

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held  
Wednesday, April 4, 2018**

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

Present: Greg Honderd, Richard VanderKlok, Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Jeannine Bolhouse, Josiah Sammy  
Absent: Donna Ferguson,  
Also present: Ted Woodcock, Deputy Zoning Administrator

**#180404-01 – Agenda for April 4, 2018**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Sammy, to approve the agenda as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-02 – Minutes of the regular March 21, 2018 meeting**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Sammy, to approve the minutes as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-03 – The layout of the Preliminary Plat of Jackson Ridge, part of P.P. # 70-14-36-400-049, -055, located at 4958 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan ([plat map](#))**

Todd Stuve, Exxel Engineering, represented the applicant and presented the request.

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

Jeanine Bolhouse asked about the driveway orientation for Lot #6.

Todd Stuve responded that the developer planned for the driveway to be off the interior street, Ridgeside Ct.

Greg Honderd stated the following. He liked the plat plan and how the developers set up Lot #6.

Josiah Sammy asked about the proposed accessory structure and how far it was from the proposed property line between Lots #1 and #2. He asked if the Planning Commission could do anything about that structure.

Greg Honderd responded that the Planning Commission would not.

Todd Stuve noted that the proposed accessory building on Lot #2 met the side yard setback requirement per the Township Zoning Ordinance.

The chairperson opened the public hearing.

Julie VanKampen, 285 Jackson, stated that she had concerns about the floodplain and water table height in this area as her and other neighbors had experienced some flooding in the past few years.

She stated that the new development would make the flooding situation worse. She does not want the development to proceed.

Todd Stuive responded by saying the plan shows where the floodplain is located and if development were to take place inside the floodplain, the developer would acquire the correct permits and approvals from other agencies. As for the water table, he stated that the development would not impact it.

Greg Honderd asked the Deputy Zoning Administrator about how Township staff handles administration of the floodplain.

The Deputy Zoning Administrator stated that Township staff is not trained on how to read the FEMA floodplain maps that are held in the office and that applicants and/or residents have to decide whether their property is in the floodplain or not.

Greg Honderd explained that the Planning Commission's role is to look at the preliminary plat based on the standards in the Township Zoning Ordinance only. He explained that this was a recommendation to the Township Board.

The chairperson closed the public hearing.

**Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Tim Smit, to adopt the staff report as finding of facts and to recommend to the Township Board to grant tentative preliminary plat approval of Jackson Ridge revised, based on the findings that Township Ordinances have been met, as shown on the drawing dated 2/26/18, and with the following conditions:**

- a. The individual building envelopes appear to meet the minimum standards but each building permit application will be reviewed at the time it is submitted for conformance for each individual site.
- b. **Sidewalks are required to be installed as per Sec. 10-216 in the Code of Ordinances adjacent to the proposed Jackson Ridge, as well as adjacent to 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. and Jackson at the time those lots are developed (unless waived by the Township Board). The developer shall also provide sidewalks adjacent to the existing house on Jackson Ridge prior to the submission of the first building permit application in the plat.**
- c. **As per the Ottawa County Road Commission, the developer shall provide a legal document giving the Ottawa County Road Commission the road right of way on 4<sup>th</sup> or easement for sidewalk to fit in a safe manner. This shall be presented to the Township prior to Township Board approval.**
- d. **Lots 1 and 10 shall only have access from the interior street called Ridgeside Ct.**
- e. Any signs require permits and shall meet ordinance requirements. If a sign is constructed, a document shall be provided indicating who is responsible for maintenance

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-04 – (SUP1805) P2:7, Inc., Thomas Czaplicki, 6336 Blendon Shores Ct., is requesting a special use permit for mini storage garages under Sec. 16.3(H), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-22-450-017, located at 1778 Chicago Dr., in an (HS) Highway Service Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, MI ([site plan](#))**

Todd Stuive, Exxel Engineering, represented the applicant and presented the request.

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

Jeanine Bolhouse stated this location is good for self-storage garages.

Tim Smit asked the applicant what the garage buildings will look like as the Planning Commission has had some issues in the past regarding similarity between projects on adjacent parcels. He was not opposed to the self-storage garages, but since this is a more visible intersection, he wanted to be sure the Planning Commission had all the information in front of them.

Thomas Czaplicki stated that he was awaiting final plans from the architect and they would be available in approximately two weeks. He explained what the building would look like and compared it to the newly constructed building across 18<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Tim Smit stated that he would like to see the plans before making a decision to approve the site plan. He also asked why the decorative fencing did not extend to the property line on the northeast portion of the site plan. He stated that he would like to see the decorative fence in place of the proposed chain link fence. He also asked about a dumpster location.

Thomas Czaplicki stated that they did not plan on having a dumpster at this time.

Greg Honderd stated the following. He agreed with Tim Smit about the decorative fencing to replace the proposed chain link fence and that he would like to see the building elevations to ensure that the proposed buildings would be harmonious with the adjacent property. He also discussed a sidewalk waiver.

Josiah Samy said that he was concerned with the green screening and that he visited the site. He stated that from the park behind Waterford Place you would be able to see the mini storage garages during the fall and winter months when the foliage is not full. He asked about the possibility of adding evergreen type trees to thicken the green screen.

Richard VanderKlok stated that this parcel was a good location for mini storage garages to be located. He also said that there could be administrative approval by the Zoning Administrator once the building elevation plans were submitted. He also stated that the applicant was trying to make it harmonious with the adjacent properties and that the green screen was ok as is.

The chairperson opened the public hearing.

No public comment was made.

The chairperson closed the public hearing.

**Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Samy, to adopt the staff report as findings of fact and to approve Special Use Permit (SUP1805) P2:7, Inc., Thomas Czaplicki, 6336 Blendon Shores Ct., to have mini storage garages under Sec. 16.3(H), on a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-22-450-017, located at 1778 Chicago Dr., in an (HS) Highway Service Commercial district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, MI, based on the findings that the existing trees meet the standard in the ordinance for the 25 foot greenbelt and all applicable standards of the ordinance have been met, and (with the conditions as**

noted) including the general special use standards in Sec. 20.3 and the specific special use standards in Sec. 20.4(AK), with the following condition:

1. Signage shall be provided on the gates to indicate the entrance and exit.
2. All signs require permits and shall meet ordinance standards.
3. Sidewalks shall be provided unless waived by the Township Board.
4. A Storm Water Drain Permit (written permission from the Drain Commissioner's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Decorative fencing shall continue to the northeast corner of the property.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Samy, to adopt the staff report as findings of fact and to approve the site plan dated 2/26/18, as presented based on the findings that the existing trees meet the standard in the ordinance for the 25 foot greenbelt and all applicable standards of the ordinance have been met, and with the following conditions:

1. Signage shall be provided on the gates to indicate the entrance and exit.
2. All signs require permits and shall meet ordinance standards.
3. Sidewalks shall be provided unless waived by the Township Board.
4. A Storm Water Drain Permit (written permission from the Drain Commissioner's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. The Zoning Administrator administratively approve the building elevations when submitted by the applicant with the right of the applicant to appeal.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-05 – (REZ1805) Ordinance 2018-10** to change from (RR) Rural Residential to (LDR) Low Density Residential part of a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-17-300-005, located at 7289 36th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan. ([survey](#))

Adam DeYoung, the applicant, presented the application.

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

Tim Smit asked about the parcel of land directly west of the rezoning parcel and asked if that was going to be developed in the future and if it would fit in this proposed plat if there was to be a proposed plat to the west.

Greg Honderd stated that there were wetlands on that parcel to the west and that it may never be developed.

Josiah Samy said it was consistent with the other parcels in the area.

The chairperson opened the public hearing.

Edward Parks, 7242 Biscayne, asked if Biscayne will connect to 36<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Ed DeYoung responded that this was only a rezoning and that no plan had been submitted yet.

Edward Parks asked if there would be any woods remaining next to his property since they had begun to remove trees on the proposed rezoned parcel.

Greg Honderd said that is up to the developer, not the Planning Commission.

The chairperson closed the public hearing.

**Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Samy, to adopt the staff report as finding of facts and to recommend to the Township Board to approve the following resolution** because the proposed zoning designation is **consistent** with the Master plan; the area is **capable** of sustaining the uses within the LDR district without addition public funds; and the uses allowed within the LDR district are **compatible** with the neighboring uses.

**Georgetown Charter Township  
Ottawa County, Michigan  
(Ordinance No. 2018-10)**

At a regular meeting of the Georgetown Charter Township Board held at the Township offices on \_\_\_\_\_, 2018, beginning at 7:30 p.m., Township Board Member \_\_\_\_\_ made a motion to adopt this Ordinance because the proposed zoning designation is **consistent** with the Master plan and the Future Land Use Map for the area; the area is **capable** of sustaining the uses within the LDR district without addition public funds; the uses allowed within the LDR district are **compatible** with the neighboring uses, as recommended by the Planning Commission, and to adopt the staff report as finding of fact, which motion was seconded by Township Board Member \_\_\_\_\_:

**AN AMENDMENT TO THE GEORGETOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
ZONING ORDINANCE, AS AMENDED, AND MAP**

THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GEORGETOWN (the "Township") ORDAINS:

ARTICLE 1. The map of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

**(REZ1805) Ordinance 2018-10** To change from (RR) Rural Residential to (LDR) Low Density Residential part of a parcel of land described as P.P. # 70-14-17-300-005, located at 7289 36<sup>th</sup> Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Except as expressly modified by the above, the balance of the Zoning Map of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

ARTICLE 2. Severability. In the event that any one or more sections, provisions, phrases, or words of this Ordinance shall be found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect the validity or the enforceability of the remaining sections, provisions, phrases, or other words of this Ordinance.

ARTICLE 3. Except as specified above, the balance of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and map shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

ARTICLE 4. Effective Date. The provisions of this Ordinance shall take effect upon the expiration of seven (7) days from the date of publication of this Ordinance or a summary of its provisions in accordance with the law.

The vote in favor of adopting this Ordinance was as follows:

Yeas:

Nays:

Absent:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND ORDINANCE DECLARED ADOPTED.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by Georgetown Charter Township Board at the time, date, and place specified above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard VanderKlok  
Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-06 –Initiate Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Chapter 24**

There was discussion about a potential Zoning Ordinance amendment to consider Chapter 24 footnote (x) to reduce the rear yard setback in an Industrial District when the rear yard of an industrial parcel abuts another Industrial parcel.

**Moved by Tim Smit, seconded by Josiah Samy to initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment as follows.**

**Chapter 24 – DISTRICT REGULATIONS.** (revised 3/28/16)

DISTRICT	Minimum Lot Size Per Unit (a)		Maximum Lot Coverage (percent)	Minimum Yard Setbacks (b)(o)(v)			Maximum Building Height (p)	
	Area (Square Feet)	Width (Feet)		Front (s)(t)	Side			Rear
					Least One	Total	Feet	
<b>I Industrial</b>	40,000	150	40	45 (r)	20 (m)	40	40 (X)	45

\* Footnotes are integral part of these District Regulations and should be read in conjunction with the above schedule.

**(X) When an Industrial parcel’s rear lot line abuts another Industrial parcel, the minimum required rear yard setback is reduced to (20) twenty feet.**

**Josiah Samy stated that he would like to discuss this amendment at a time when there was another publication.**

Greg Honderd stated that there has been a larger setback in the past due to many Industrial parcels butting up to Residential districts, however, this would be different if it were an Industrial parcel next to another Industrial district.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**#180404-07 – Initiate Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Care Centers**

**Moved by Josiah Samy, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to initiate the Zoning Ordinance amendment as follows and to direct the Zoning Administrator to publish the Zoning Ordinance amendment at a time when there is another publication.**

**Sec. 20.4 SITE DESIGN STANDARDS.** (revised 6/27/2013)

Those uses specified in Section 20.1 as permitted by "right" or as special land uses shall be subject to the requirements of the District in which the use is located in addition to all applicable conditions, standards and regulations regarding site design and development and other standards and conditions as are cited in the following:

~~(K) — Day care centers.~~

- ~~(1) — There shall be provided, equipped and maintained, on the premises, a minimum of one hundred and fifty (150) square feet of usable outdoor recreation area for each client of the facility up to a total of 20 clients. Further, there shall be provided a minimum of an additional fifty (50) square feet of usable outdoor recreation for each client over the first 20 clients. (revised 9/27/2010)~~
- ~~(2) — The outdoor recreation area shall be fenced and screened from any abutting residential district by a greenbelt, in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.11.~~
- ~~(3) — In addition to required off street parking, off street pick up and drop off areas shall also be provided.~~
- ~~(4) — The facility shall comply with all applicable State licensing requirements.~~

**Chapter 13 – OS – OFFICE-SERVICE COMMERCIAL.****Sec. 13.1 PURPOSE.**

This District is designed to accommodate office uses together with office sales uses and certain personal services. It is the purpose of this district to accommodate permitted uses typically in proximity to major shopping facilities and/or in compatible relationship with the major arterial street system and surrounding land uses. The nature of modern office use development provides greater compatibility for integration into a community structure. Therefore, this District has been established for the purpose of encouraging office and related development, but excluding general commercial activity.

**Sec. 13.2 PERMITTED USES.**

Land and/or buildings in this District may be used for the following purposes by right:

- (A) Office buildings for any of the following occupations: executive, administrative, professional, accounting, writing, clerical, stenographic, drafting, and office equipment and supplies sales.
- (B) Medical offices including clinics.
- (C) Banks, credit unions, savings and loan institutions not including drive-through facilities.
- (D) Personal service establishments which perform personal services on the premises, including barber and beauty shops, interior decorating shops, photographic studios, laundromats or similar uses. (revised 7/25/95)
- (E) Hospitals, provided, at least one (1) property line abuts a major or minor arterial street; minimum main and accessory building setback shall be one hundred (100) feet; and ambulance and emergency entrance areas shall be visually screened from view of adjacent residential uses by a structure or by a sight-obscuring wall or fence of six (6) feet or more in height. Access to and from the ambulance and delivery area shall be directly from a major or minor arterial street. (revised 3/28/16)
- (F) Commercial schools including art, business, music, dance, professional, and trade.
- (G) Municipal buildings, public utility buildings, service installations, exchanges, and public utility offices. (revised 3/28/16)
- (H) Churches. (revised 3/28/16)
- (I) Accessory buildings and uses as defined in Chapter II.
- (J) Day care centers (revised 10-25-06)**

**Sec. 13.3 USES REQUIRING SPECIAL LAND USE APPROVAL.**

The following uses may be permitted by obtaining Special Land Use Approval when all applicable standards as cited in Chapter XX are met.

- (A) Drive-through establishments including banks, dry cleaning pick-up stations and similar personal services, not including drive-through restaurants and vehicle service stations.

- (B) Restaurants or other establishments serving food and/or beverages but not including drive-throughs.
- (C) Mortuaries and funeral homes.
- (D) Commercial soil removal.
- (E) Commercial radio and television and wireless communication towers. (Revised November 1997)
- ~~(F) Day care centers (revised 10-25-06)~~

## **Chapter 14 – NS – NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE COMMERCIAL.**

### **Sec. 14.3 USES REQUIRING SPECIAL LAND USE APPROVAL.** (section revised 3/28/16)

The following uses may be permitted by obtaining Special Land Use Approval when all applicable standards as cited in Chapter XX are met.

- (A) Vehicle service stations.
- ~~(B) Day care centers.~~
- (C) Commercial soil removal.
- (D) Vehicle Wash Establishment
- (E) Commercial radio and television and wireless communication towers.
- (F) Adult Foster Care Congregate Facility.
- (G) Veterinary hospitals, clinics, and kennels.
- (H) Drive-through restaurants.

## **Chapter 15 – CS – COMMUNITY SERVICE COMMERCIAL.**

### **Sec. 15.3 USES REQUIRING SPECIAL LAND USE APPROVAL.** (section updated 3/28/16)

The following uses may be permitted by obtaining Special Land Use Approval when all applicable standards as cited in Chapter XX are met.

- (A) Open air businesses.
- (B) Veterinary/animal hospitals, clinics, and kennels.
- (C) Amusement Parks.
- (D) Commercial soil removal.
- ~~(E) Day Care Centers.~~
- (F) Commercial radio and television and wireless communication towers. (Revised November 1997)
- (G) Vehicle repair establishments when all activities are conducted within a wholly enclosed building.
- (H) Adult Foster Care Congregate Facility.
- (I) Greenhouses and plant nurseries selling retail. (added from 16.3 with SUP)
- (J) Par 3 golf course, miniature golf, driving ranges and similar outdoor recreation uses.

## **Chapter 16 – HS – HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL.**

### **Sec. 16.3 USES REQUIRING SPECIAL LAND USE APPROVAL.** (section revised 3/28/16)

The following uses may be permitted by obtaining Special Land Use Approval when all applicable standards as cited in Chapter XX are met.

- (A) Vehicle repair establishments when all activities are conducted within a wholly enclosed building.
- (B) Drive-in theaters.
- (C) Greenhouses and plant nurseries selling retail.
- (D) Par 3 golf course, miniature golf, driving ranges and similar outdoor recreation uses.
- (E) Open air businesses.

- (F) Amusement parks.
- (G) Commercial soil removal.
- (H) Mini-storage garages.
- (I) Sexually oriented businesses
- (J) Commercial radio and television and wireless communication towers.
- ~~(K) Daycare center.~~

There was discussion about permitting a day care center by right in all the commercial zoning districts. This would eliminate the special use standards and not require a fenced recreation area and leave that amenity to be required by the State of Michigan when appropriate.

Jeanine Bolhouse said that she wanted to see a separate definition for preschools rather than it being included in the day care center definition as it currently is.

Josiah Samy said that he would also like to discuss this at future meetings.

Greg Honderd said he understands the need for separate definitions and suggested that the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission could come up with appropriate language to clearly define a preschool and a day care center.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### **#180404-08 – Public Comments**

No public comment was made.

#### **#180404-09 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.