

DRAFT

**SPRING LAKE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
OCTOBER 17, 2018 – REGULAR MEETING**

PRESENT: Jack Ketchum, Greg Latsch, Crystal Morgan, David Rumpel, Russ Tiles  
ABSENT: Harry Dyck, Jerry Rabideau  
PARTICIPANTS: Lukas Hill, Township Community Development Director  
Ron Bultje, Township Attorney

**A. Call to Order**

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

**B. Approval of Agenda**

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

**C. Approval of Minutes**

Latsch made a motion, support by Ketchum, to adopt the Planning Commission September 19, 2018 regular meeting and the September 25, 2018 special meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. Public Comments**

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

**E. The Villas at Spring Lake Country Club – Preliminary PUD Review**

Hill stated that staff met with the applicant to discuss items in the Community Development Director's report. The applicants have also applied to rezone the property under discussion.

Rick Pulaski, Director of Planning from Nederveld, presented the PUD plan. Developers Michael and Mick McGraw were present to answer questions.

Pulaski stated that the configuration of the PUD was developed with the Spring Lake Country Club, which prefers that the development be kept away from the golf course. Municipal water and sewer are available. The Ottawa County Road Commission has approved the two entrances. The Ottawa County Drain Commission has asked that there be no runoff to Petty's Bayou. There is a small spot of wetlands at the north end of the property, and a 30-foot buffer will be used. The PUD has 55% to 65% open space, depending on the interpretation of the ordinance. With 29 acres to be developed

DRAFT

and 88 units, there are 3.03 units per acre; the Master Plan for R-2 zoning requires three to five units per acre.

Roads in the development will be private roads to allow for more curves and driveway density than the Road Commission would allow. The entrance roads will be boulevards, and there will be dense landscaping to buffer the entrance from State Rd.

Homes will meet energy efficiency standards. There will be individual homes or 2-unit condo buildings.

The developers are asking for a sidewalk on only one side of the street to allow for market flexibility. They received the Community Development Director's report but did not make any plan changes before the Planning Commission meeting. They anticipate including changes from both the report and the meeting in the final PUD submittal.

Hill stated that Commissioners could require a traffic study, a market study or an environmental assessment as part of the PUD submission. He stated that the Road Commission would consider traffic, and an environmental assessment was probably not necessary as there are no wetlands on the site. A market study could be interesting, but did not need to be required. Mick McGraw stated that a new wetland delineation was completed in summer of 2017 and found minimal wetlands on the site.

Hill stated that a Sustainable Community Assessment was submitted. Hill has reviewed it and would score some items differently, but the PUD decision would not be based solely on the Sustainable Community Assessment.

Latsch asked about the water table and whether basements are planned. Pulaski stated that the site elevation drops from State Rd to the north, and the water table basically follows the surface. The north end of the PUD will need to be raised to allow for sewer flow. All of the units will have basements, but only some will be walkouts. Mick McGraw stated that they prefer a flat driveway, and the basement wall will be 1.5 to 3 feet above the road.

Ketchum asked how the runoff would be addressed. Mick McGraw stated that some stormwater would be stored in the pond. The area is very sandy and a retention basin is not required. The site slopes gently and there will be sheet runoff.

Mick McGraw stated that the other item in the Community Development Director's report that needed to be addressed was a connection to Cross Lane. The developers definitely will connect the municipal water at that point. They are also open to a pathway connecting the neighborhoods. They definitely will not connect their development road into Cross Lane. Commissioners generally agreed that a road connection would not be required.

Ketchum stated he preferred more connectivity for walkers. Mick McGraw stated that they were considering a wider sidewalk on only one side of the street. They were investigating adjusting the pond to two ponds to add more paths. They will include sidewalk connections at the entrances to the edge of State Rd. They would like a trail to the Country Club, but do not have permission.

DRAFT

Michael McGraw stated that the sitting areas mentioned in the Community Development Director's report are a good idea for their large green spaces along the roads. There will be passive green space behind the units to preserve trees.

Ketchum asked if the developer would commit to the path to Cross Lane. Mick McGraw stated that they would include that if the Commissioners required it. Ketchum and Rumpel stated that they prefer a path connection at the Cross Lane location.

Latsch and Ketchum asked about the market for this type of development. Mick McGraw stated that they anticipate building this type for about ten more years. After that, there will still be a market for the units but not as many will need to be built.

Ketchum stated that there may not be enough off-street parking for guests. Mick McGraw stated that more parking will be added when the detailed design is completed.

Rumpel asked if the sidewalks shown in the site plan are the final design, and whether there should be a sidewalk along State Rd to allow for a looping connection. Mick McGraw stated that they will do a major redesign of the sidewalks in the final PUD design. They will also adjust the landscaping at the entrances. They will consider the sidewalk along State Rd.

Morgan asked about screening on the east side of the development near the existing neighborhood. Michael McGraw stated that they would clear as little as possible there and would fill in the gaps with landscaping.

Morgan asked about phasing of the development. Mick McGraw stated that they will build out in three to four phases, and that it will take about six years to complete.

Tiles asked about phasing of the grading. Mick McGraw stated that all grading will be done at once, and the ponds will be dug in the first phase.

Morgan asked if street lights are proposed. Mick McGraw stated that they were including street lights and would work with the electric utility if possible to make maintenance easier for the homeowners later.

Rumpel asked if a deceleration lane was required by the Road Commission. Pulaski stated that they will need to install a center left lane and deceleration lanes.

Hill asked if Commissioners were interested in a site visit. Consensus was that a site visit would be helpful, so Hill will schedule this.

Motion by Rumpel, support by Ketchum, to direct Hill to set the public hearing for the PUD for November 28, 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

**F. Architectural Standards - Discussion**

Hill stated that the Board of Trustees discussed architectural standards for commercial and industrial properties and would like the Planning Commission to consider these standards. Commissioners directed Hill to draft an architectural standards ordinance for discussion.

**G. Fences in Front Yards of Flag Lots - Discussion**

Hill stated that the fence ordinance regulates flag lots such that a front yard lot line for the flag lot could be the rear yard lot line for an adjoining property. This means that the type of fence which could be installed along the lot line would be different depending on which homeowner was installing the fence. Commissioners directed Hill to draft a memo for continued discussion.

**H. Planning Commission 2019 Meeting Dates**

Motion by Morgan, support by Ketchum to approve the 2019 Planning Commission meeting dates as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

**I. Commissioner Comments**

1. Township Board: No report.
2. ZBA: The ZBA considered four items. One item related to a front yard fence on a flag lot. Another item was an accessory building authorization. The final two items related to waterfront setbacks.
3. Community Development Director: No report.

**J. Adjournment**

Rumpel moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:21pm. Latsch seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Ketchum, Secretary  
Planning Commission