

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held
Wednesday, September 21, 2016**

Meeting called to order by Chairman Honderd at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Greg Honderd, Richard VanderKlok, Don Hebler, Donna Ferguson, Tim Smit, Jeannine Bolhouse, Steve Hall

Absent: None

Also present: Mannelle Minier, Zoning Administrator

#160921-01 – Agenda for September 21, 2016

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the agenda as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#160921-02 – Minutes of the regular [August 10, 2016](#) meeting

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Steve Hall, to approve the minutes as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#160921-03 – (ST1615) Advanced Interiors, 6656 Pine Ridge Ct., is requesting approval of a revision to an approved site plan to allow a dumpster to be located in a truck well with no screening, on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-22-477-004, located at 6656 Pine Ridge Ct., in an (I) Industrial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County ([site plan](#), [dumpster](#), [sight diagram](#))

Doug Stalsonburg represented the applicant and presented the request.

The Zoning Administrator presented a [staff report](#) and the [memo](#) from the Code Enforcement Officer.

Richard VanderKlok said that the location was okay but they should be consistent with the screening.

Jeannine Bolhouse said that the location was okay but they should be consistent with the screening.

Tim Smit said that the location was okay but they should be consistent with the screening.

Greg Honderd stated the following. They could use slats or other material to add to the railing as screening. Colombo's has a unique situation because materials from the installers were dumped into the dumpster as well as materials from the store. Where the applicant wants to put it is practical, but what if they move out of the building and the new tenant wants to use the loading dock. Where they want to locate it is okay and with a slatted system in the railing they would meet the requirement.

Doug Stalsonburg said that the weeds were meaningless and that the cross-section shows that the dirt of the berm would actually screen the dumpster. All that is wanted is the screening, but it serves no purpose. The berm is the screening. Fence or arborvitae would just cost money and get

in the way for snow plowing. This should be required to accomplish something. There is no purpose here because the dumpster cannot be seen.

Greg Honderd said that there are two parts to screening: one, to prevent blowing trash which is irrelevant in this case because the materials won't blow; and two, to prevent the dumpster from being seen. He asked if it would be that hard to put in screening in the railing.

Don Besteman, owner of the property, said that they have to open the gate in the railing and to use that for screening would interfere with the dumping.

Greg Honderd said that canvas like for a pool cover could be used.

Don Hebler said that pine trees could go on the hill and that the dumpster was visible from a pickup or semi. He said that it was important for the Planning Commission to be consistent.

Steve Hall said the following. He disagrees with the comments already made. He drove back by the dumpster and the entire length of the street. The berm by the railroad is weedy the whole way. He asked if they wanted to comply with the letter of the law or the intent. The intent is to disguise it and it is very well disguised. This may set a precedent but this is a unique situation. This property is not the most desirable by the railroad tracks and from his observation the dumpster can't be seen from Chicago Dr.

Donna Ferguson stated the following. She drove to the site, and east and west on Chicago Dr. and would not see the dumpster. It was tough to see the top. However, she was a stickler with the rules and it would be easy to put three trees in, though it would really not be necessary for the screening.

Don Hebler asked who owned the berm.

Doug Stalsonburg stated the following. The berm is on railroad property. He did the engineering back in the 1970s when the PUD was developed. When constructing the pond they found unsuitable soil and got permission from the railroad to push it up on their property to widen the property to create the elevation grade. This was part of the PUD construction and it is on the railroad property.

The chairman opened the floor to public comments. No one was present to make public comments. The chairman closed the floor to public comments.

Don Besteman said that the dumpster is not visible from any road and would be more of an eyesore if it was fenced in. He said that the neighbors to the west can see it, but they can see his materials too. He said that this meets the language in the ordinance for being consistent with the environment.

Moved by Steve Hall, seconded by Don Hebler, to determine the following:

- 1. The location of the dumpster is acceptable in the truck well.**
- 2. The area on the Chicago Dr. side of the interior lane does not have to be screened with either six foot high fencing or landscaping because it is acceptable as it is.**

And based on the findings listed above, that the Planning Commission adopts the [staff report](#) as finding of facts and approves the site plan revision dated 5-11-15, as presented, with all other previous approvals for the site plan to remain in effect.

Motion was withdrawn by the mover and seconder.

Moved by Steve Hall, seconded by Don Hebel, to determine the following:

- 1. The location of the dumpster is acceptable in the truck well.**
- 2. The area on the Chicago Dr. side of the interior lane does not have to be screened with either six foot high fencing or landscaping because the existing berm satisfies the screening requirement and the existing screening and location are acceptable. So no additional screening is necessary.**

And based on the findings listed above, that the Planning Commission adopts the [staff report](#) as finding of facts and approves the site plan revision dated 5-11-15, as presented, with all other previous approvals for the site plan to remain in effect.

Greg Honderd said that he agreed with the motion and that this meets the intent of the ordinance.

The rest of the Planning Commissioners concurred.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#160921-04 – Other Business

There was discussion on potential future ordinance revisions.

#160921-05 – Public Comments

#160921-06 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.