



Park Township

PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

November 16, 2010

Arendshorst called the meeting to order at 6:33pm.

Members Present: Nicki Arendshorst, LeeAnne Jachim, Steve Schaftenaar, Bill Cole, Ed de Vries, Joseph Lampen and Bob Ellis.

Others Present: Andy Bowman, Township Planning Consultant

MOTION

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

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

MOTION

A motion was made by Ellis and supported by Jachim to approve the October 5, 2010 minutes as presented.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

AGENDA ITEMS

Item #1 PUD Amendment-Point West I
 Revised Preliminary Site Plan

At this time, Ms. Arendshorst voluntarily excused herself from the discussion.

Vice-Chair Lampen assumed the discussion.

Greg Raad - Prein & Newhof represented the applicant.

Raad recapped the process until now. He explained revisions in the Preliminary Plan as including a continuation of the rows of existing cottages into the middle of the development.

He has left an open area in the middle of Macatawa shore frontage with no boat slips so the view is maintained. A maximum of 80 boat slips are included to each side of this open area with one (1) parking spot per boat slip is proposed. A common area and boathouse is also included in the plans. No fuel or maintenance services are anticipated on the site. The boathouse will be single story. The north/south road on the east side of the property will be moved closer to the water.

One main road is now proposed east and west. The entrance to the cottages would be on the southwest corner of the property and the gatehouse would slide to the south to allow for parking on the side of the road, while allowing others through. The plans eliminate the sidewalk previously proposed and send pedestrian traffic on the east side of the road along the shore. The plans use landscaping to navigate pedestrian traffic.

Raad also addressed concerns of emergency access. The access plan discussed with Chief Gamby will be submitted for review to the proper authorities and given to the Planning Commission. The road width went from 22' to 26'. All of the turning radii are met. They are proposing a 9' sidewalk.

Raad reviewed the home sites proposed for the property. The frontage was moved from the inside to the outside to allow the internal portion of the project for garage parking access. The proposal calls for 26 lots with detached cottages and lots 34' wide. The attached cottage units proposed are one 4 unit and one 3 unit complex (7 total) keeping a cottage architectural theme. The hillside building now has 2 distinct buildings with garages (12 units maximum). The plans reflect a reduced size to fit the character of the other cottages. There are a total of 45 maximum units. It would be recorded as a site condominium.

Two parking spots on the northwest corner are not entirely on the applicants property and may be relocated per negotiations regarding the deed. The parking plan does not show additional parking spaces but the applicant feels as the project moves forward spaces will become evident. Accounted for are two (2) spaces per unit for cottage lots, fourteen (14) spaces (7 inside, 7 outside) for the town house style cottages and twenty-four (24) for the hillside residents located in the basement level. Outside street parking will consist of twenty-three (23) spaces with a proposed fifty-eight (58) additional spaces.

Recommendations that were requested to be incorporated in the plan were accomplished according to the applicant.

1) Density of 40-43 units

2) Hillside structure generally in the same footprint and height of existing steel

- 3) Units address the street better rather than garages opening up to porches across the street
- 4) Preserve views along Lake Macatawa
- 5) Integrate Lake Macatawa into plan better
- 6) Equal distribution of units (not all in hillside)
- 7) Improve Pedestrian and Vehicle circulation
- 8) Light house access.

Additional comments indicated that all units are sprinkled and that enclosed storm sewer will be built throughout the property. The applicant is proposing a collection of roof runoff and disposal into the storm sewer.

Lampen asked the Planning Commission if they have any clarifying questions then discussed the 8 items recommended in the last meeting.

Bowman asked if boat slips will be a final part of the plan.

Raad stated it is not their plan to have final DEQ approval on the boat slips by the time of the final PUD. They would be set if necessary by placing them in the plan.

The Planning Commission discussed the points of the proposal that needed clarification.

Some of the commission comments/observations included:

- a) disappointment in limited access to the lighthouse for the public to enjoy,
- b) Townhouses are 2 separate structures and have space between them,
- c) Stand alone cottages have 34' lot sizes to build a 24' cottage with 10' separation between buildings. Proposed a 2' minimum with a maximum of 10' from home to property line,
- d) A form-based code and style pattern book will be submitted with the final PUD for the stand alone cottages with the township and be detailed enough for conclusive administrative approval,
- e) Include signage and lighting examples in final PUD,
- f) A larger association with 3 different types of sub-association will be needed due to the maintenance requirements of each type of property,

Bowman stated the Planning Commission can condition the number of parking spots not necessarily the amount of boat slips.

The Planning Commission reviewed the resubmitted preliminary plan for adherence to their previous 8 recommendations and found the following:

- 1) Constructing a pedestrian walkway continuing to the west of the parking lot on the Northwest side of the property,
- 2) Mid-block pedestrian stop sign(s) at the entry road by the parking spaces is requested. Other traffic calming measures should be investigated,
- 3) The PUD must limit the number of units to a total of 40 with some flexibility in dwelling or site groupings given to the applicant,
- 4) Drainage ideas and suggestions need to be addressed and examples given,
- 5) Signage and lighting examples expanded from plan.

There was consensus among the members of the Planning Commission to include these items as they continue working on their preliminary plan recommendations for the Township Board and the applicant.

MOTION

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

VOTE

Motion carried: 6-0

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Arendshorst resumed her position as Chair of the meeting and opened the public comment period.

Tim Hemmingway-asked why the Planning Commission has changed their process regarding public comment.

Dan Mitchell-presented several questions regarding density.

Tom Kovert-questioned the density of the PUD.

John Gronberg-stated there is a flaw in the property measurements that have led to incorrect density being assigned.

Doug Slepink-questioned the density of the proposal as it relates to other areas in the township.

Paul Lingeman-donated his time to Mr. Mullin.

Ken Mullin-questioned the density of the proposal based on structure-to-land ratio.

Betsy Mathison-proposed her thoughts on a suitable development plan.

Tom Guiseburg-Hillside building is too large and proposed single family homes on the bluff.

Ward Dobbin-questioned the loss of parking spaces and access by the closing of Interlake Walk.

Peter Schwartz-is concerned about the number of proposed slips and their management.

Shirley Swaney-read and submitted the petition distributed to the township regarding the PUD.

Bill Hardy-questioned density of the PUD and read an attorney's letter.

Bonnie Gronberg-requested a density summit between all parties.

Bruce Caulkin-questioned the amount of slips in the PUD, concerned about density.

Banva Donnelly-asked the Planning Commission to consider the impact to the residents.

Sally Pollock-concerned about the marina and should be only available to cottagers.

Arendshorst closed the public comment period.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Arendshorst stated there is a training session about Medical Marijuana and offered the class to the Planning Commission.

MOTION

A motion was made by Jachim and supported by Cole to adjourn at 10:10pm.

VOTE

Motion carried: 7-0

Respectfully Submitted by,

Daniele Dykens

11/15/10