

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held Wednesday, May 21, 2025.

Meeting called to order by Chairman Josiah Samy at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Josiah Samy (Chairman Samy), Jeannine Bolhouse, Gary Veldink, Brian Reed, Tom Healy, Jessica Ulberg, Geoff Brown

Absent: None

Also present: Ryan Schab, Zoning Administrator (ZA)

#250521-01 – Planning Commission Agenda for [May 21, 2025](#)

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Geoff Brown, to approve the agenda of the [May 21, 2025](#) meeting as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#250521-02 – Minutes of the [April 16, 2025](#) Planning Commission Meeting

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to approve the minutes of [April 16, 2025](#) as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#250521-03 – (SUP 2502) 7537 20th Ave LLC, 7537 20th Ave. to have a restaurant (no drive-through), under Sec. 13.3(B), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-15-327-024, located at 7537 20th Ave., in a Office Service (OS) Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan. ([Site Plan](#), [General Notes Revision](#), [Application](#), [Fee Paid](#))

The Applicant presented their application to the Planning Commission.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#) to the Planning Commission. In addition to the staff report, the ZA presented information regarding parking. During the application process, it was brought to the attention of the ZA that more parking would be required than initially calculated due to the requirements in **Sec 26.8 TABLE OF OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS**. The requested use has two calculations for parking: *Either 1 space per 70 square feet or usable floor area OR 1 space per each 2 persons allowed within the maximum occupancy load as established by local, county, state, fire, health, or building codes* **WHICHEVER IS GREATER**. The calculation in the staff report is based on the usable floor area and required 36 spaces for the restaurant use. However, after consulting with the Fire Department to obtain the maximum occupancy load as established by fire code, this particular restaurant would require 106 spaces, which exceeds the total number of parking spaces provided for the site. Therefore, the current proposed layout of the restaurant would not be permitted and significant adjustments would need to be made before Use Zoning Approval could be granted and the parking approved. Due to these requirements, the Applicant is attending the meeting to be evaluated based on the special land use standards for their restaurant use and a condition of approval should be added to state that the parking ordinance must be met prior to Use Zoning Approval being granted for the restaurant use.

Gary Veldink asked the applicant if there is room for outdoor seating.

The Applicant confirmed that due to the site plan requirements there is not room for outdoor seating.

Gary Veldink asked the Applicant if they have approval from the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission (OCWRC) to potentially expand the parking to the north towards Macatawa Bank.

The Applicant confirmed that they have not received approval from the OCWRC because they were not informed that parking may be an issue until today. This is the reason he is seeking the special land use approval for the restaurant use contingent on the parking ordinance being met. Currently, Bosco's Pub is the potential tenant. The Applicant would meet with them after the approval and discuss if a layout could be feasible given the parking requirements. If not, the Applicant would like to know that they are still approved for a restaurant use.

Gary Veldink noted that if the special land use is approved, it will run with the land and not the specific tenant being proposed. Even if the Planning Commission agrees that Bosco's Pub could make the layout work, any other restaurant would be able to apply for approval after the special land use is granted.

The Applicant stated that they know they will not be able to meet the parking requirements as the restaurant is currently proposed. They understand that parking will have to be approved for each individual tenant space before they occupy the building. He understands that the Planning Commission is thinking about the long term outcomes of the approval.

Brian Reed shares Gary Veldink's concerns about the parking available on the site. He would prefer to see the proposed parking layout before making any decision on the matter.

Jessica Ulberg said that she has concerns about the traffic the business would generate and the parking.

Chairman Samy asked the ZA to bring up the Zoning Ordinance **Sec 26.8 TABLE OF OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS** to discuss the parking requirements to get a better understanding of the situation.

The ZA read through the ordinance and explained to the Planning Commission that the requirement for parking is either based on usable floor area or maximum occupancy, whichever of those calculations require a greater number of spaces. Since the maximum occupancy calculation requires a greater number of parking spaces (106 spaces required) than the usable floor area calculation (36 spaces required), the official number of parking spaces required is 106.

Jeannine Bolhouse raised the point that the ordinance stipulates that the maximum occupancy can be established based on *local, county, state, fire, health, or building codes* and that the ZA only used the fire code to determine maximum occupancy. She inquired why they are basing this number based on the fire code and not the other codes.

The ZA stated that he is not qualified to determine maximum occupancy based on any of the codes listed in the ordinance but historically, the zoning department has received assistance from the Township's fire inspector to determine maximum occupancy based on fire code for parking calculations. He also confirmed that the 106 spaces required number is entirely based off fire code and not *county, state, health, or building code*.

Chairman Sammy inquired whether the other codes listed in the ordinance would still require the amount of parking that is required based off fire code.

The ZA stated that if the ordinance required the calculation to be based on all the codes, it would be important to calculate maximum occupancy based on every code listed in the ordinance.

Chairman Sammy was concerned that if a different code was used and the requirement was lower, the fire inspector could shut down the operation because it is not in compliance with fire code.

The ZA clarified that the Applicant meets the ordinance based on *1 space per 70 square feet or usable floor area* but since the maximum occupancy calculation requires more parking, the official required parking calculation has to be based on maximum occupancy as the ordinance is written.

Gary Veldink stated that fire code always trumps building code.

Chairman Sammy asked if the 25% reduction could be granted even though the required number is based off a fire code calculation for maximum occupancy.

The ZA stated that the parking could still be reduced. The maximum occupancy would not change because it is calculated based on the fire code, but they could still be approved for a reduced number of parking spaces.

Chairman Sammy stated that with a 25% reduction, the use requires 80 spaces and the site has provided for 74. He asked if they would only be short 6 spaces if granted the 25% reduction.

The ZA stated that the parking calculation also has to factor in the other three tenant spaces: the dentist office, counseling office, and vacant space which is assumed to be office. Even with the 25% reduction for the restaurant use, it requires more parking spaces (80) than the entire site provides (74).

Chairman Sammy asked the applicant about the possibility of shared parking. The Planning Commission in the past has approved parking calculations based on signed agreements between neighbors to share parking.

The Applicant stated that he is confident he could obtain an agreement with Macatawa Bank (to the north) who would likely prefer to share their parking with the Applicant over having additional parking be installed.

Chairman Sammy inquired about shared parking possibilities with the other two buildings off Baldwin St.

The Applicant stated that they obtained the property from Mr. Powell. He is less familiar with the other neighbor. Powell's parking lot will be a bit of a distance away from his building. He prefers to not get hung up on parking. He is willing to reduce the size of the restaurant to ensure he meets the parking ordinance. He believes Macatawa Bank would be the most logical neighbor to obtain a shared parking agreement with.

Chairman Samy asked about the proposed motion. He wanted clarification that a condition could be added that the restaurant would not be approved unless it met the parking ordinance.

The ZA stated that the restaurant needs to meet the parking ordinance even without the condition, but due to the complicated nature of this request, it may be worth adding that condition to the motion. The Use Zoning Compliance would not be approved until he meets the parking requirements. This means the Applicant would need to make significant adjustments to the layout as it stands. Every individual tenant space will need to be approved using the 74 spaces provided.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that the Planning Commission can add conditions to the approval as stated in the Staff Report. Specifically requiring certain hours of operation for the restaurant. She also asked about the possibility of restricting the amount of people allowed within the building but acknowledged the issue would be enforcement of such a policy.

The ZA stated he would be cautious of adding a condition that restricts the number of people allowed within the building because all conditions must be to further the ordinance.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that the parking ordinance is incredibly unclear when it references, "*as established by local, county, state, fire, health, or building codes.*" Even though Gary Veldink has informed the board that fire code trumps building code, she would not have known that. She would not know how to calculate the occupancy based on health code. It would be difficult to know what to use if you had to calculate parking. Since the ordinance says "or" she would argue this means you can use any of those codes to determine max occupancy. Therefore if there is a local or county code that would calculate the maximum occupancy as lower, it could be used to determine the parking and require less. She finds that language to be concerning and unclear.

Tom Healy stated that the maximum occupancy part of the restaurant parking calculation is almost always going to be the greater number. He does not see where 70 SF of UFA would ever be used to calculate parking. He asked the Applicant which spots would be used for the restaurant.

The Applicant stated that the restaurant would be in the north east tenant space.

Tom Healy asked if the Applicant was present at the variance request back in 2024 to grant reduced setbacks.

The Applicant stated that his engineer and one of his partners was present to present those requests.

Tom Healy stated that during the variance hearing for the reduced setbacks, the question was asked which other tenant spaces would go in besides the dental office. The offered spaces were a medical office, financial advisor, and physical therapist. A restaurant was never brought up. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was never informed of the potential to put a restaurant here and it is possible the ZBA would have felt differently about the request if provided with that information.

The Applicant stated that it would be difficult to know exactly what tenants would be going in at that stage of the process. The restaurant will not change the integrity of the building itself. The biggest reason for the reduced setback was so the detention ponds could be placed in the back rather than be placed by the street.

Geoff Brown stated that the Applicant can change their interior layout to fit with Fire Code and ensure the parking ordinance is met. The Fire Department is the entity that would stop a business from having too many people in their building to begin with. He agreed with Tom Healy that this request is not what he remembers seeing come to the ZBA. Once the Planning Commission approves this special land use request, any restaurant can apply to go in here.

Tom Healy stated the Planning Commission would be granting a special use, which is not allowed by right. Office space is allowed by right.

Geoff Brown doubted whether this location is a good spot for a restaurant. While he would like to see more restaurants come to Georgetown, he acknowledged that there are a lot of hurdles to putting in one in this location.

Chairman Samy opened the public hearing.

Beverly Schat, 7506 21st Ave., was not aware that this building was being constructed. She was assured by the Township that it was just a dental office, then the monstrosity of the building went up. She did not receive this information until the building was going up and she called the Township office, now she has received this letter about the restaurant request. She finds it unbelievable that 4 tenants are allowed in this location near her residential area. She wants to know what type of restaurant would be going in. She does not believe this will help the value of her property. She is concerned about the school nearby and traffic. She was reminded to direct her comments to the chair.

Chairman Samy asked the ZA if there was a rezoning on this property that would have necessitated a notice going out to nearby property owners. He also asked about a notice for the variance request.

The ZA confirmed that a rezoning was not done but the variance necessitated a property notice being sent out in 2024.

Chairman Samy assured that staff follows strict guidelines and everyone within 300' of the property would have received a notice in the mail informing them of the variance request and the notice is posted in the Township Office.

The ZA stated it is also posted in the paper.

Chairman Samy mentioned that the Planning Commission does not control property values. The Ottawa County Assessor is responsible for getting residents an assessed value. The Planning Commission will address other issues now like traffic, the nearby school, and possibly hours of operation. The Planning Commission cannot choose what type of restaurant will go in. A special land use approval would encompass all types of restaurants including wineries and distilleries, subject to all other requirements.

Chairman Samy closed the public hearing.

Geoff Brown stated that this is not what the variance was approved for and Tom Healy agreed it was not discussed.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked if knowing that the Applicant planned to do a restaurant would have affected the outcome of the variance hearing as the Applicant indicated the reason for the request was so the retention pond could be established in the rear yard.

Tom Healy stated it would have at least been helpful to understand the full context and the transparency would have been helpful. It may not have changed the decision but the transparency is important.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that sometimes business owners do not always anticipate the opportunities that will come to them. They simply have a prospective tenant that is excited at the potential to move in here and therefore have ended up at a Planning Commission meeting.

Tom Healy stated he would have appreciated at least knowing the Applicant was not sure what would go in there. He brought up [Sec. 26.9 (K) which allows the approving authority to grant up to a 25% reduction in the required parking. It lists a set of 7 items to base the reduction on:

Sec 26.9 MISCELLANEOUS OFF-STREET PARKING PROVISIONS

- K. The approving authority as designated in Chapter 19 may grant a reduction in the required number of parking spaces for commercial, industrial or mixed use developments from one space up to a maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of the number of required spaces as calculated from Chapter 26, based on the following:
1. The applicant has demonstrated that the parking needs of the development would be adequately served due to factors such as joint use of common space for varying time periods of use or with alternate modes of transportation;
 2. With the condition that if the site and/or development is changed in any way by additional development, change in the size of the property or change of use, the parking requirements would be recalculated and reevaluated, and the reduction eliminated if the determination is made that the waived parking spaces are needed to meet the needs of the changed development or site.
 3. If the reduction is eliminated due to the mentioned site/development changes, the newly calculated number of parking spaces shall be provided prior to any approvals being granted for a change in use, parcel size, or additional development.
 4. In granting the reduction, the determination must be made that the reduction will not cause unreasonable negative impacts to the surrounding properties.
 5. Additional documentation could be required to provide assurances that the circumstances which warranted the reduction do not change, such as the use or size of development.
 6. Adequate space is provided for snow removal and storage.
 7. That in reducing the required number of parking spaces, the intention is for more green space or landscaped areas to be provided, in addition to less paved surfaces that required storm water runoff. (revised 1-24-05)

Tom Healy believes that all seven of these items must be met in order for a parking reduction to be granted.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that due to the language “based on the following,” she does not necessarily agree all seven items must be met. It is not clear that you must to go through each

factor and determine if each of them are met. It is intended to be open for interpretation to give the governing body the ability to grant the reduction. Any number under 25% can be granted.

Tom Healy asked if there are any factors that would need to be met to grant such a reduction, he focused on factor 6 which requires “adequate space is provided for snow removal and storage”.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that even that item is open for interpretation, what constitutes adequate space could be interpreted differently.

Chairman Samy asked Tom Healy if there is an item in the list he is hung up on.

Tom Healy does not see what a reduction in this particular case would be based on. The Applicant did not make any arguments for factor 1 and the staff report does not address it. The Planning Commission does not have a determination as to why the reduction has been granted, they have just been told that the reduction is granted. Item 4 states that the reduction cannot have a negative impact on surrounding properties. The Planning Commission has discussed that likely people will be parking at Sandy Hill or the bank, these are negative impacts on surrounding properties and therefore this standard is not met. So the question is now whether one met item can carry the approval of the reduction given at least one of the items is not met. He stated that item number 5 is not met, that could met with be a letter from the fire department.

Chairman Samy stated that these standards are up for interpretation. For example the shared parking agreements we discussed could ensure that parking on neighboring properties does not create a negative impact.

Tom Healy does not want to conflate the issue. He is referencing the 25% reduction and does not believe it should be granted. This application has too large a building, on too small a parcel, and is attempting to fit too much on the site.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked Tom Healy if she believes that all the parking required is necessary. She asked the group if they believe having 106 spaces for this restaurant is necessary, it seems wild to her. She feels that the 25% reduction is reducing the excessive amount the parking ordinance requires.

Tom Healy says he does not understand why the ordinance requires that many but that is what the ordinance states. Since the maximum occupancy calculation requires more parking, that calculation provides what is required.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated the reduction is reducing the requirement from a number that is ridiculously high. She believes that the requirement is so high, using the 25% reduction is what makes the requirement reasonable. In her opinion, the township ordinance is requiring too much parking.

Tom Healy stated that he does not disagree with her but the Win Tavern is using the maximum occupancy calculation and if you go there on a Saturday night, the parking is maxed out.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated not having enough parking is a detriment to the business. She would never try to walk across 20th Ave. to get to a restaurant.

Geoff Brown stated that the parking requirements are unreasonably large. He acknowledged that there are other examples of takeout restaurants within Georgetown that operate with less parking.

Tom Healy stated that Sec 26.9 (K) of the ordinance needs serious work and he would like the other commissioners to comment before moving on to discuss the general special land use standards.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated the Planning Commission is not here to change the ordinance today, the maximum occupancy calculation must be used per the ordinance even if the requirement feels excessive. With regard to the 25% reduction, because the requirement is high, it is appropriate to reduce the parking. These businesses can coexist, the other uses will likely not be using all of their required parking, and therefore this can still work even with the 25% reduction. She believes it is important to limit the hours of operation due to the school being so close by. If a breakfast place goes in here, it will create conflicts. It should not be open until kids are done going to school which would be after 9-10 a.m. She does not see there being an issue with conflicts in the afternoon. These hours could change on weekends when school is not in session.

Tom Healy stated the Applicant's letter suggests that with 36 spaces, if 100% of them turn over 4 times a day that would be additional 144 vehicles. He believes it illustrates the intent is to fill that parking lot as many times a day as possible.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that is not the conclusion she came to while reading the letter. It is simply illustrating the maximum they could possibly do. She suggested the start time should be around 11 a.m. and she is worried about the morning being too busy in that area.

Brian Reed stated that lunch and afternoon get horrible in that area as the buses will line up in that area for Kindergarten.

Jessica Ulberg stated that people cannot get past that area and it is busy.

Chairman Samy stated that people are not going out to dinner at 3 p.m.

Brian Reed stated it is impossible to turn left out of there during the afternoon. People line up an hour early to pick up their kids and stay an hour after. The buses do come during lunch time to pick up the Kindergarten students as well.

Geoff Brown asked if a parking study was done for the dentist's office.

The Applicant stated that the parking study was done for the restaurant as that use would have the most questions surrounding the parking.

Geoff Brown asked if the Bosco's owner gave an indication of when their hours would be even though it is not particularly relevant to the approval.

The Applicant stated that they do not plan to operate for breakfast and he would be in favor of requiring a later start. Then the Planning Commission does not have to worry about the possibility of a breakfast place coming in there. He is looking for an afternoon/evening type business. However, if the requirement is that it cannot be open during school hours at all, no restaurant is

going to go in there. If another medical office goes in there, there would be more traffic generated at 3:30 p.m. from that than the restaurant.

Jessica Ulberg has concerns about the application meeting the general standards in Sec 20.3, specifically standard 4 and the excessive production of traffic in an already busy area. She is less concerned with standard 1 as this is a commercial corner, and agrees with the staff report that standards 2 and 3 are met. She does believe the parking requirements need to be looked at and does not disagree with granting the reduction. However, she can anticipate that people will go somewhere else to find parking if the lot is full. Traffic and parking are her two biggest concerns and while she would love another restaurant in Georgetown, she does not know if this is the right spot.

Brian Reed stated that the Planning Commission is prescribing what should go in here, which he does not believe is right. He does not have a plan in front of him that meets the ordinance. He believes the parking issue should be addressed prior to a special land use being issued.

Chairman Samy stated that the difficult thing with special land uses is that they stay with the property. Even if they had a more concrete plan in front of them with exact hours, the tenant could change.

Brian Reed stated that he does not believe the Township should be telling people how to run their businesses. He is not qualified to determine if the 25% reduction should be granted based on the type of business but would rather see more specifics.

Gary Veldink wonders if the 74 spaces proposed are enough for this building. This building already has a dentist office, two vacant spaces, and now a restaurant is being requested. The area on the north of the property is likely not big enough to add additional parking. The Township would never recommend that people park at Sandy Hill on the other side of 20th Ave. for liability reasons. He disagrees with requiring certain hours, if the Planning Commission wants to approve this then the business should be able to stand up on its own. It was approved to be an office building and that is what it should be. The building is already large for the parcel, a restaurant does not look like it will fit and it is not a proper place for it.

Chairman Samy stated that he does not want to set up a business to fail. The existing Bosco's in Terra Square has issues with parking. They have about 5 spots designated to them and the rest are taken up by the other uses in that vicinity. He could see a takeout restaurant working better, more akin to a Boardwalk Subs or Bangkok Taste. He worries about future tenants not having enough parking. He would be more receptive to the request if parking agreements were obtained. As far as the 25% reduction is concerned, item 1 discusses business hours that do not always overlap. However all of the offices would be open during the day and the restaurant could be a lunch spot. The parking ordinance should be reviewed during the Master Plan process, specifically Sec 26.9 (K) regarding reductions should be made more clear. The parking is his biggest concern even though he could see a restaurant fitting well in the area generally.

Tom Healy weighed in on the special land use general standards. He agrees with Jessica that standards 1-3 seem to be met. In regard to standard 4, odors coming out a restaurant cannot be controlled. There are 3 residential houses surrounding the site and there is an elementary school directly across the street. A restaurant is a more intense use for that kind of area as opposed to just office spaces.

Chairman Samy asked if there are any motions.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that it feels like the consensus is to deny the request. The Planning Commission would like to see growth in the Township but there are too many issues with this specific area for it to make sense.

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Gary Veldink to deny the special land use request (SUP 2502) 7537 20th Ave LLC, 7537 20th Ave. to have a restaurant (no drive-through), under Sec. 13.3(B), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-15-327-024, located at 7537 20th Ave., in a Office Service (OS) Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Geoff Brown asked if the Applicant can come back with a better floor plan/better parking. He does not want to see them denied and then have to wait a year to make a similar request.

The ZA confirmed he believes that if denied, the Applicant would need to wait a year and then submit a new application to make a similar request.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked if they could table the request so that the Applicant would have an opportunity to provide an updated plan that meets the ordinance.

Geoff Brown agreed with tabling the request to allow the Applicant to develop a more concrete floor plan so the parking could be more accurately calculated and layout evaluated as Brian previously suggested during discussion.

Chairman Samy agreed with the idea of tabling the request.

Jeannine Bolhouse withdrew her motion to deny the special land use request (SUP 2502) 7537 20th Ave LLC, 7537 20th Ave. to have a restaurant (no drive-through), under Sec. 13.3(B), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-15-327-024, located at 7537 20th Ave., in a Office Service (OS) Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan., Gary Veldink withdrew his support.

Tom Healy asked if there is a date the item must be brought back before the Planning Commission once tabled.

Gary Veldink stated that there is no date on a table and there is no further discussion allowed.

The ZA stated that he would like to verify if it must be addressed at the next meeting since there was a notice sent out in regard to the request.

Geoff Brown stated that he does not want to deny the request and prevent the Applicant from coming with a new plan for an entire year. The building is not finished yet. He would like the Applicant to have some office spaces operate there now and then if a takeout restaurant like Stir Fry Express wanted to move over there two years from now, this item could be removed from the table and addressed with more precise and accurate information. The Applicant would have to reapply.

The Applicant stated they did not plan to put all their eggs in one basket based on the Bosco's request and would prefer to not be outright denied.

Jessica Ulberg asked if it would be acceptable for the Planning Commission to deny the request and add a condition that they can reapply with a new plan.

Gary Veldink questioned why they cannot deny this specific special land use request for specific reasons and then allow them to come back with a new request.

Brian Reed suggested tabling and allowing the ZA to investigate the proper procedure.

Jeannine agreed and did not want to deny the request which would require the applicant to reapply.

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Geoff Brown, to table the special land use request (SUP 2502) 7537 20th Ave LLC, 7537 20th Ave. to have a restaurant (no drive-through), under Sec. 13.3(B), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-15-327-024, located at 7537 20th Ave., in a Office Service (OS) Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Yeas: Chairman Samy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Gary Veldink, Brian Reed, Jessica Ulberg, Geoff Brown

Nays: Tom Healy

Absent:

MOTION CARRIED.

#250521-04 – (ST2503) Gary Veldink Construction, P.P. # 70-14-21-300-133, located at 3190 Port Sheldon St. The request is for site plan approval for a site condo development for 3 lots in the LDR district. Public water and sanitary sewer will be provided. This application will be reviewed under the Site Condo standards in Sec. 3.31. ([Site Plan](#), [Application](#), [Fee Paid](#))

Moved by Chairman Samy seconded by Geoff Brown to recuse Gary Veldink from the deliberation and present his application as the applicant.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Applicant, Gary Veldink, presented their application to the Planning Commission.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#). The ZA also stated that even though Kreekfield Dr. is already an established public street, a condition should be added that the Ottawa County Road Commission approves 3 driveways in this location. He has reached out to the Ottawa County Road Commission but is yet to receive a response.

Geoff Brown asked the Applicant if he needed to do a lift station to install the sewer.

Gary Veldink stated no. The property was zoned OS because they anticipated offices going in here. There is an 8" line which allows the applicant to bring sanitary sewer to all his parcels to the south of the site condo development and also to the site condos.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked who will maintain the upper strip of land that connects to Port Sheldon St. and asked if unit one will be responsible.

Gary Veldink stated that he plans to install the sidewalk from Port Sheldon St. himself. Then he will quitclaim deed that 45' strip of land to the church.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked if there will be curb cuts for each individual unit.

Gary Veldink stated that yes he is planning for that. There is full curb along Kreekfield Dr., and he plans to do curb cuts for each unit.

Chairman Sammy opened the public hearing.

Chairman Sammy closed the public hearing.

Moved by Chairman Sammy, seconded by Tom Healy to adopt the following motion:

Motion: To adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve (ST2503) Gary Veldink Construction, P.P. # 70-14-21-300-133, located at 3190 Port Sheldon St. Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan for site plan approval for a site condo development for 3 lots in the LDR district under Sec. 3.13, as requested, based on the findings that all applicable standards of the ordinance have been met and to accept the site plan dated 4/25/2025;

And with the following conditions of approval:

- (1) A Storm Water Drain Permit from the Ottawa County Water Resources should be submitted to the Township prior to the issuance of any building permits.**
- (2) A list of the lowest building opening for each lot as recorded with the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission shall be provided to the Township prior to the issuance of any building permits.**
- (3) A copy of the recorded master deed and restrictive covenants and all exhibits, as recorded with the Ottawa County Register of Deeds, shall be provided to the Township prior to the issuance of any building permits.**
- (4) Immediately after completion, the developer will provide as-built plans for all water and sewer installations in the development to the Township and all plans shall become the sole property of the Township.**
- (5) The property 3190 Port Sheldon St. is zoned Low Density Residential (LDR), contrary to the label on the Site Plan dated 4/25/2025 that states Office Service Commercial (OS).**

(6) The Ottawa County Road Commission will grant approval for three separate driveways to be installed along Kreekfield Dr. prior to the issuance of any building permits.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#250521-05 – Communications, Letters and Reports

The ZA stated that he received approval from the Township Superintendent, Justin Stadt, to make the first meeting of each month completely dedicated to the Master Plan Review and the second meeting of the month can be reserved for applications and other items. This would allow Tanya DeOliveira, the planner, to have a meeting completely dedicated to her, as per her request, and not require the Planning Commission to schedule any additional meetings that were not already planned for. Tanya is looking to host the first meeting on July 2, 2025.

Jeannine Bolhouse inquired whether any members will be absent that week due to the holiday.

Chairman Samy stated that the first chapter is just an overview of the Township and it should be okay if one person cannot attend.

Gary Veldink will be missing from the July 2, 2025 meeting.

The ZA stated that due to unforeseen circumstances, there could be situations in which there is an extra item on the agenda, however it would be great to establish that the plan going forward is to keep the first meeting for the Master Plan review.

Jeannine Bolhouse supported the plan to dedicate the first meeting of each month to the Master Plan review.

Chairman Samy also supported the plan.

There was consensus among the Planning Commission to dedicate the first meeting of each month to the Master Plan review and reserve the second scheduled meeting of each month to applications.

#250521-06 – Public Comments

No public comments were made.

#250521-07 – Other Business

Jeannine Bolhouse stated that she wanted to inform the Planning Commission and public that she went to school with the planner from Williams & Works, Tanya DeOliveira. They have known each other for over 30 years and swam together in school. She considers Tanya to be a good friend but does not consider it to be a conflict.

Chairman Samy, who was on the committee tasked with hiring Tanya DeOliveira, expressed that the information was not used in the selection process.

Jeannine Bolhouse confirmed she learned of Tanya DeOliveira's involvement in the process after the fact but still felt that it was important to put it on the record.

Chairman Samy thanked the Planning Commission members for attending the Joint Meeting with the Zoning Board of Appeals and Township Board on May 19, 2025. It was great to hear from all the members. He anticipates this Master Plan review will involve give and take from everyone involved. The Planning Commission needs to do their best to explain why they are recommending certain items. They should not change things about the Master Plan just to change it, there needs to be sound reasoning involved.

Gary Veldink stated that in reality, the Master Plan review is mostly updating statistics. It is not as large of a document as it may seem.

Chairman Samy stated that Planning Commission also wants to look at addressing some ordinances in the Township throughout the process.

#250521-08 – Adjournment

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Geoff Brown to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned 8:57 p.m.