall be indicated in the Final Plan as shown in the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement.
3. Yard and building spacing for the so-called “flexible” semi-attached units on the west side of the site and the Hillside attached units shall remain as indicated on the Preliminary Plan and supplement.
4. Ancillary boat slip or marina buildings and pool proposed along the Macatawa shoreline shall maintain configurations as indicated on the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement. Any additional changes as required or prescribed by the MDEQ in authorizing a marina permit shall be incorporated into the Final Plan.

**Density.** *Density of the proposed planned unit development.*

The total number of dwelling units allowed on this site shall not exceed forty units and some flexibility in proposed unit locations can be shown on the Final Plan. Unit numbers for each of the detached dwelling areas shall be indicated on the Final Plan.

**General Compatibility.** *General compatibility with adjoining properties and properties in the proposed planned unit development.*

1. The Final Plan shall include a set of building form guidelines based on the Preliminary Plan architectural and design concepts presented in the Preliminary Plan including the 4/8/11 supplement. These documents must include enough detail and guidance to allow Township officials to approve future detached residential buildings as they have been proposed for this PUD.
2. The Final Plan shall include architectural sketches for the semi-attached “Flex Units” and the fully attached “Hillside” dwelling unit building that includes enough detail to ensure building designs and styles fit the development.
3. The Final Plan shall include all on-site details and narrative material as proposed in the Preliminary Plan and 4/8/11 supplement for the private marina/boat slip area including walkways, parking areas, ancillary buildings and any other structures or buildings between the roadway and the marina. In an effort to reduce vehicular and pedestrian travel to and from the marina parking area, the Final Plan shall further include a method to encourage the purchase or leasing of slips by residents living in the PUD area in the initial phases of marina development. This method could include a right-of-first-refusal for PUD residents or some similar method of encouraging up to half the boat slips to be owned or leased by residents of the development.

**Staff Memo of Transmittal**  
**May 14, 2011**