



Master Plan 2021

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	Page 1
Chapter 2	Snapshot of the Past & Present	Page 3
Chapter 3	Natural Features	Page 12
Chapter 4	Public Utilities	Page 18
Chapter 5	Traffic and Vehicular Circulation	Page 24
Chapter 6	Land Use Issues, Goals & Policies	Page 26
Chapter 7	Future Land Use	Page 32
Chapter 8	Rationale & Highlights of FLU Map	Page 36
Chapter 9	Implementation	Page 46
Chapter 10	Use of Land Use Plan in Programing Capital Expenditures	Page 48

Chapter One Introduction



Planning for the future is an important responsibility of local government. The preparation of a Land Use Plan is the means by which the preferences regarding the future development of the community is expressed. It provides background information concerning historical and current trends in the community. This information is useful to existing and prospective residents and business owners in the Township.

Specific uses for and benefits of preparing a Land Use Plan include the following:

- Helps direct growth into a desired development pattern, rather than leaving the future shape of the community to chance and circumstance.
- Assists in planning for future public facility needs, helping to ensure that expenditures on new capital facilities are cost-effective.
- Provides the policy direction needed to make wise zoning decisions, and provides the legal support for zoning decisions.
- Provides a clearly-stated expression of public goals and policies, to guide private sector decisions.
- Helps protect natural features which are major community assets.
- Identifies and helps maintain aesthetic values of the community.

The major elements of the Land Use Plan include the following:

- **Description and analysis of existing conditions in the Township.**
The existing characteristics of the community are described, including population history and demographic characteristics, socio-economic characteristics of the community, predominant natural features of the community and the existing land use pattern in the Township.
- **Projection of Future Population**
Historical population trends and consideration of community goals are used to prepare projections of future population growth in the Township. Land needs for future residential, commercial and industrial growth can then be defined.
- **Issue identification.**
Based on knowledge of past and current trends in the community, major growth and development issues which need to be addressed in future planning for the Township are identified.
- **Formulation of community goals.**
The land use goals of the community will be identified.
- **Future Land Use Map**
Based on knowledge of the past and goals for the future, a Future Land Use Map is prepared which depicts the extent and direction of future growth in the community.


Chapter Two


Snapshot of the Past and Present



Historical Population: Georgetown Township and Surrounding Communities 2000 Actual through 2019 Estimates					
Community	2000	% Change 1990-2000	2010	% Change 2000-10	2019*
GEORGETOWN TOWNSHIP	41,658	27.50%	46,985	12.8%	52,637
As % of Ottawa County Total	17.5%		17.8%		18%
City of Hudsonville	7,160	16.0%	7,116	-0.6%	7,348
As % of Ottawa County Total	3.0%		2.7%		2.5%
Allendale Township	13,042	62.6%	20,708	58.8%	26,709
As % of Ottawa County Total	5.5%		7.8%		9.2%
Holland Township	28,911	65.0%	35,636	23.3%	38,690
As % of Ottawa County Total	12.1%		13.5%		13.3%
Blendon Township	5,721	20.7%	5,772	0.9%	6,802
As % of Ottawa County Total	2.4%		2.2%		2.3%
Ottawa County	238,314	26.9%	263,801	10.7%	291,830
City of Grandville	16,263	4.1%	15,378	-5.8%	15,858
As % of Kent County Total	2.8%		2.6%		2.4%
Kent County	574,335	14.7%	602,622	4.9%	656,955

*US Census: 2009-2019 American Community Survey, Demographic and Housing Estimates








Population Age Distribution Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, & Michigan 2000, 2010, 2015, & 2019

Age Group	2000			2010			2015			2019		
	Georgetown Township	Ottawa County	Michigan									
Under 5	7.0%	7.7%	6.8%	7.8%	6.9%	6.2%	6.6%	6.5%	5.8%	7.1%	6.2%	5.7%
5-9	8.4%	8.1%	7.5%	7.0%	7.3%	6.6%	8.1%	6.8%	6.2%	7.4%	6.7%	5.9%
10-14	8.8%	8.2%	7.5%	8.0%	7.7%	7.0%	7.8%	7.5%	6.6%	7.0%	7.0%	6.3%
15-19	8.5%	8.7%	7.2%	8.8%	9.1%	7.6%	7.4%	8.8%	7.0%	7.6%	8.6%	6.6%
20-24	7.6%	7.9%	6.5%	7.4%	8.1%	6.7%	8.8%	9.2%	7.2%	7.6%	9.3%	7.1%
25-34	11.4%	13.4%	13.7%	12.1%	11.9%	11.9%	10.9%	11.6%	12.0%	12.3%	11.9%	12.7%
35-44	16.1%	15.9%	16.1%	12.5%	13.2%	13.6%	11.8%	11.9%	12.2%	12.5%	11.7%	11.7%
45-54	13.4%	12.5%	13.8%	14.5%	14.2%	15.3%	13.2%	13.4%	14.4%	11.4%	12.0%	13.2%
55-59	4.7%	4.3%	4.9%	5.9%	5.8%	6.6%	6.0%	6.2%	7.3%	5.5%	6.3%	7.2%
60-64	3.5%	3.2%	3.8%	4.1%	4.5%	5.2%	5.5%	5.4%	6.3%	5.9%	5.7%	6.8%
65-74	5.5%	5.1%	6.5%	6.5%	5.9%	6.9%	6.8%	7.1%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.8%
75-84	3.5%	3.6%	4.4%	3.7%	3.7%	4.5%	5.1%	3.9%	4.5%	4.5%	4.1%	4.1%
85 & Over	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	2.0%	2.7%	2.1%	7.1%


*US Census 2010-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
US Census 2010 Age Groups and Sex
**Percentages may not add up to exactly 100% due to margins of error in US Census Data Estimates




Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, & Michigan Age Distribution Estimates 2019



Georgetown Township Occupation of Employed Persons





Occupation Distribution for Georgetown Township 2015 and 2019 Estimates

Georgetown Township Occupation	2015*		2019*	
	Number Employed	Percent of Employment	Number Employed	Percent of Employment
Management, Business, Science, and Arts Occupations	8,987	36.9%	10,895	40.1%
Services Occupations	3,520	14.4%	4,007	14.7%
Sales and Office Occupations	6,210	25.5%	6,504	23.9%
Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance Occupations	1,808	7.4%	1,735	6.4%
Production, Transportation, and Material Moving Occupations	3,859	15.8%	4,028	14.8%
Total Employment, Persons 16 years and older	24,384	100%	27,169	100%

*2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: Occupation by Class of Worker for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over


*2015-2019 American Community Survey 5- Year Estimates: Occupation by Sex and Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over



**Median Household Income
Georgetown Township and Surrounding Communities**

Community	1989	2010	2015	2019
Georgetown Township	\$30,056	\$62,723	\$62,910	\$78,481
City of Hudsonville	\$32,114	\$54,645	\$54,650	\$64,189
Allendale Township	\$30,738	\$52,253	\$44,938	\$55,646
Holland Township	\$35,529	\$53,499	\$57,145	\$63,985
Blendon Township	\$36,667	\$56,603	\$62,862	\$80,658
City of Grandville	\$36,906	\$50,984	\$53,572	\$62,827
Ottawa County	\$36,507	\$55,095	\$58,989	\$69,314

*U.S Census Bureau | 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

New Residential Construction





**Median Value of Owner Occupied Housing
Georgetown Township and Surrounding Communities**

Community	Median Value 2015	Median Value 2019
Georgetown Township	\$178,600	\$217,500
City of Hudsonville	\$129,100	\$155,300
Allendale Township	\$157,800	\$196,500
Blendon Township	\$197,000	\$243,400
Holland Township	\$136,400	\$170,600
City of Grandville	\$136,100	\$161,800
Ottawa County	\$155,400	\$191,800
Kent County	\$151,200	\$173,700
Michigan	\$137,500	\$154,900

*U.S census: 2019 American Community Survey: Selected Housing Characteristics

**Georgetown Township
Distribution of Housing Units by Type
2019 Estimates**

Type of Housing Unit	# of Units (Georgetown Twp.)	% of Units (Georgetown Twp.)	% of Units (Ottawa Co.)
Single-family detached	13,817	73.7%	69.6%
Single-family attached	1,727	9.2%	6.9%
2-unit in Structure	249	1.3%	2.8%
3-4 units in Structure	475	2.5%	3.5%
5+ units in Structure	2,329	12.4%	11.7%
Mobile Homes	144	.8%	5.6%
Total	18,741	100%	100%

*U.S census: 2019 American Community Survey: Selected Housing Characteristics

Chapter Three Natural Features





The Township's natural features play a significant role in planning for the future use of land in the community.

Natural resources provide an essential element to the Township's suburban character. Some benefits provided by natural resources may be destroyed or threatened by uncontrolled or unplanned development. They include:

- recreation opportunities (such as hiking cross-country skiing, boating, biking, golf courses);
- education (heritage restoration, science, interactive education);
- restoration of plant and animal species (Hager Hardwood Forest);
- aesthetics (rural ambiance, serenity, privacy);
- pollution reduction (emission, noise, water, waste);
- wetland functions (flood control, groundwater recharge and purification, unique plant and animal habitat);
- economic value (agriculture products).

The Township contains sensitive soils, prime farm land, wetlands, and floodplains. A discussion of the Township's natural features with implications for land use planning follows:

Soils


The Ottawa County Soil Survey of 1972 was used to determine each soil type's limitations for development. Agricultural land in Georgetown

Township is made up of muck soils, primarily used for growing vegetables, and a variety of soil types, used for corn, wheat, and hay. The varying topography caused by geological and natural occurrences influenced the location of soil types. Soil characteristics evaluated for the Development Suitability map include water table, bearing capacity, percolation rate, and slope.



The following maps, titled "Natural Features-Soil Limitations on Urban Development" and titled "Georgetown Township Soils" from Ottawa County Planning and Grants, indicate that a large portion of the Township is subject to the constraints described above. It is very evident from a review of this map that the development of the Township to date has been influenced strongly by natural features considerations. In particular, soil conditions (and water and sewer service availability) have exerted a strong influence on the pattern of growth in the Township. Large areas of muck soils are undeveloped and largely in productive agricultural use. Much of the most suitable land for development has been consumed. Areas where much of the Township's growth is now taking place are subject to heavy soil constraints. This results in higher development costs for foundations, dewatering and stormwater management. Unfortunately, it may also result in problems if developers need to avoid these higher costs. They then are passed on to the public and local government, who are left to solve such problems as flooding, poor drainage, and soil erosion and sedimentation.

Georgetown Township Soils



Planning and Grants Department
12220 Fillmore Street, Suite 170
West Olive, Michigan 49460

Phone (616)-738-4852
Fax (616)-738-4825
email: plan@co.ottawa.mi.us
www.co.ottawa.mi.us




© Copyright 2003, Ottawa County
This map has been developed through the
Ottawa County Geographic Information System
and as such is the property of Ottawa County.
Any duplication is restricted under the Copyright
laws, the Ottawa County Policy on Enhanced
Access to Public Records and Act 482 of the
Public Acts of 1996, as amended.

Hydro Date: April 1999
D.O. Date: April 1999

Legend

Soil Textures	
Clay Loam	Loamy Sand
Complex	Muck
Fine Sandy Loam	Pit
Land	Pits
Loamy Sand	Sand
Loam	Sandy Loam
	Silt Loam
	Silty Clay Loam

Georgetown Township and Hudsonville with Digital Orthos - Close-up View



Red outline shows muck soil area

Planning and Grants Department
12220 Fillmore Street, Suite 170
West Olive, Michigan 49460

Phone (616)-738-4652
Fax (616)-738-4625
email: plan@co.ottawa.mi.us
www.co.ottawa.mi.us



© Copyright 2003, Ottawa County
This map has been developed through the
Ottawa County Geographic Information System
and as such is the property of Ottawa County.
Any duplication is restricted under the Copyright
laws, the Ottawa County Policy on Enhanced
Access to Public Records and Act 402 of the
Public Acts of 1996, as amended.

Hydro Date: April 1999
D.C. Date: April 1999

Legend		Georgetown Township	
 Single Family - Very Low Density (SF/VL)	 Commercial - Highway (C/H)	 Agricultural/Rural Residential (AG/RR)	 Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
 Single Family - Low Density (SF/L)	 Commercial - Office/Service (C/OS)	 Low Density Residential (LDR)	 Community Commercial (CR)
 Single Family - Attached (SF/A)	 Industrial (I)	 Medium Density Residential (MDR)	 Highway Commercial (HC)
 Single Family - Manufactured Housing (SF/MH)	 Industrial/Commercial (I/C)	 High Density Residential (HDR)	 Industrial (I)
 Multiple Family (MF)	 Agricultural (AG)	 Office/Service (OS)	 Public/Semi-Public (P/SP)
 Commercial - General (C/G)	 Public/Quasi-Public (P/Q)	 Parks/Recreation (P)	 Recreation/Open Space (REC)
 Commercial - Downtown (C/D)	 Special District (SD)		

Prime Farmland

Agricultural land uses have decreased over the past 20 years due to the continued development of new residential uses in prime farmland areas.



Wetlands

Wetlands are defined by the MDEQ as “land sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances does support, wetland vegetation or aquatic life.” The US Fish and Wildlife Service has identified wetlands in Georgetown Township through interpretation of aerial photography.

Wetlands in some instances can represent a limitation to development, but wetlands can also be a valuable development site amenity. Values of wetlands include:

- assisting in the control of stormwater and floods;
- improving water quality through filtration of pollutants;
- serving as a groundwater recharge area;
- controlling erosion;
- providing critical habitat for wildlife;
- providing open space and aesthetic value.

Significant wetlands in Michigan are protected by the Goemare-Anderson Wetlands Protection Act, Public act 203 of 1979. This Act places restrictions on, and in some cases prohibits, development within a wetland. The MDEQ is responsible for reviewing development plans in wetland areas. During this review, the MDEQ considers the following: location of project in mapped wetlands, existing soil types and vegetation, and depth to the water table. MDEQ staff should be consulted for an on-site wetland determination by developers prior to requesting action by the Township on development proposals. The areas identified as wetlands on the Floodplains



and Wetlands map are based on general criteria, which may differ from those used to determine whether a site is a regulated wetland status. Total reliance should not be placed on the mapping included herein and a developer would be responsible for obtaining their own wetland delineation.

Floodplains

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has determined the 100 and 500- year floodplain boundary within Georgetown Township for purposes of administering the federal flood insurance program. The areas within the FEMA 100-year floodplain are included on Flood Insurance Rate Maps, revised May 16, 2013, as amended.



Development within the 100-year floodplain is subject to compliance with federal, state and local development standards. These requirements are all coordinated into a single system of floodplain management intended to lower the risks to life and property from flooding in the Township. The 100-year floodplain adjoins many of the smaller drainage courses in the Township, in addition to the Grand River. Floodplain area is found along Rush Creek, the Lowing-Comstock Drain (main drain and tributaries), Bliss Drain, Watson Drain and Huizenga Drain.



Chapter Four Public Utilities






A large portion of the Township is served both by public water and sewer service. The Township is fortunate to be on the route of two of the four main water transmission lines which deliver water from Lake Michigan to the Wyoming metropolitan Area. The water and sewer service area map illustrates the general service areas for both utilities, based on main and distribution/collection system locations.

Public Water Service


Public water service is provided to the Township by both the Ottawa/Grand Rapids System and the Ottawa/Wyoming System. These systems were created by agreements negotiated by the Ottawa County Road Commission with the major water supplying communities in Ottawa and Kent County. The Ottawa/Wyoming System serves most of the Township, with the Ottawa/Grand Rapids System serving only a small area in the northwest part of the Township adjoining the Grand Valley State University campus in Allendale Township.

Sanitary Sewer Service


The limits of sewer service availability roughly follow that of public water service, with some exceptions. Currently, public sewers do not extend south of I-196 to the far southeast corner of the Township. Waste treatment services are provided by the City of Grandville through a service agreement. A small area south of the GVSU campus is served by the Allendale system.




Sewer map dated 2020



Water map dated 2020



Sanitary Sewer Master Plan dated May 2015



**Ottawa County Water Resources
Drains in Georgetown Township
2019**


Chapter 5

Traffic and Vehicular Circulation



Vehicular circulation is constrained by the Grand River and the railroad tracks. Access to the I-196 expressway is provided at Chicago Dr., 44th St. and at the east end of Baldwin St. Access to M-6 expressway is provided at 8th Ave. to the south of the Township. Since the Township is basically a bedroom community, many residents travel to jobs in the Grand Rapids area via the I-196 Expressway or to Zeeland and the lakeshore communities via Fillmore and 48th Ave.

Baldwin, Cottonwood, Bauer, Fillmore, and Chicago Dr. are main thoroughfares that move traffic from residential areas to the Jenison commercial center and to the expressway interchanges. Port Sheldon/44th St. also provides east/west access.



A cooperative effort with neighboring municipalities and the county has identified 48th Ave. as the *primary* north/south corridor. The North-South Corridor Study, dated May 2004, prepared by: URS Corporation-Great Lakes, is hereby adopted by reference.

The development of the access ramp that connects Baldwin directly with the I-196 expressway eliminates the need to cross the railroad tracks and to travel through the intersection of Main St. and Chicago Dr. in order to access the expressway.

Another roadway that will continue to develop into a major corridor is 8th Ave. This roadway provides access to the M-6 South Beltline. Access management should be practiced along this area to provide for uninterrupted traffic flow as much as possible.

The 20th Ave./18th Ave. Connector carries traffic to Chicago Dr. and 44th St./Port Sheldon. Not much developable land exists along this corridor, but the road provides valuable circulation for traffic traveling north and south.

Consideration should be given to making improvements to the following areas:

- future 48th Ave. interchange at I-196
- future widening/improvements to 48th Ave.
- Chicago Dr.

The streets listed in Chapter 24 of the Georgetown Township Zoning Ordinance, footnote (b) **and Chicago Dr.** are to be considered as Major Arterials, Minor Arterials, and Collectors.

Chapter Six Goals and Policies



Land Use Issues

Consideration of existing conditions in the Township and types of concerns expressed by citizens during zoning, special use and site plan review processes, and concerns expressed by members of the Planning Commission and Township Board resulted in the following list of major land use issues:

- Traffic circulations within the Township, and into and out of the Township

The Township has been identified as primarily a residential community with commercial areas to service the residents. Major needs include an easier way to get in and out of the Township, as well as a way to ease congestion within the Township. Continued population growth causes vehicular movements to commercial areas and to access the expressway to become a high priority.

The location of the Grand River restricts traffic to the north and northeast. The 48th Ave. corridor will provide north/south access within and out of the Township.

- Land use conflicts

Potential conflicts are created in several locations where dissimilar types of land uses exist in close proximity. These types of conflicts should be avoided in the future.

When residential developments are proposed to be located within close proximity to industrial or commercial uses or when industrial or commercial uses are proposed to be located within close proximity to residential uses, buffering elements should be provided to lessen negative impacts.

- Maintenance due to non-owner occupancy

Dwelling units in older areas of the Township have been turning into rental units when the owners upgrade or move to retirement homes. Special attention should be given to the upkeep of these units to maintain the integrity of the neighborhoods in which they reside.

- Vacant commercial buildings

Redevelopment (which may include demolition) should be encouraged for commercial buildings dealing with vacancy issues.

- Number, size and location of neighborhood commercial centers

The majority of commercial services in the Township are concentrated in the Main St./Baldwin/Chicago Dr. area; Baldwin/20th Ave. area; Chicago Dr. corridor; and at the corner of 28th Ave. and



Port Sheldon. Commercial areas are also located near GVSU at Pierce and 42nd Ave., at the southwest corner of Bauer and Cottonwood, and at the corner of Baldwin and 36th Ave. The area south of Chicago Drive in the vicinity of Cottonwood could possibly accommodate commercial uses as well.

In addition, the area around the Township ice rink, east of 48th Ave. and north of Bauer, has been identified for commercial development, especially since commercial development has already located on the west side of 48th Ave.

Consideration may be given for a very limited number of additional areas for small scale commercial services; however, strong consideration should be given first to redevelopment of existing vacant commercial space before commercial space is created.

- Revitalization of property along Chicago Dr., on Main St. and along the Port Sheldon/44th St. Corridor

Attention needs to be paid to older developments that should be required to meet current ordinance requirements if possible and if practical when applications are submitted for action on these sites. Major problems are poor aesthetic conditions along Main St. and the length of the Chicago Dr. corridor, uncontrolled access in certain locations, and a random mix of uses. Changes could be implemented on a case-by case basis for individual properties as opportunities present themselves. Landscape improvements and driveway closures should be required.

LAND USE GOALS AND POLICIES

Based on consideration of the land use issues, the following goals and policies were established to guide the development of the Land Use Plan:

Goal

To achieve and maintain a mix of residential opportunities served by distinct neighborhood commercial nodes and identified industrial concentrations that provide quality living environments, convenient access to commercial goods and services, and some employment.

- With a majority of the residential uses being single family homes;
- With a limited amount of HDR uses located by Grand Valley State University, preferably developed as PUDs, and also by the east end of Baldwin because the need has substantially been met in other areas of the Township;
- With a limited amount of community commercial areas to service residents; and





General Land Use Policies

Planned Unit Developments and open space clustering are possible development tools that would provide multiple densities of residential, along with possible commercial uses with flexible zoning requirements.

Planned unit developments shall be consistent with the intent of a PUD as listed in the Georgetown Township Zoning Ordinance, including, to encourage innovation in land use and variety in design, to encourage useful open space, and to provide for enhanced site and building architectural features. Such developments shall provide innovation and desirable design elements. Although the intention is not to direct a developer toward any specific details, PUDs with uses other than solely single family residences shall, at a minimum, contain the following elements:

- An overall design theme with common coordinating architectural elements contained in all buildings and structures as well as signs, rooflines, forms and materials;
- A coordinated color scheme and coordinated textures of materials;
- Drive-through elements and stand-alone structures shall have design *elements common to* principle structures;
- Creative, desirable and useable open space;
- Buildings and structures designed to provide the best or front face to any adjoining public streets.



A mixed use PUD (with any combination of residential, commercial and/or industrial uses) may be used as a developmental technique if it is clear the PUD substantially provides for the intent of a PUD as listed in the Georgetown Township Zoning Ordinance. The mixed use PUD shall contain some uses that conform to the Township Land Use Plan for the subject site with the determination of the percentage of uses to be consistent with the

Master Plan to be determined by the Planning Commission and Township Board, taking into account if the development substantially provides for the intent of a PUD.

Access to major roads (**Chicago Dr. and** those listed in the Zoning Ordinance) should be limited and placed in locations that have the least impact practical on the through flow of traffic. Special consideration should be given to the practice of good access management techniques, specifically on the major roads.


To aid in the practice of good access management techniques, “The Access Management Guidebook,” as amended, by the Michigan Department of Transportation, should be used as a guide for land use decisions.

New development should be directed to areas efficiently served by public roads, utilities, and other public services, or the developer should be required to bring these services to the area to be developed.

Intense development in areas having environmental constraints, such as floodplains, wetlands, and unstable soils should be discouraged.

Development which creates land use conflicts between different uses should be avoided. Gradual transitions from intensive commercial and industrial uses to low density residential uses should be provided, or developers should be required to provide an adequate buffer. Consideration should be given to developments which can provide opportunities for buffers between high and low intense uses.

Gateways to developments should be given special attention in regard to the aesthetics of development or redevelopment in areas on and near the major arterial streets that encompass the ports of entry to a development or to the community. These streets include, but are not necessarily limited to, Chicago Dr. (east and west), Baldwin St. (east and west), Port Sheldon Rd. (east and west), 8th Ave. (south), Fillmore St. (west), Bauer Rd. (west) and 44th St. (east). The Township should encourage vital, innovative and creative signage, landscaping and other exterior aesthetic elements that help define the community and entrance into the community. Encouragement should be given for signs to contain some uniqueness (i.e. rock garden or waterfall), to be ground-mounted and low to the ground, and to have a design and color compatible with the area.



Residential Land Use Policies:



New residential development should occur contiguous to existing developed areas to ensure efficient utilization of existing utility lines, or the developer would be responsible to bring the utilities to the location.

The Township should provide opportunities for a variety of living environments for differing

preferences in housing styles and prices, however limiting more HDR dwelling units to areas around Grand Valley State University or possibly the east end of Baldwin because the need has been substantially met in other areas of the Township.

Higher density residential uses should be placed in proximity to major roads, possible future mass transit and commercial services to lessen impacts on the road system in the Township and lessen driving distances.

Commercial Land Use Policies:

Major commercial centers serving the entire community should be concentrated near the existing commercial core area in the vicinity of Main/Chicago Dr./Cottonwood.

The Township should encourage the development of property south of Chicago Dr. in the vicinity of Cottonwood and the area near the east end of Baldwin St. by the new I-196 connector including the property to the Chicago Dr.

Confined neighborhood commercial centers could be provided in select locations to place needed services conveniently accessible to residential neighborhoods as long as they are restricted to 5,000 square feet or less of building size.

Office/service uses and higher density residential uses should be used as transitional zones. Residential character with appropriate setbacks and buffers should be maintained along major arterial streets, such as Baldwin, 44th St., Port Sheldon Rd., and 48th Ave. where nonresidential uses have not already been established or planned.

Industrial Land Use Policies:

The benefits of new industrial development should be weighed against the resulting traffic impacts, land use conflicts and potential noise, odor and other adverse impacts of industrial growth.



New industrial development should be directed to select areas which have good road access and utility services, or are planned to receive them, and where conflicts with other land uses are minimized.

Chapter 7

Future Land Use



Based on the issues, goals and policies presented, and on consideration of potential future population growth in the Township, a map titled “Georgetown Township Future Land Use Map” dated **December 13, 2021**, depicting the desired future development pattern in the Township was prepared and may be viewed at the Georgetown Township Office or online. **It is noted that lines separating land use categories are NOT to be considered to be defined lines and the lines are not necessarily parcel specific.**

Following is a description of the general types of uses included in each of the land use categories, and a discussion of the rationale of the Map and its relation to the Plan goals and policies. The residential development densities associated with the land use categories are considered to be gross development densities measured over a large area, encompassing both developed and undeveloped land, as well a public right-of-way. As such, they are not intended to be applied as maximum densities for purposes of regulation. Their primary purpose is forecasting overall population distribution in the future.

DESCRIPTION OF FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORIES

RR/AG-Rural/Agricultural Preservation

Land in this category is not anticipated to be developed for urban uses within a 15 to 20 year timeframe. It is intended for agriculture uses, as well as very low density residential development which does not require provision of



public utilities. Gross density of residential development in this category is not intended to exceed one dwelling per ten acres, although zoning may permit development on lots smaller than this. The gross density figure is intended to be an overall measure of density in this category, including public right-of-way and land devoted to agricultural uses or other non-development uses.

LDR-Low Density Residential

This category includes land primarily developed for detached single-family residential use in the LDR and LMR zoning districts. Residential development in this land use category is intended to be served by public water and sewer services.

Since the Future Land Use Map anticipates future urban growth in areas not currently served by public utilities, it is recognized that this growth will be contingent on expansion of utility services through main extensions. In some cases, development of attached forms of housing may be appropriate, at low densities, in response to site specific circumstances, such as wetland, wooded lots, steep slope, floodplain, or other natural features constraints. Overall development density in this category is assumed to be two/three dwelling units per acre.

MDR-Medium Density Residential

Development in this category includes multiple family residential uses, up to a maximum density of seven units per acre. Development in this category includes attached single-family condominiums as well as townhouse condominiums. It might also include manufactured housing developments approved in accordance with Township zoning regulations. Average gross density in this land use category is assumed to be five dwelling units per acre.

HDR-High Density Residential

Residential development density from seven to fifteen units per acre is included in this category, with an average assumed gross density of ten units per acre. Multiple family residential apartments are the predominant type of housing in this density range.

OS-Office Service

This category includes personal and business service uses which typically are of low intensity and do not generate high traffic volumes. Examples include professional, administrative and medical offices, banks, and services such as dry cleaning and photocopying. These types of uses do not involve processes or activities that are visually objectionable or which produce noise, odors, dust, smoke or other environmental effects.

NC-Neighborhood Commercial

Neighborhood Commercial uses are intended to serve the convenience commercial needs of the immediate area. As such, there are a very limited number of areas where land is provided for these uses. Neighborhood commercial centers are typically small in size, in the range of two to six acres. A neighborhood commercial center should be small in size and scale, typically being no greater than 20,000 square feet in total floor area. This category is not intended to provide for uses which serve the community-at-large, or which compete with existing commercial centers in the Township and the City of Hudsonville. Examples of neighborhood commercial uses include convenience retail stores, small sit-down or carry-out restaurants not having drive-through service windows, bank branch offices, dry cleaners and other personal services. A full-service supermarket or other big box uses such as hardware stores or department stores, which typically would include a minimum of 40,000 square feet of floor area, would not be considered consistent with the purpose of this land use category.

CC-Community Commercial

This land use category includes a full range of retail and service commercial uses, including department, discount or membership retail stores, restaurants, gasoline and service stations, vehicle sales and repair, and other commercial uses which typically serve the entire community, generate high traffic volumes or are dependent upon high volumes of traffic on adjacent roads.

HC-Highway Commercial

Heavy machinery storage and sales, farm supply, mini-storage, and auto body repair are uses in this classification. Heavy concentrations are located along the entire length of Chicago Dr.

I-Industrial

Included in this category are a variety of light manufacturing and fabrication uses, as well as heavy equipment or materials handling and storage. Warehousing and trucking would also be placed in this category.

P/QP-Public/Quasi Public

This category includes governmental and private non-profit facilities, such as the Township offices, fire stations, post office, churches and schools.

REC-Parks/Recreation/Natural Areas

All public parks are included in this category, as well as public, private and semi-public golf courses. In addition, stormwater detention areas owned by the Ottawa County Drain Commission and/or the Township are placed in this category.

Residential PUD

Development in this category includes residential uses intended to be served by public water and sewer services. In some cases, development of attached forms of housing may be appropriate, at low densities, in response to site specific circumstances, such as wetland, steep slope, floodplain, or other natural features constraints. The intention is to provide for flexibility in the regulation of land development and to encourage innovation in land use and variety in design, layout and type of structures, as well as to encourage open space and enhanced site and building architectural features

Commercial PUD

Development in this category includes commercial uses intended to be served by public water and sewer services. The intention is to provide for flexibility in the regulation of land development and to encourage innovation in land use and variety in design, layout and type of structures, as well as to encourage open space and enhanced site and building architectural features.

Mixed Use PUD

Development in this category includes a mix of commercial, and/or residential and/or industrial uses intended to be served by public water and sewer services. In some cases, development of attached forms of housing may be appropriate, at low densities, in response to site specific circumstances, such as wetland, steep slope, floodplain, or other natural features constraints. The intention is to provide for flexibility in the regulation of land development and to encourage innovation in land use and variety in design, layout and type of structures, as well as to encourage open space and enhanced site and building architectural features.

Chapter 8

Rationale and Highlights of the Future Land Use Map



The Future Land Use Map reflects the expected continued development of the Township as a high-quality residential community. In addition, smaller amounts of land are provided for expansion of the Township's commercial and industrial base. Following is a discussion of the Future Land Use Map organized according to several specific geographical sub-areas of the Township which served as the focus for issue identification and policy development by the Planning Commission. **The map shall be used in conjunction with the text of the Land Use Plan since the language is a vital part of the Plan relative to uses that are planned for the future without specific locations known at the time of the adoption of the Plan.**

Jenison Commercial Core

The land adjacent to the Chicago Dr., Baldwin St., and Cottonwood area serves as the commercial service core of the Township. The extension of Cottonwood St. south of Chicago Dr. to Port Sheldon Rd. provides the opportunity for minor expansion of the commercial core and could be developed as a Town Center. Commercial uses should not encroach any further north on Cottonwood or west on Baldwin St.



Land on the east end of Baldwin St. near the access to I-196 including the land to Chicago Dr. could be redeveloped with mostly low intensity commercial use such as Office Service, with limited access, and possibly higher density residential uses. Consideration should be given for the area to be a single development, or as much as possible, with very limited access to the main roads and with most accesses to interior roadways only. Consideration should be given for connection to bike trails. However, the Grand River and Rush Creek floodplains, as well as the nearby City of Grandville waste treatment facility may impose limits on the extent of any new development along the east end of Main St. In addition, any development in this area should have special attention paid to aesthetics such as landscaping and identifying signage since this is one of the major gateways to the community.

Chicago Dr. Corridor

No major changes in the existing land use pattern along the Chicago Dr. corridor are anticipated. The character of the retail uses at the east end should be maintained; however, a mix of commercial and residential uses are appropriate for the south side. Much of the undeveloped land on the south side of Chicago Dr. is subject to wetland, floodplain or unstable soils constraints and will remain undeveloped unless a plan is presented to mitigate the floodplain with proper engineering for compatible uses. In the 12th Ave. area, any development should include combined parcels if possible. Reuse of the DeWent Gravel property for industrial use is anticipated. Much of the land on the south side of the corridor is placed in the AG/RR category, where wetlands, floodplains or poor soils make more intense uses infeasible or environmentally damaging. Attempts should be made as follows when opportunities arise:

- to improve appearances,
- to eliminate nonconforming uses, structures and conditions,
- to update landscaping,
- to screen off-street parking areas visible from the roadway with walls, landscaping or berms,
- to limit driveway access to the fewest necessary to provide reasonable access to the site including shared accesses or access via a service driveway,
- to create defined entries and eliminate undefined or gravel entrances,
- and to take advantage when opportunities become available to bring sites into conformance with current ordinances.

Redevelopment or demolition of vacant buildings should be encouraged. At the southwest end of the Township, the area south of Chicago Dr. is designated for Highway Commercial and the land along New Holland and 40th Ave. is designated for LDR. The M-121 (Chicago Drive) Corridor Access Management Plan, prepared for MDOT, prepared by URS Corporation, LSL Planning Inc., and Progressive AE, dated September 2009, is hereby adopted by reference.

Baldwin St. Corridor

A major goal of the Plan that has been established and continues to be important is to maintain a residential living environment along Baldwin St. frontage, where non-residential uses have not already been established. The Jenison commercial core and the small clusters of commercial and office service uses near 20th Ave., west of 12th Ave. and at the northwest corner of Baldwin and 36th Ave. should be maintained. The PUD at the northwest corner of 36th Ave. and Baldwin contains residential uses along with the commercial uses.”


A narrow strip of muck soils which crosses Baldwin near west of 12th Ave. has been designated as park/open space on the Future Land Use Map. Acquisition of this land on the north side of Baldwin would provide a valuable green space corridor connecting the existing park/stormwater detention area on the south side of Baldwin to Maplewood Park and Maplewood Lake north of Baldwin. A pedestrian/bicycle trail along this greenbelt could eventually be extended further north along the edge of the muck lands all the way to Cedar Lake and the County Park on the Grand River. The muck area between Baldwin and Rosewood could be considered for a lineal park connecting to Maplewood Park.

The area at the east end of Baldwin St. near the I-196 connection to Chicago Dr. should be developed with some type of overall plan and could contain mixed uses including uses of a low intense commercial nature and possibly some higher density residential uses. The area at the east end of the Township near the Grand River should be left in a natural state. Consideration should be given for access to mass transit and to paths. Development in this area should be mindful and consistent with the trail system along the river.

The area at the west end of Baldwin St. near 48th Ave. should continue to be developed with low intense residential uses.

Northeast Corner of the Township

Extensive sand and gravel mining activity continues in this area. A reclamation plan has been adopted by the Township Board and by Ottawa County, titled Bend Area Park Site, A Planned Mining and Reclamation Program, dated **2010**, prepared by Bauer-Ford Reclamation Design. The plan is adopted within this plan by reference. The plan encompasses approximately 1,000 acres, bordered on the north and east by the Grand River; on the south by the golf course, Taylor Street, residential properties and Fillmore Street; and on the west by 22nd Ave. This may be a good area for the development of athletic fields.



Southeast Corner of the Township

Lack of public sewer service currently constrains development in the area south and east of I-196. In addition, this area has rolling topography that is not conducive to urban development densities. Therefore, it is anticipated that this area will continue to be characterized by very low density residential development, typically on lots of five acres or more.

Another significant influence on this area is the M-6 South Beltline freeway. The alignment enters the Township near Jackson St. and 12th Ave., and connects to I-196 immediately north of this intersection. Full direct access to the M-6 South Beltline is provided at 8th Ave. in Jamestown Township. Access to the M-6 South Beltline at 8th Ave. provides greater accessibility for the southeast corner of the Township to employment centers outside the Township. This could create more demand for development in the part of the Township; however, the lack of public sewer service to this area will prohibit that.

The current low density residential character of the area and the attractive natural features which characterize the area should be encouraged and maintained. At such time as sewer becomes available, the area could possibly be developed as a planned unit development, with special attention given to using good access management practices.

The area around Parsons Drive and 8th Ave. should remain residential, including detached homes and single-family attached.

Bauer Rd./Fillmore Area.

The Land Use Plan recognizes that this is an area in transition from very rural to urban residential which includes the approved residential planned unit development. However, the natural character of the area should be preserved to the extent possible. As public water and sanitary sewer become available, planned development in the form of PUDs or open space preservation projects could be permitted within an overall residential density limit of 3.5 units per acre. Preference should be given to large scale developments that will maintain open space and preserve the natural character of the land, while meeting the residential goals of this Plan. Conventional subdivisions that simply divide the land into lots with no amenities and little regard for the natural character should be discouraged.

Opportunity exists at the west end of Bauer Rd. near the Township Ice Arena for further development of outdoor recreational-type uses, including parks, playfields or other uses with an open-space nature.

Edson Dr./VanBuren Area.

The area east of the Hudsonville City limits has been reclaimed for residential development, such as the completed plats of Georgetown Shores and mining operations have been completed. The area between Edson Dr. and VanBuren St. is expected to develop for residential use, while the area south of VanBuren extending to I-196 is projected to remain as agricultural, with very low intensity uses.

Property along the south side of Chicago Dr. that abuts the City of Hudsonville now has a high density residential use with commercial uses adjacent to Chicago Dr.

North of Hudsonville

The Plan encourages residential infill. As stated in the Plan goals and policies, infill development is needed to make more cost-effective use of the Township's investment in water and sewer facilities. Heavy clay soils and elevation limits are a constraint on development in this area, but can be overcome. An elevated water storage facility has been constructed on 36th Ave. north of Baldwin and will help service this area.

Any specific proposals for rezoning to the neighborhood commercial district in this area should be evaluated based on proper land use planning considerations, including the following:

- whether the property proposed for rezoning has physical and environment characteristics which are suited for the proposed zoning;
- compatibility with uses of adjoining properties;
- the availability of public utility services, which should be required for commercial use;
- whether there is a need for more commercial uses.

South of the ridgeline which lies south of Port Sheldon Rd. muck soils are anticipated to remain in agricultural use. Some muck land extends from the southwest portion of the Township into the northwest corner of the City of Hudsonville and should remain AG/RR due to the muck land, unstable soils, and high water table. Efforts should be made to reserve the muck soils for agriculture uses unless the area was to be developed into a PUD where consideration would be given to the characteristics of the area.

44th St. Corridor

The future land use recommendation for the land in the vicinity of 44th St. between Kenowa and Chicago Dr. has been established as a pattern, including the following:

- providing for commercial uses only at the extreme ends of the corridor, at Kenowa Ave. and near the Chicago Dr./Port Sheldon Rd. intersection, and at the 8th Ave. intersection, mid-way through the corridor. The southeast corner of 44th St. and 8th Ave. may be developed as a PUD with low intense commercial or residential uses if the development complies with the following: 1) adequate buffering is provided to the adjacent neighboring LDR district; 2) the site is serviced by public water and sanitary sewer; and 3) the site is developed in accordance with the results of a traffic study in regard to allowable driveway locations, driveway design and configuration, road improvements such as right turn lanes, intersection signal improvements and/or timing changes, or other improvements.



- providing for a mix of low-to-medium density residential uses along the corridor, with site design which minimizes access driveways onto 44th St.

Approximately ten acres of land, located within the Fairway Estates PUD, are provided for neighborhood commercial use, along with possible residential/mixed uses. Some construction has already taken place.

Kenowa should remain residential on the west side of the street, other than near 44th St.

Good access management practices should be utilized to minimize access to this road and to encourage the movement of vehicular traffic along this corridor.

48th Ave. Corridor

This has been identified as the major north/south corridor for the Township, as well as for other municipalities bordering the road and GVSU. The future plan is to widen the street to a five lane road from the southern border of the Township to Bauer Rd., then to a four lane Boulevard north. Special consideration should be given to good access management policies along 48th Ave. and increased setback requirements. The North-South Corridor Study, prepared by URS Corporation-Great Lakes, prepared for Grand Valley Metro Council and the Ottawa County Planning Commission, dated May 2004, is hereby adopted by reference.

A small amount of land at the corner of 48th Ave. and Port Sheldon has been identified for future neighborhood commercial uses as long as there is no direct access to 48th Ave.

The property with the ice arena at the corner of Bauer Rd. and 48th Ave. is designated as commercial and this area could be developed with neighborhood commercial uses near 48th Ave. and attached and detached single family residential uses to the east. A residential PUD is currently being developed in this area. Special consideration should be given to good access management along this corridor, as well as to larger setbacks. Commercial uses are located west of 48th Ave. in this area in Blendon Township. No neighborhood commercial uses should expand to the south of the intersection of Bauer Rd. and 48th Ave.

The section of 48th Ave. from New Holland St. north to Port Sheldon should be designated as RR/AG, with the potential to be LDR if utilities are brought to the area either by a developer or the Township. The section of 48th Ave. from Port Sheldon north to Bauer Rd. should be developed as LDR. A portion of the east side of the intersection of 48th Ave. and Port Sheldon, bordered by the utility lines, could be developed with commercial uses with no access to 48th Ave. The section of 48th Ave. from Bauer Rd. north to Pierce St. should include the above noted reference to the area around the ice rink.

Northwest Corner of the Township

Although Allendale Township has provided a minimal amount of public services to some developments near GVSU, the lack of public sewer service currently constrains development in the area. If public utilities become available, an opportunity may exist for development that would be compatible with the surrounding area. In such instances where appropriate, the entity would have to provide the sewer to the property through a utility agreement.

Gateways to the Community

Gateways to the community have been identified as those main roads providing ports of entry into Georgetown Township, including, but not necessarily limited to, Chicago Dr. (east and west), Baldwin St. (east and west), Port Sheldon Rd. (east and west), 8th Ave. (south), Fillmore St. (west),

Bauer Rd. (west) and 44th St. (east). Especially important areas of concern were identified as the east end of Baldwin where the on and off ramps connect to I-196, as well as east Chicago Dr. near the Main St. intersection and west Chicago Dr. near the City of Hudsonville boundary, and signage has been installed.



Goals noted that when possible, the Township should encourage ways to provide identification of municipal boundaries so those entering the area recognize the community of Georgetown Township. In addition, special attention should be given to the aesthetics of development and redevelopment in areas on and near the gateways. Vital, innovative and creative signage, landscaping and other exterior aesthetic elements that help define the community and entrance into the community should be encouraged.

Based on these goals as stated in the previous Master Plan, the Township has constructed the following: a Veteran’s Plaza at the corner of Baldwin and Main St.; a large identifying sign on the south side of Baldwin near the I-196 off ramp; and an identifying waterfall sign at the corner of Chicago Dr. and Main St.

Improved appearances should be made in these areas including:



- to eliminate nonconforming uses, structures and conditions,
- to update landscaping,
- to screen off-street parking areas visible from the roadway with walls, landscaping or berms,
- to limit driveway access to the fewest necessary to provide reasonable access to the site including shared accesses or access via a service driveway,
- to create defined entries and eliminate undefined or gravel entrances,
- and to take advantage when opportunities become available to bring sites into conformance with current ordinances.





Ottawa County Grand River Greenway Trail


Through adoption of the Master Plan, the Township commits to participating with the Grand River Greenway Trail as opportunities arise.

The Grand River Greenway will provide a network of **connected park and open space lands along the river**. These linked lands provide greater benefit to wildlife and also creates the land base needed for linear regional trails. Ottawa County Parks has been acquiring land to establish the greenway since 1996, when the county parks millage was first approved. Over 2,600 acres and 13 miles of river shoreline have been purchased.





Chapter 9 Implementaion of the Plan



IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

Management of growth in a community is a continuous process composed of many components, one of which is the preparation of a long-range Plan for the development of the community. Management of growth does not end there, however. A variety of steps should be taken by the Township to encourage the realization of the future vision of the community expressed in this Plan. These steps fall into the following major areas:

- use of the Land Use Plan as a guide to land use decisions;
- modification and fine tuning of development regulations to achieve Land Use Plan goals;
- use of the Land Use Plan in making decisions concerning investments in capital facilities.

Use of the Plan as a Guide to Land Use Decisions

Zoning and subdivision regulations are the primary mechanisms for ensuring that future development in the Township furthers the attainment of the goals expressed in this Plan. Realization of these goals will only occur if the Township Planning Commission and Township Board consistently use the Plan as a guide in making zoning and capital expenditure decisions.

This does not require blind adherence to the Plan in deciding each and every rezoning request which comes before the Township. The proper use of the Land Use Plan as a policy document involves asking the following questions when deliberating land use decisions:

- Does the proposed request conform to the Land Use Plan?
- If it does not, what was the reason for the land use designation contained in the Plan?
- Is this reasoning still valid, or have conditions changed or new information become available which now renders the original Plan designation no longer applicable?
- Does a deviation from the Plan make sense in this application?

Land use decisions, whether conforming to the Land Use Plan or not, should be made after explicit consideration of the relationship of the decision to the Land Use Plan. If a decision contrary to the Plan is made, it should be for specific, stated land use planning factors. If the reasoning and soundness of the Land Use Plan are still valid, a planning request which conflicts with the Plan should be denied.

The Land Use Plan should also be an easily accessible and highly visible document, to make property owners, developers and the general public aware of the community's goals for the future.

Chapter 10

Use of Land in Programming Capital Expenditures



Use of Land Use Plan in Programming Capital Expenditures

One of the major benefits and uses of a Land Use Plan is its use in programming and prioritizing capital facilities expenditures. The future growth pattern will affect the location of future utility improvement needs.



The Sewer Distribution Map, dated 2020, the Water Distribution Map, dated 2020, and the Water Reliability Study of 2017 are hereby adopted by reference, including improvements mentioned in the plans.

Need for Periodic Plan Updates

Finally, the Plan should be periodically re-examined no less than every five years or as required by State Law, to ensure that it continues to reflect the needs and desires of the community, as conditions change in the future. If properly kept current, the Plan should continue to be a valuable policy guide to the Planning Commission and Township Board.

Georgetown Charter Township
Ottawa County
Resolution No. 211213-05

TOWNSHIP BOARD RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN AMENDED MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, THE Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) authorized the Planning Commission to prepare a Master Plan for the use, development and preservation of all lands in the Township; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission prepared a proposed updated Master Plan and Future Land Use Map and submitted the plan to the Township Board for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2021, the Georgetown Township Board received and reviewed the proposed Master Plan prepared by the Planning Commission and authorized distribution of the Master Plan to the Notice Group entities identified in the MPEA; and

WHEREAS, notice was provided to the Notice Group entities as provided in the MPEA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 1, 2021 to consider public comment on the proposed updated Master Plan, and to further review and comment on the proposed updated Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Township Board finds that the proposed updated Master Plan is desirable and proper and furthers the use, preservation, and development goals and strategies of the Township;

WHEREAS, the MPEA authorized the Township Board to assert by resolution its right to approve or reject the proposed Master Plan;

THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Adoption of 2021 Master Plan.** The Township Board hereby approves and adopts the proposed 2021 Master Plan, including all of the chapters, figures, maps and tables, and the Future Land Use Map as revised, contained therein. Pursuant to MCL 125.3843 the Township Board has asserted by resolution its right to approve or reject the proposed Master Plan and therefore the approval granted herein is the final step for adoption of the plan as provided in MCL 125.3843 and therefore the plan is **effective as of December 13, 2021.**
2. **Distribution to Notice Group.** Pursuant to MCL 125.3843, the Township Board has asserted by resolution its right to approve or reject the proposed Master Plan, and therefore, the Planning Commission recommends that the Township Board approves the Master Plan as presented and approves the distribution of the adopted plan to the Notice Group.
3. **Finding of Fact.** The Township Board has made the foregoing determination based on a review of existing land uses in the Township, a review of the existing Master Plan provisions and maps, input received from the Planning Commission and public hearing, and with the assistance of Township staff, and finds that the updated Master Plan will accurately reflect and implement the Township's goals and strategies for the use, preservation, and development of lands in Georgetown Township.
4. **Effective Date.** The Master Plan shall be effective as of the date of adoption of this resolution.

Yeas: Jim Wierenga, Gary Veldink, Becky Steele, John Schwalm, Ryan Kidd
Nays: Michael Bosch
Absent: Kirsten Manthei

Yeas: 5
Nays: 1
Absent: 1

The Chairperson declared the resolution adopted.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, written over a horizontal line. The signature is cursive and somewhat illegible.

Signature of Clerk

#211201-03 – Master Plan Public Hearing and Consideration.

Moved by Donna Ferguson, seconded by Gary Veldink, to approve the resolution for the adoption of the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map as presented (with the noted revision on page 30) and to recommend to the Township Board to approve the adoption of the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map as presented.

**Georgetown Chapter Township
Ottawa County
Resolution No. #211201-03**

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN AMENDED MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, THE Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) authorized the Planning Commission to prepare a Master Plan for the use, development and preservation of all lands in the Township; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission prepared a proposed updated Master Plan and Future Land Use Map and submitted the plan to the Township Board for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2021, the Georgetown Township Board received and reviewed the proposed Master Plan prepared by the Planning Commission and authorized distribution of the Master Plan to the Notice Group entities identified in the MPEA; and

WHEREAS, notice was provided to the Notice Group entities as provided in the MPEA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 1, 2021 to consider public comment on the proposed updated Master Plan, and to further review and comment on the proposed updated Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed updated Master Plan and Future Land Use Map revisions are desirable and proper and furthers the use, preservation, and development goals and strategies of the Township;

THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Adoption of 2021 Master Plan.** The Planning Commission hereby approves the proposed 2021 Master Plan, including all of the chapters, figures, maps and tables, and the Future Land Use Map as revised, contained therein.
2. **Distribution to Township Board and Notice Group.** Pursuant to MCL 125.3843, the Township Board has asserted by resolution its right to approve or reject the proposed Master Plan, and therefore, the Planning Commission recommends that the Township Board approves the Master Plan as presented and approves the distribution of the adopted plan to the Notice Group.

3. **Finding of fact.** The Planning Commission has made the foregoing determination based on a review of existing land uses in the Township, a review of the existing Master Plan provisions and maps, input received from the public hearing, and with the assistance of Township staff, and finds that the updated Master Plan will accurately reflect and implement the Township's goals and strategies for the use, preservation, and development of lands in Georgetown Township.

Yeas: Jeannine Bolhouse, Michael Moores, Tom Healy, Gary Veldink, Josiah Samy,
Jessica Ulberg, Donna Ferguson

Nays: None

Absent: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chairperson declared the resolution adopted.

MASTER PLAN REQUIREMENTS - 2021

January 20, 2021 Planning Commission initiates the review of the Master Plan

Initiation of the Master Plan Review

#210120-05 – Master Plan Discussion

Moved by Tim Smit, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to initiate the Master Plan review process, to send out letters of intention to plan to each of the neighboring municipalities and the County and to solicit input from members of the Boards and Commissions.

Yeas: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Josiah Samy, Gary Veldink

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

January 21, 2021 Letters sent to neighboring communities and County Planning Commission that the Township is considering amending the Master Plan.

None Letters sent to any public utilities and railroads that register with the Township (must pay the cost)

January 21, 2021 A notice is placed on the website.

August 18, 2021 Once the Planning Commission completes work on the draft proposal, the document is presented to the Township Board for review, comments and approval for distribution for comments.

Sept. 13, 2021 Township Board approves the distribution.

Sept. 28, 2021 Copies of the draft plan are sent to neighboring communities along with a notice of the public hearing.

Sept. 28, 2021 A copy is sent to the county with the notice of the public hearing, along with a list of the neighboring communities that were sent the plan, and a signed acknowledgement that the Township met the requirements of the law.

None Copies are sent to any utilities that register to receive the plan.

None Neighboring communities have up to 63 days to respond with any *advisory* comments to be sent to the Township and to the County.

None The County has up to 63 days to respond with *advisory* comments after the original draft copy was received by them.

Dec. 1, 2021 After the advisory time period expires, the Planning Commission holds a public hearing (notice could be published prior to the date of expiration of the advisory period).

Nov. 2, 2021 Notice for the public hearing includes one notice published not less than 15 days before the hearing. Posted in the lobby and on website on

Dec. 1, 2021 PC votes on the plan and must approve the plan (even if the Board is the adopting authority). Must be approved by a simple majority of the PC. A statement recording the Planning Commission's approval of the Master Plan, signed by the chairperson or secretary, must be included on the inside front or back of the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map.

#030623-06 Township Board motion approving the Township Board to be the adopting authority

#030623-06 – Review Adopting Authority for Master Plan

Moved by Stanley Sterk, seconded by Bernard Mackus, to approve the Township Board as the adopting authority for any future Master Plan adoptions, with the voting requirements to be a majority of the Board (four out of seven members).

MOTION CARRIED.

Dec. 13, 2021 TB must approve the plan by simple majority

NA If the Board rejects the plan, a statement of objections is submitted to the Planning Commission, who then is required to consider the objections and revise the plan to address the objections.

Dec. 13, 2021 The Master Plan is effective upon final adoption.

Dec. 14, 2021 After the plan is approved by the Board, the final plan is distributed to the same list of municipalities, the county, and the registered public utilities. A statement recording the Township Board's approval of the Master Plan, signed by the clerk, must be included on the inside front or back of the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map.