

DRAFT

**SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
APRIL 20, 2016 – REGULAR MEETING**

PRESENT: Jack Ketchum, Greg Latsch, Ron Lindquist, Dennis Masson, Crystal Morgan,  
David Rumpel, Russ Tiles  
ABSENT: None  
PARTICIPANTS: Lukas Hill, Township Community Development Director  
Ron Bultje, Township Attorney

**A. Call to Order**

Rumpel called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

**B. Approval of Agenda**

Masson made a motion, support by Ketchum, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

**C. Approval of Minutes**

Ketchum made a motion, support by Masson, to adopt the March 16, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. Public Comments**

A time for public comment was provided. No comments were offered.

**E. Koster – Special Land Use/Waterfront Accessory Building – 18201 N. Fruitport**

Ken Koster presented his request for a shed for storage. The shed will be 8x10 feet, and 10 feet high. The shed will look like the house and will be color-matched to the house.

Ketchum asked how far the north side of the shed was from the property line. Koster stated it was 10 feet, but that the building could be moved somewhat south.

The public hearing was opened at 7:05 pm. There were no comments. Hill read a letter which was received from John Dozema, 18233 N. Fruitport. Dozema is concerned that the shed will impede his view of the lake, and he doesn't like the look of the building.

Koster presented photos of storage sheds which can be seen from their property.

DRAFT

Motion by Masson, support by Ketchum, to close the public hearing at 7:22pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Masson, support by Ketchum, to approve the Koster Special Land use request as submitted to construct a 8'x10'x10' high waterfront accessory building with the following conditions:

- a. The accessory building generally meets the criteria in Section 902 and 306 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- b. The accessory building shall be built in compliance with the submitted site plan and elevation drawings.
- c. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.
- d. The accessory building will be located a minimum of 10 feet off the north lot line.

With a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**F. Fewless Properties LLC – Site Plan Review for 14520 Cleveland St.**

Chris Wilson, CB Wilson Construction and Jim Milanowski, Milanowski & Englert, presented the site plan. The building has been vacant for many years and is being renovated. The front part will be office space; the back will be warehouse space. There is a need for a parking lot. The Township engineer has reviewed the plans and submitted his comments. A new septic system will be installed. A permit will be needed from MDOT for the driveway. Permits from MDEQ and the Township will be required for the wetlands, especially the small wetland in the ditch near the road.

Masson asked if the Commission was just considering the parking lot and landscaping. Hill stated that was correct. Masson asked if the number of parking spaces were sufficient as required by the ordinance. Hill stated that there were sufficient spaces.

Motion by Rumpel, support by Lindquist, to approve the Fewless Properties LLC site plan dated 3-14-16 for a new parking lot as it is compliant with Section 1003, Site Plan Review Criteria, and Section 326 of the Zoning Ordinance with the following conditions:

1. The applicant obtains engineering approval for drainage and completes a storm water maintenance agreement;
2. All new lighting be night sky friendly;
3. The site remains otherwise compliant with all federal, state and local laws; and
4. The applicant complies with all written and verbal representations.

With a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**G. All Shores Church – Gazebo/Playground Equipment – 15550 Cleveland St.**

Dave Boomgaard presented the request for a larger gazebo and some playground equipment to be located near the new bike path. The community currently uses the parking lot and the church

DRAFT

would like to create a park-like area. The larger gazebo will be vinyl, so it will be lower maintenance. There will be metal picnic tables and a low-impact playground.

Lindquist asked about the alternate 2 site plan. Hill stated that was depicting the overall layout of the site.

The public hearing was opened at 7:46pm. There were no comments. Motion by Masson, support by Ketchum, to close the public hearing at 7:47pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Masson, support by Tiles, to approve the All Shores Wesleyan Church site plan and special land use for a new gazebo, play area, and minor parking lot extension as it is compliant with Section 1003, Site Plan Review Criteria, and Section 326, Section 902, and Section 937 of the Zoning Ordinance with the following conditions:

1. The site remains otherwise compliant with all federal, state and local laws; and
2. The applicant complies with all written and verbal representations.

With a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

#### **H. Laker Meadow – Site Condominium – Preliminary Approval**

Matt Purvis, P.I.G. LLC and Jim Milanowski, Milanowski & Englert, presented the plans for a six-unit site condominium development. The lots will front on Leonard Rd. Each unit will consist of a complete lot, and there will be no common areas.

A stormwater retention basin will not be constructed. There will be a storm drain at the north end of each property. There is an existing storm drain west of Site 1, and it will be extended along all six sites. They will include a tee in each lot for drainage. The existing ditch will be filled in and the storm drain will be enclosed as requested by Ottawa County Road Commission. Latsch expressed concerns about maintenance of the storm drains. Hill stated that the Township can require a maintenance agreement with the master deed.

Lindquist asked whether this development must be developed as a PUD. Hill stated that the developers have received a variance from the ZBA to develop this as a site condominium development due to unique circumstances.

Lindquist asked how high the houses will be raised, as the Township does not want to see “mushroom” houses. Milanowski stated that the houses will be raised so basements can be included but the height is not known at this time.

Ketchum asked if the developers are just doing the infrastructure, or if they are building the houses. Purvis stated that each lot owner will build their own house. There will be basic rules in the master deed, but there will be no association.

DRAFT

Ketchum asked about wetland delineation and protection. Milanowski stated that the delineation has been done, and that the wetlands will be physically designated. They will include rules regarding the wetlands in the owner documents.

Ketchum stated there will need to be a driveway turnaround, so cars don't back onto Leonard Rd. Purvis stated that would be a project restriction and all units would have turnarounds.

Morgan asked about Hill's recommendation for sidewalks, and whether they were required to be installed when the units were constructed. The developer has requested that the sidewalks not be required to be built until neighboring properties install sidewalks. Bultje stated that in reviewing Section 312B of the Zoning Ordinance, there is no Planning Commission discretion to waive the sidewalk requirement. A variance would be needed from the ZBA.

The public hearing was opened at 8:32pm. There were no comments. Motion by Lindquist, support by Masson, to close the public hearing at 8:33pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Masson, support by Ketchum to accept the staff recommendation and approve the Laker Meadow preliminary plan and as it generally meets the criteria set forth in each applicable section above with the following conditions:

1. Legal documents including the master deed shall be submitted for legal review.
2. The Township Attorney shall prepare a resolution of approval for the development outlining all conditions and requirements for any final approval.
3. All necessary outside agency approvals shall be obtained prior to final approval (Road Commission, Drain Commission, DPW, etc.).
4. Any adjustments to the utilities shall be approved by the Township Engineer.
5. A sidewalk shall be installed across the frontage of the development along Leonard Road.

Lindquist requested a roll call vote. A roll call vote was taken. With Lindquist as the sole no vote, the motion carried.

## **I. Spring Ridge PUD – Consideration of PUD Qualification**

Rick Pulaski, Nederveld, presented the request for preliminary approval. Changes since the last presentation were discussed. They are now proposing all private roads in the subdivision, with a narrower right of way. This allows the lots to be moved further from the wetlands. They are proposing two entrances as required by the Spring Lake Fire Department. They have reduced the wetland impact, and have included a park area on the east side of the development.

Masson asked about the density of the development. Hill stated that medium density should be three to five units per acre. This development has 1.7 units per acre, or 2.1 units per acre if the open space is removed from the calculation. Ketchum stated that he believes that the green space should be rewarded and that the density of 2.1 units per acre is acceptable. Lindquist stated he was concerned that undevelopable wetlands were being considered open spaces.

Ketchum stated that the developer will need to show creative housing elevations. Dale Kracker, developer, stated that the housing elevations are only suggestions, as each resident will customize their house, so the neighborhood will be more diverse.

Ketchum asked about a school bus shelter. Pulaski stated that they were going to include it on final plans. After discussion, Pulaski will contact Spring Lake Public Schools and determine the appropriate location for the shelter.

Motion by Lindquist, support by Masson, to schedule the public hearing for May 18, 2016. The motion passed unanimously.

**J. Waterfront Accessory Buildings – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment**

Last year, the Township approved a text amendment to the General Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that requires accessory buildings larger, taller or greater in area that allowed by right to be reviewed by the ZBA instead of the Planning Commission. Based on this amendment, it appears that it would be consistent to amend the Zoning Ordinance to also have the ZBA review waterfront accessory buildings. Suggested changes were presented.

The public hearing was opened at 9:26pm. There were no comments. Motion by Latsch, support by Masson, to close the public hearing at 9:27pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Masson, support by Ketchum to have the attorney review the recommended changes to the Zoning Ordinance and forward the changes to the Township Board with the Planning Commission recommendation to adopt the changes. With a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**K. Section 332, Large Scale Developments – Review Existing Language**

Last year, the Township approved a text amendment to the General Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that would require any residential development over eight (8) lots to be reviewed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). At the Township Board level review, additional language was added and subsequently adopted. Hill would like a review as to whether the wording is reflecting the original intent of the ordinance. A public hearing is required.

The public hearing was opened at 9:28pm. There were no comments. Motion by Rumpel, support by Masson, to close the public hearing at 9:29pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Lindquist, support by Ketchum, to table the consideration of changes to the ordinance for further staff review. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

**L. Temporary Uses – Consideration of Text Amendment**

There have been additional requests for temporary uses in Spring Lake Township and staff recommends improving Township regulations in that area. Additional language was presented.

Motion by Lindquist, support by Ketchum, to table the matter for further staff review, including how to handle requests for outdoor seating. The motion passed unanimously.

**M. Commissioner Comments**

1. Township Board: No report.
2. Zoning Board of Appeals: Several items were handled at the last meeting. The Scott variance and Gentry authorization were tabled. P.I.G. LLC received a variance from the requirement for a development to be a PUD if it includes more than 8 lots due to unique circumstances.
3. Community Development Director: No report.

**N. Adjournment**

Masson moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:35pm. Ketchum seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Ketchum, Secretary  
Planning Commission