

PROPOSED MINUTES
LAKETOWN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
4338 BEELINE ROAD
ALLEGAN COUNTY
HOLLAND, MI 49423
(616) 335-3050

December 2, 2009

ARTICLE I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bob Cook called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Cook, Ed Stielstra, Linda Howell, Bob Slikkers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Al Dogger

STAFF PRESENT: Al Meshkin – Township Manager
Ron Bultje – Township Attorney
Diane Ybarra – Recording Secretary

ARTICLE II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the November 4, 2009 meeting. Following discussion, **a motion was made by Linda Howell and seconded by Ed Stielstra to approve the minutes with the correction noted. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

ARTICLE III. OLD BUSINESS

A. ZONING ORDINANCE DISCUSSION (Held at the end of the meeting)

Chairman Cook stated the commissioners have been working to create guidelines for the zoning ordinance. Bob Cook opened discussion on guidelines suggested for the ordinance. Bob would like to go through each paragraph using Linda Howell's document to work through.

Bob Cook questioned the use of the term "mixed use" in paragraph one. Linda Howell pointed out that the term "residential" is stated in the next paragraph. It was agreed that the term "residential"

be removed.

Bob Cook moved onto the next section entitled “Building Design”. Linda Howell commented on that the few buildings currently existing may not coincide with the intended guideline for aesthetically compatible structures. It was confirmed that the character of the current buildings would not be considered a standard building type. Bob Slikkers agreed that the current structures could and should be preserved but like buildings would not be the standard. Al Meshkin commented that the terminology “along Blue Star Highway” should be stricken. The next bullet point addressed pedestrian oriented requirements. The specifics of building styles and facades will be addressed later in the document. Linda noted the term “quality materials” might be debated.

Under “General Requirements” the front and rear facades were addressed. It was stated that all sides of the building must be complementary. Ron Bultje questioned what is considered complementary? Linda suggested addressing it by requiring the materials be similar and consistent. Ed Stielstra stated that the word complementary implies that it could be a somewhat different standard with similar materials but does not have to be the same. Al Meshkin suggested that if the rear of the building is not visible, the materials may not have to match the front façade. Bob Slikkers suggested that the sides and the back should match that of the building front. Linda suggested using the term “consistent” instead of complementary or matching. Bob Cook suggested building materials and design be used for this terminology. Bob suggested adding that those sides that are need not visible from the street should not be held to the guidelines. It was decided that flexibility would be addressed later in the document.

Under “Public Entrances” Linda questioned if these guidelines were applicable to every entrance or just the main entrance. It was decided that it would apply to the public entrances. Bob Cook suggested adding the phrase “to the extent feasible” in regards to the standard addressing the screening of the buildings and property to allow for flexibility. Ed Stielstra asked if satellite dishes were part of the equipment guidelines and it was noted that it is. The word “mechanical” was removed from the paragraph.

Under “Security and Safety Equipment” it was noted that security equipment must be interior and not visible during business hours. It was noted that security devises are not required. The next topic is the safety of the buildings. Ed Stielstra questioned at what point the building inspector becomes involved. He suggested that the inspector be involved at the beginning of the building process.

“Exterior Facades and Materials” was discussed at length. Very specific building materials were listed. Al Dogger suggested eliminating the entire section listing the specific materials. Bob Cook spoke in favor of removing the specifics. Linda Howell suggested eliminating the percentages noted in the materials list. Bob stated this would be part of a larger discussion ensuring that quality building materials are used and how this would also be part of a discussion relative to architectural details. Bob Slikkers supported removing this section and Ed Stielstra agreed. Al Meshkin

commented that there are many new materials being established and there will be more in the future. It was agreed that this section would be removed.

Under “Additional Standards” awnings and their purposes was discussed. There were no suggested changes to this item. Ed Stielstra noted that under “Maintenance” the actual building code and not just maintenance is addressed. Ron Bultje stated that the Township would have to adopt a “Property Maintenance Code” in order to enforce items listed in this section. He stated that there are many details in such a code. Al Meshkin stated that some of these maintenance items are addressed in the Township Zoning Ordinances. The awning material make up was discussed and how to enforce the maintenance of secure awnings in good repair. Ron pointed out that awnings can be a critical component of the architecture and these details should be included in the document. The projection and clearance of the awnings was discussed. Ron Bultje suggested reviewing this document and its details not just as guidelines that could be considered meaningless but as standards and/or potential ordinances. Al Meshkin confirmed that calling this document “standards” is firmer than “guidelines” giving the Planning Commission more authority to enforce as related to the actual Zoning Ordinances. Linda Howell questioned if awnings that extended into the sidewalk would be allowed versus window awnings. Al Meshkin questioned what the definition of “public street” is versus streets within a development. Ron confirmed that it is defined as public or private street such as one within a planned unit development. There was debate as to whether or not the awning could be allowed for the loading or unloading of pedestrians at a building entrance.

Under “Building Orientation” Bob Cook suggested amending this section to address public entrances. Public entrances should face public or internal roads of the development. This item also discussed “expression line” for two story buildings. It was decided to eliminate this section. The specifics of the façade and window transparencies should not include a specific percentage in order to include all types of building uses, such as retail and professional services. The window glazing specifics will be eliminated. The buildings must be designed to complement a pedestrian environment.

Under “Alternative Design and Materials” Bob asked for confirmation if the details of this section should be included in the actual ordinance language by way of the ordinance referring to the standards.

The next section to be reviewed at the January meeting will be “Landscaping”.

ARTICLE IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. NIENHUIS SPECIAL USE REQUEST

Richard and Nancy Nienhuis, owners or agents of property located at 1930 W. 32nd Street, also

known as Parcels #0311-003-032-00 and 0311-003-033-00, request a special use permit to construct an oversized accessory building on this property.

Mr. Richard Nienhuis distributed an updated copy of the statement of explanation addressing the changes made to the original drawing for the accessory building. The changes are in the height at 18 feet instead of 17 feet and also an extra 4 feet instead of 3 feet in square footage. The 16 foot average height will now be 2 feet over the allowable height.

Chairman Bob Cook opened for public hearing. No comments.

A motion was made by Linda Howell and seconded by Ed Stielstra to close the public hearing. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED

Al Meshkin reported receiving an email communication of support from one Park Township resident.

Chairman Bob Cook complimented Mr. Nienhuis on his detailed drawing and written explanation. He asked to see a picture of the overall height from the updated drawing. Mr. Nienhuis provided the drawing explaining that the dormer provides extra storage. The roof faces the north and south.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Linda Howell and seconded by Ed Stielstra to approve the special use request contingent on it meeting the conditions according to the application submitted under revision two, requirements in sections 17.03 and 14.09(f)(6), in accordance with all verbal representation made at this meeting and in compliance with all federal, state, county and township provisions. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

ARTICLE V. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Ellen Fitch of 3665 63rd Street commented that it should be described in detail what the architectural details are of the Belvedere Inn. It seems that this is the standard being set for this development. Bob Cook explained that the Belvedere Inn will be used as an example of a current structure but not a standard for development. Ed Stielstra commented that it would not necessarily describe what the intent is for the standard. Bob Slikkers noted that the Belvedere Inn would not set the standard but that building and the Red Barn would be allowed to stay as they are. These buildings are not meant to set the standard for the future development structures. Ms. Fitch feels strongly about providing a detailed architectural description of the Belvedere Inn for the purposes of establishing it as a standard of what would be harmonious with it and what is not. Linda Howell suggested changing the verbiage of the preamble of the document. Ms. Fitch continued to stress the importance of providing an inventory of the character of the buildings in this area whether or not they are in the

specific area. Ed suggested clarifying this section of the document. Ron Bultje expressed that the “grandfathering” of certain structures is actually a protection and preservation of the integrity and natural life of these buildings.

ARTICLE VI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Bob Slikkers and seconded by Linda Howell to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 P.M. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED