

**ALLENDALE CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

October 21, 2024 – 7:00 p.m.

Allendale Township Public Meeting Room

1. Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Adams.
2. Roll Call – Members present were Chairman Adams, Member Bronson, Member Zeinstra, Member Westerling, and Member Jacquot: Mr. Ransford was also present. Vice-Chairman Nadda and Member Zuniga were not present.
3. Communications and Correspondence – None
4. A Motion was made by Member Jacquot, seconded by Member Zeinstra to approve the October 7, 2024, Planning Commission minutes with a correction to the date of the upcoming meeting (October 21, 2024). Motion was carried unanimously.
5. Motion was made by Chairman Adams, seconded by Member Jacquot to approve the agenda. Motion was carried unanimously.
6. Public Comments for *non-public hearing items*.

Chairman Adams opened the Public Comments, having no one come forward to make comments, Chairman Adams closed the Public Comments.

7. Public Hearings:
 - A. Water's Edge South Planned Unit Development (Addition to Hidden Shores West PUD)

Jack Barr with Nederveld was present representing Water's Edge, he noted he thought there was a misunderstanding as to where the development is going in relation to Pierce Street, and he pointed out to the Commission where it would be in relation to the existing Hidden Shores West project.

Mr. Ransford explained that this project was before the Planning Commission in September for preliminary discussion and some direction including adding more off-street parking and including in the covenants and Master Deed that the units are to be owner occupied with no rentals. The Trip Gen Analysis that covered the entirety of the Hidden Shores project was sent to the Planning Commission today and it was determined that no traffic study would be needed and included in the meeting packet was an example of the streetlights that will be installed. Mr. Ransford further explained that the Site Plan and Rezone are before the Commission today for their approval to move forward to the Board of Trustees to hold Public Hearings and ultimately approval of the project.

Chairman Adams opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone present who would like to give comments. There being no speakers present, Chairman Adams closed the Public Hearing/Comments and opened it up to the Commissioners for comments.

Chairman Adams stated that as the Planning Commission there are several things that need to be considered, the first being whether two-unit condominiums are appropriate to permit pursuant to Section 12.05 Modification of Zone Requirements.

Mr. Ransford apologized, saying he meant to touch on that earlier, he reminded the Commission that they had this conversation at their previous meeting, but he wanted to solidify it in the Public Hearing form and as reflected in the Resolution document.

Chairman Adams noted this is something that they had talked about before but wanted to know if there were any additional comments or anything else.

Member Zeinstra stated he thinks it fits nicely with phase one and the previous condominiums as well.

Chairman Adams stated we have talked about the pending trip-generation data, that one has been taken care of and doesn't need any additional traffic study. They also had confirmation of the street light fixture that will match phase one. He inquired about the PUD standards in section 12.08.

Mr. Ransford stated that they had covered that in the previous meeting as well, in addition to the site plan review standards there are the standards in the 12.08 which the applicant did address in their initial submission, there are some boxes they have to check and they have done that, as a formality we are just repeating that list if there were any concerns about those and if there are not again reflected in that resolution those have been found to be compliant and we can recommend that to the Board.

Chairman Adams asked if that would also go for the site plan review, standards have also been met.

Mr. Ransford confirmed that is correct.

Member Zeinstra made a motion to recommend approval of the Site Plan presented by way of the content of the draft resolution to be adopted by the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded by Member Westerling and carried unanimously.

B. Woodford Farm (Meyers Estates) Tentative Preliminary Plat

Todd with Exxcel Engineering representing Woodford Farms, gave an overview of the project that sits on a 20-acre parcel east of 64th Avenue and a half mile north of Lake Michigan Drive. He explained it is zoned R3 and is currently a corn field. They are planning 59 single family residences with 2 duplex units. There is access from 64th Avenue with a secondary access point from Washington. The Ottawa County Road Commission has approved the road plan. There will be sidewalks and trees throughout the development, a retention pond and there is water and sewer available and will be constructed throughout the site. The developer plans to deed the lot that lift station will be located on to the Township. There is existing vegetation along the property line and there will be a 10-ft no disturb zone and additional evergreens planted.

Mr. Ransford stated that the Planning Commission heard this back in September, the concerns that were brought up were the exposed areas on each property line they are addressing that concern with additional trees in the area, prohibition of on-street parking which has been satisfied in the covenants, adding striped crosswalks at the T-intersections as well as signage that is reflected in the plan. The applicant pending your review of the trees has satisfied what the Commission requested in September, as part of the Commission's process this is only time that the Commission sees the planning application this will be a recommendation to the Board, they handle the rest of the steps from there, it is otherwise ready to go.

Chairman Adams asked what kind of evergreens would be placed along the property line and what the spacing would be.

Todd with Exxcel Engineering replied that they are calling for Black Hill Spruce 6 – 8 ft tall with spacing roughly 20 feet apart and they are being placed between existing White Pines. He noted that if there is a tree the Township prefers, they are open to that as well.

Chairman Adams opened the Public Hearing/Comments for Woodford Farms.

A member of the audience asked if anything would be done with the north side, would that be cut down or anything.

Scott MacDonald from the Village Condos asked if the 10ft on the east side will preserve the trees there and in the NE corner it looks like it may get pretty wet in there and asked if that will be impacted in there or he assumes with the retention pond it will be okay.

David McNair, he lives just on the other side of 64th, he is just curious what the average retail price of each of these units is expected to be, also who is going to maintain the duplexes. I know the original rezoning there was a limitation on bedrooms, it would seem it would be well within the number of bedrooms based on the plat that is currently there, but he would just like to confirm that it is two because there is a limit on the bedrooms based on the space, he doesn't think it is an issue but just for clarification.

There being no other speakers for the Public Hearing/Comment, Chairman Adams closed the Public Comments.

In response to the questions posed during the Public Comments, Todd stated that the existing 10 ft preserve area runs from lot 7 to lot 10, there are some property line stakes that show where that line is and the trees in there will be preserved and supplemented with these additional trees. Regarding the north line we don't know exactly where the trunks of the trees are, but we are putting a storm sewer line along there, but we are not touching any of the trees in the corner.

Sam Steak, Woodford Farms, stated that regarding maintaining the duplexes it would be on whoever ends up building them, it will most likely be us who keeps them, so it will probably be us who keeps and maintains them, but it is possible they could be sold to somebody else. In my experience in building a duplex on one of those lots would probably go for \$650-750,000, it is a very expensive, high-end rental property so it is a different level of maintenance. House value wise we are probably at a \$450,000 to high-end 650,000 range.

Chairman Adams asked about the number of bedrooms clarification.

Mr. Ransford explained relative to the rezoning question when it was proposed for rezoning there was a question about the potential density for multi-family buildings, that is where the Township has language for additional bedrooms, there is language in terms of single-family homes and two-family homes for minimum square footage and if there are additional bedrooms there is another 100 square feet. That discussion, at least during the rezoning portion, was if they come back with four, sixteen-unit buildings or 25-unit threshold that is when we really talk about those extra bedrooms, it essentially is not applicable to this.

A member of the public asked if Lot 22 is a building lot or maintenance lot.

A Woodford Farm representative stated it would be a building lot.

It was noted that there is no plan to take the trees out on the north side unless they must for the drainage line that will run down that line.

Chairman Adams asked if this would come back to the Planning Commission, Mr. Ransford explained that this is the only time it will come before the Planning Commission then advances to the Trustees Board.

It was acknowledged that the covenant needed to be changed regarding the single-family homes only requirement for lots 60 and 61.

Motion was made by Member Zeinstra and seconded by Member Westerling to recommend approval of the Woodford Farm Tentative Preliminary Plat to the Township Board based on our summary including the change to the convenance for lots 60 and 61. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Site Plan Review:

A. Great Lake Tree Service – 4503 Pingree Street

Joel Terpstra, the contractor representing Great Lake Tree Service, gave an overview of the business and plan to the Commission.

Mr. Ransford explained this is a use by right in the industrial district, his associate Kevin reviewed this project, the site plan was well done, they are looking for some relief on the landscape requirement in the front, fencing is 7ft tall fence with metal panels, if the Commission would like to require a front and back service drive entrance/exit it would be at your discretion.

They are proposing an LP Smart Side in Tundra Gray and for the privacy screen and fencing to hide the equipment and any storage we are using the metal siding proposed on the second page and will match the building color. There will be metal flashing caps that will lip over on the screen wall. There was a question regarding a dumpster enclosure, there is not due to the 7ft fence around the property, but they are willing to put in a wrap around enclosure. There is a plan to store between 4-6 vehicles in the building, in the back area on the gravel they are proposing 4 medium larger trucks, up to 6 trailers, one track skid steer, and an excavator which is why they are proposing the metal fence that is not see-through. There is no concern for an over-abundance of noise since the grinding of materials will not happen there.

It was asked if they would consider adding some sort of landscaping along the north property line along the berm. They did the berm because the ordinance stated they had to do it because it was it was zoned AG; they had not planned on planting in the berm, but they are open to it. Member Zeinstra suggested something to return to nature maybe with seedlings or wildflower grasses or trees. The Planning Commission was comfortable with the front yard landscaping as presented and authorized a waiver for the omitted plantings.

Due to there being no other buildings at this time, the Commission would consider deferring the sidewalk requirement until such time an adjacent property constructs sidewalk along the right-of-way.

There was a question about signage, it will be about a 4 x4 sign on the building and can work with you if the sign itself needs to be approved administratively while constructing the building.

It was noted the office is labeled as the bathroom on the plan, there will be a small front office, so could figure 30 trips a day or less. The Commission doesn't believe there needs to be a traffic study for this type of business and doesn't think a frontage road or drive would be needed behind the business. It was noted that the gravel does have to be dustless pursuant to the ordinance, they could

brine it to ensure it stays dustless. Commission thinks the plan looks solid and good. The applicant is to return with revised plans addressing the following:

- The northern berm shall have a more natural look, including trees, but those trees do not have to meet the Zoning Ordinance.
- Provide the storm water details.
- A plan note addressing a brining schedule.
- Sealed engineered plans and sealed Landscape Architect plans.

9. New Business:

A. Work Text Amendment – Bed and Breakfast Establishment

* Section 32.03 – Definitions (B)

* Section 23.23 – Bed and Breakfast Establishments

Mr. Ransford explained the language before them was drafted based on the Commissions input at the previous meeting and thinks it meets what the Commission was asking for.

There was a question regarding whether a new build can I wait a year then turn it into a bed and breakfast, do they need to put a restriction regarding a waiting time. The Commission didn't see a need for a waiting time. It was questioned why there is a minimum of 2000 square feet, it was determined that requirement could be struck and the applicant could make their case for use. There was a question of whether this should fall under the Rental Inspection Program but there is a concern if the Rental Program changes or gets dropped there will be a disconnect; it was determined that it would be run by legal counsel.

Mr. Ransford will touch base with who he needs to, update the language and bring it back for review by the Commission.

10. Old Business:

A. Support Services Residences – Text Amendment Discussion

Although this was directed to bring this back as a public hearing, after talking with legal counsel it was decided to bring back suggestions from them and ask if the Commission wanted to tweak the language prior to the public hearing.

The addition of language to supersede the 5 adult limit to be taken as a case-by-case situation by the Planning Commission based on size of the dwelling as presented by the applicant. Mr. Ransford will revise as directed and return the language to the Commission for review.

11. Public Comments - None

12. Township Board Reports

Member Zeinstra reported that the Board discussed the budget, met the new Sargent from the Sheriff's Office assigned to Allendale, and signed up for 4th of July fireworks.

13. Commissioner and Staff Comments – A question whether there can be something in the Ordinance regarding not allowing inverted crown catch basins; they cannot restrict usage of them.

Mr. Ransford advised that the applicant for Springfield North is requesting a letter to present to the Road Commission regarding the decision the Planning Commission had regarding Camfield Road not

connecting so he can take it to appeal at the Road Commission. Mr. Ransford will draft a letter stating the Commission doesn't mind saying they don't see a need for a connection.

14. Meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for November 4, 2024, at 7:00 p.m.

DRAFT