

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held  
Wednesday, August 10, 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

**#160810-01 – Agenda for August 10, 2016**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Tim Smit, to approve the agenda as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#160810-02 – Minutes of the regular [July 6, 2016](#) meeting**

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#160810-03** – (PUD0603C) Great Lakes Convenience, Inc., 6785 Whitneyville Rd. SE, Alto, is requesting revised preliminary plan approval for a PUD (not the PUD rezoning because it is already in place) for a gas station/convenience store, retail/bank building, drive-through restaurant and three apartment buildings on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-26-200-077, located at 850 44<sup>th</sup> St., in a (PUD) Planned Unit Development district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Don DeGroot, Exxel Engineering; Rick Geenen, Eighth Enterprise, LLC; James Brodi, Create 3, PLLC; Don Ziemke, Eighth Enterprise, LLC; along with several associates, represented the applicant and presented the request. A video depicting the development was presented.

The Zoning Administrator presented a [staff report](#).

There was discussion about the revised architecture and the consensus of the Planning Commission was that the revisions were a vast improvement and this part of the plan was good and acceptable.

There was discussion about allowing drive-through establishments.

Greg Honderd stated the following. The drive-through establishments work against the walkability of the site and the community feel. The video gives an unrealistic impression of open space surrounding the site.

Tim Smit was okay with allowing drive-through establishments.

Don Hebler said that people like drive-through establishments.

Steve Hall said that he was okay with allowing drive-through establishments.

Donna Ferguson said that she was concerned with the traffic flow, congestion and possible confusion of drivers. She said that the drive-through businesses made the traffic flow more complicated.

Rich VanderKlok stated the following. He was not in favor of the layout as shown because most of the proposed green space was not useable. He liked the idea of a community feel and was not sure this was accomplished. There is a lot of stuff going on.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated the following. She was concerned with that the drive-through establishments and that the layout was cumbersome. She said that people will not get out of their cars and the site is not walkable and not cohesive. She was concerned with the layout and the awkward traffic flow. She was not opposed to the drive-through businesses but it was not the best plan.

Greg Honderd summarized the comments.

Don DeGroot stated the following. The amount of walkable neighbors would not support the businesses and the drive-through establishments were more convenient for the others. The pedestrians would likely walk around the outside of the site. A walkable common area is not feasible and would only provide for the people who live in the area. On the easterly portion of the site a bank could locate. It would be important for the success of the operation. The space between the building and 44<sup>th</sup> St. is generous. The traffic flow is not the issue and the operation requires the motoring public. A gas station, bank and coffee shop would balance.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked about the single drive-through lane because most banks have multiple drive-through lanes. She asked if a bank would be interested in locating here if there was only one drive-through lane.

Don Hebler said that he was concerned with circulation because there were many obstacles for the traffic.

Steve Hall said that it would be busy.

Donna Ferguson said that she was concerned with the traffic flow.

Richard VanderKlok said that at the March 2, 2016 Planning Commission meeting direction was given for an interior service drive to be added to provide access to the pumps and now a lot of asphalt is shown.

Jeannine Bolhouse said that there are other ways to make this clearer and there is too much asphalt with too many places for vehicles to go in multiple directions. She said that the location of the pumps was okay, but the traffic flow was awkward, and she was not convinced that this is the best layout.

Tim Smit said that the location of the pumps was okay, but there is a lot of stuff. He said that the traffic will do well and it is clear there is a service drive.

Greg Honderd stated the following. Taking out the corner building would provide more green space and walkability, and result in less traffic conflict. There should be a right-in and right-out on 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. There is a nice mix of residential and businesses. Banking has changed and the single

lane might be okay. The video was well done and provides a sense of the traffic flow. However, the video gives the impression of the site being more open and a roomier development because none of the neighboring buildings were shown. With the building in the corner, it is congested and difficult to get a pedestrian walkway. If the building was eliminated, a walkway could be added along 44<sup>th</sup> St.

Rick Geenen said that the drive-through from the building at the gas pumps was removed and placed at that building at the corner. The location of that building came as a response to the Planning Commission direction to block the pumps.

Steve Hall said that if there cannot be an interior walkway, than a northern one should be delineated.

Donna Ferguson said that she was concerned with the pedestrian walkway and that the area would be used by cars. She said that much of the open space was not usable.

Richard VanderKlok stated the following. The ordinance states that open space is an important part of a PUD and that it should be useable. The useable open space is an inherent part of the PUD. The Planning Commission can determine if the proposed open space meets the ordinance requirements. The plan is showing open space that is not useable.

Don DeGroot stated that much of the open space, though not available for active use, was expanded from the previous plan and is still used for buffering and nice landscaping features.

Richard VanderKlok said that there should be an interior walkway at the north of the site going east and west.

Jeannine Bolhouse said that the landscaping looks beautiful; however, she had concerns about the open space being useable and abundant. She asked who would walk over the parking lot.

Tim Smit stated the following. The open space in the PUD is meant for the townhouses. The rest of the site is for people to get in and get out. There is a sidewalk on Lake Michigan Dr. and that is a busy road. No one will use an interior sidewalk because people will always take the shortest distance.

Don Hebler said that the sidewalk now is mostly on the asphalt and that it should be moved to the north.

The chairman opened the floor to public comments.

Pete VanDyk, 7691 Finch, said that this is a great site for a gas station, especially with the apartments to the south. He said that the layout was beautiful and he was in favor of the proposal.

Scott Diepenhorst, 8885 Cedar Lake Dr., stated his reasons for being in favor of the proposal.

Michael Bosch, 7190 Walnut, said that the proposal had a residential feel and he was in favor of it.

The chairman closed the floor to public comments.

Don DeGroot said that they needed the complete access to 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. for the convenience to M-6 and the full left turn lane was needed.

Richard VanderKlok said that the Planning Commission should remember that this is a prime piece of real estate in the Township and it is critical that this project is done well because a lot of people will drive past this.

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

1. Drive-through establishments are acceptable.
2. Attached garages are required and are a condition of approval for the residential uses.
3. The proposed architecture is acceptable and coordination with the proposal and will be a condition of approval for all future final development phases.
4. The proposed location of gas pumps, service drive and interior traffic circulation is acceptable.
5. As noted at the March 2, 2016 meeting, the Planning Commission directed that an interior service drive provide access to the pumps which should be located in the interior of the site. The Planning Commission determines that the layout as proposed meets that direction.
6. The Planning Commission determines that the pedestrian walkways **MUST BE MOVED INTO THE GREEN SPACE** on the north of the site on the other side of the parking to meet the intention of the ordinance and the direction given by the Planning Commission at the March 2, 2016 meeting stating that pedestrian walkways shall be provided to connect the northwest corner to the southwest corner of the site along 44<sup>th</sup> St. without having the pedestrians use the parking areas (even though the Board waived the requirement of sidewalks in the road right-of-way along 44<sup>th</sup> St.).
7. The Planning Commission determines that the open space as proposed meets the language in the ordinance which states that open space is an important component in a PUD and shall be usable and the language in the Master Plan which states that it should be creative, desirable and useable.
8. The Planning Commission determines that the proposal meets the intention of the Master Plan and that the architecture of the proposed buildings coordinates with the existing building and with each other and that the uses are consistent with the Master Plan.
9. The Planning Commission determines that the setbacks and trash receptacles are acceptable and that plan should be revised for the following elements:
  - a. Provide the dimension from the west side of Building B parking to berm (on a separate document). Must be 24 feet and right angle parking spaces must be a minimum of 9 by 20 feet.
  - b. Provide the dimensions from the sign at the corner of 44th St. and 8th Ave. to the centerlines of 44th St. and 8th Ave.
  - c. Parking calculations noted on the plan are incorrect. Revised calculation should be provided to comply with ordinance requirements.

- 1) For the dental office, the ordinance calls for 3 parking spaces for each examining room and the plan incorrectly uses a calculation based on 1 space for each 200 SF of UFA.
- 2) Retail uses require one space for each 200 SF of GFA and the plan incorrectly notes UFA. Therefore 27 spaces are required and the plan incorrectly notes that 22 spaces are required.
- 3) Bank/retail is listed incorrectly.
- 4) Restaurant is listed incorrectly.

**10. The Planning Commission determines that the following standards in Sec. 22.10 have been met.**

- A. The proposed PUD complies with all qualifying conditions of Section 22.2.
- B. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development.
- C. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.
- D. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.
- E. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of this Chapter, respective of being either a preliminary or final PUD request (Preliminary PUD's must meet Section 22.5, A and Final PUD's must meet Section 22.8, D.)

**And further move, based on the findings listed above, that the Planning Commission adopts the [staff report](#) as finding of facts and approves (PUD0603C) Great Lakes Convenience, Inc., 6785 Whitneyville Rd. SE, Alto, for revised preliminary plan approval for a PUD (not the PUD rezoning because it is already in place) for a gas station/convenience store, retail/bank building, drive-through restaurant and other drive-through establishments and for three apartment buildings on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-26-200-077, located at 850 44<sup>th</sup> St., in a (PUD) Planned Unit Development district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan, as shown on the following documents:**

1. [Site plan](#) dated 6/28/16;
2. [application](#) and [Create 3 Narrative](#) dated June 17, 2016, and [Narrative](#) dated 6/29/16;
3. [Summary of revisions](#) dated June 21, 2016;
4. Elevations-
  - [8<sup>th</sup> Retail East](#)
  - [8<sup>th</sup> Retail North](#)
  - [8<sup>th</sup> Retail South](#)
  - [8<sup>th</sup> Retail West](#)
  - [44<sup>th</sup> Retail East](#)
  - [44<sup>th</sup> Retail North](#)
  - [44<sup>th</sup> Retail South](#)

- [44<sup>th</sup> Retail West](#)
- [Gas Station East](#)
- [Gas Station North](#)
- [Gas Station South](#)
- [Gas Station West](#)
- [Pumps](#)
- [Townhouses](#)

Based on the findings that:

1. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met as proposed;
2. The information as per Sec. 22.8(D) and 22.5 is provided, and
3. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:
  - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;
  - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;
  - c. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;
  - d. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;
  - e. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.
  - f. The deviations as noted on the plan are acceptable because they will result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards and based on mitigating factors.

And with the following conditions:

1. As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site must be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works.
2. The following must be submitted to the Township at the time a building permit application is submitted to the Township.
  - a. Proposed deed restrictions, covenants, or similar legal instruments to be used within the PUD.
  - b. A Storm Water Drain Permit from the Water Resources Commission's Office.
  - c. PUD agreement as per Sec. 22.11.
  - d. Either the deed restrictions or the PUD agreement shall contain language related to the maintenance of the open space and the landscaping.
  - e. Lighting concepts and demonstration that no light poles shall exceed a height of 25 feet.
3. All outstanding fees are paid prior to any building permits being issued.
4. Sign permits are required for all sign installation.
5. Each individual unit of a two-or multiple family dwelling unit shall be provided with an attached enclosed garage with a minimum of 200 square feet.
6. The architectural design and all structures and elements of future phases shall coordinate with the elevations provided and approved.

7. The plan is revised to show the dimension from the west side of Building B parking to berm (may be on a separate document). Must be 24 feet and right angle parking spaces must be a minimum of 9 by 20 feet.
8. The plan is revised to show the dimension from the sign at the corner of 44th St. and 8th Ave. to the centerlines of 44th St. and 8th Ave.
9. Materials used to screen the dumpsters are to be provided.
10. The northern-most pedestrian walkway **MUST BE MOVED INTO THE GREEN SPACE** on the north of the site on the other side of the parking to meet the intention of the ordinance and the direction given by the Planning Commission at the March 2, 2016 meeting stating that pedestrian walkways shall be provided to connect the northwest corner to the southwest corner of the site along 44<sup>th</sup> St. without having the pedestrians use the parking areas (even though the Board waived the requirement of sidewalks in the road right-of-way along 44<sup>th</sup> St.).
11. Parking calculations are to be revised to shown correct information.  
For the dental office, the ordinance calls for 3 parking spaces for each examining room and the plan incorrectly uses a calculation based on 1 space for each 200 SF of UFA. Retail uses require one space for each 200 SF of GFA and the plan incorrectly notes UFA. Therefore 27 spaces are required and the plan incorrectly notes that 22 spaces are required.  
Bank/retail is listed incorrectly.  
Restaurant is listed incorrectly.

Yeas: Donna Ferguson, Steve Hall, Don Hebler, Tim Smit, Richard VanderKlok

Nays: Greg Honderd, Jeannine Bolhouse

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**#160810-04 – Other Business**

**#160810-05 – Public Comments**

**#160810-06 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.