

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

October 7, 2015

ARTICLE I. CALL TO ORDER

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bob Cook, Randy Becksvoort, Linda Howell,  
Jim Lorence, Bob Slikkers  
MEMBERS ABSENT: None  
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 September 2, 2015 meeting. **A motion was made by Bob Slikkers and seconded by Linda Howell to approve the minutes as submitted. Chairman Cook called for a motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

ARTICLE III. OLD BUSINESS

A. STEELE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT REQUEST

Mr. Sean Steele, representing Diversion Properties LLC, owner or agent of property located at 4368 60<sup>th</sup> Street, Holland, MI, that being tax parcel #0311-013-001-00, requests an amendment to his existing planned unit development approval to allow composting activities on this property.

Ken Vermeulen of Barns and Thornburg apologized for any miscommunication regarding the trial site size for the composting site. What is being proposed now is the same as the original operation plan within the 14 acres of DEQ licensed area which keeps the operation relatively far away from adjoining property owners. He reviewed the report and agreement prepared by Township Attorney Bultje and noted concern with the interpretation of comments made over four meetings. Assuring that no odor will occur is not reasonable but this composting operation produces the lowest odor that is scientifically possible.

Chairman Cook asked Bultje to clarify the requirements regarding odor. Slikkers confirmed that a contract agreement will be used and the operation would have to comply with the conditions of the agreement. The issue of offensive odor will have to be measured to what creates a nuisance. Vermeulen said there are odors in the area stronger than what could come out of this site and by the law, would the average person consider the odor to be obtrusive. The science used in this composting process will reduce odor by 80%. Slikkers said we there is a resident right in the middle and it would be their feedback the township would have to consider. Vermeulen said the other consideration is to the extent that it is regulated by the DEQ operating license; clear pre-emption for solid waste disposal area which is within the 14 acre composting site.

Cook asked for Bultje's feedback. Bultje responded that in this area it would be difficult to address a zero odor condition. In agriculture there may be a day of odor when a "reasonable person" living next to a farm would understand. If the scientific process providing the 80% reduction is not used then we would have a problem. Vermeulen said that scientific process would be employed. Bultje said if there is a significant uptick in complaints it would have to be investigated.

Howell asked for confirmation that this will not be rendering compost. No road kill animals such as accepting road kill from the Department of Transportation would occur. Steele responded that it is within the DEQ permit to do so but that is not the intent. Howell said what you are interested in now could change so it would have to be in the report. Howell also asked that Steele provide copies of current licensing to be kept on file with the township office including a current operations plan. Vermeulen said the revised operations plan is the one submitted to the DEQ and may or may not ask for an amendment to the approval unless the operation is expanded after a year. Howell asked that copies of all DEQ approvals be submitted to the township office. Bultje noted that the operation plan is attached to the application and Vermeulen added it had not yet been received back from the DEQ.

Bultje confirmed the noted comments on condition x. will be added to the 9/28/15 and will incorporate the minutes subject to the 10/2/15 email. Howell added to incorporate limitations on dead animals. Slikkers highlighted comments on condition y.

Becksvoort commented that we are saying yes to something that is already being done. Vermeulen said it is not being done now and any composting being done now are piles of old materials not the new proposed operation. Meshkin said he was asked about getting the prep work done. Bultje said the contract will go to the Township Board and the normal P.U.D. procedure will apply.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Slikkers and seconded by Lorence to accept the resolution report draft dated 9/28/15 for recommendation to the Township Board regarding the Steele Planned Unit Development Amendment request pursuant to all codes set forth in Section 38.430, findings noted in the meetings, per the application and in accordance with all federal, state, county and township laws and ordinances and the verbal representation provided at this meeting and in the minutes.**

**Chairman Cook called for a roll call vote: Becksvoort - no; Slikkers - yes; Howell - yes; Lorence - yes; Cook - yes. MOTION APPROVED**

## B. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REVIEW

Chairman Cook stated this item will remain tabled until the next meeting

## ARTICLE IV. NEW BUSINESS

### A. RPE TRUST SPECIAL USE REQUEST

RPE Trust, owner or agent of property located at 797 Lakeside Drive, lot #179 of Macatawa Park, that being tax parcel #0311-340-179-00, requests a special use permit to construct a new cottage on this parcel.

Jim Brown, attorney for the applicant explained that this is the same application but the lot size is being reduced due to a portion of the lot being in litigation for clear title of ownership. The area of land between Lakeside and lot 178 is approximately 5,379 SF in size which necessitates a Special Use permit. The footprint of the cottage including the front porch is 1,215 SF and the balance of the lot will remain open space. Brown noted a letter was received from Mr. Sikkel which raised some issues of parking and no changes have been made. There are factual misunderstandings on how lot is configured. The grade will be reduced by 4 feet to make it level with Griswold as noted in the site plan. Any blind turnarounds there will be based on the vegetation. Likewise, the issue of traffic backing out on Griswold is strange because everyone up there does it. Brown added that Griswold does not narrow significantly so unsure what the issue is but his client is looking for same treatment as everyone else gets.

Chairman Cook opened for public comment.

Bill Sikkel of 42 E. Lakewood representing William Porter, property owner on Crescent Walk to the immediate south of the site stated his client is not objecting to the general construction but concerns are traffic and parking noting it would be better to have parking along the east line of the property. Griswold Walk is about 8 feet wide in the area and more akin to a sidewalk. Legal descriptions refer to it as a walk, primarily used as a sidewalk for pedestrians to the beach. The concern is to mix pedestrian and vehicle traffic suggesting that the entrance be shifted to the east as the proposed plan provides an awkward angle, difficult for a standard car to make the turn there. The other issue to be noted is that Section 38.63 (2) in terms of special use states no parking is allowed within 25 feet of the front yard setback which is a mandatory provision and should not be waived as safety is a primary issue.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Slikkers and seconded by Howell to close the public hearing. Chairman Cook called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

Chairman Cook asked Mr. Brown to address the 25 feet of landscaping. Bultje said per Section 38.63, no parking is permitted in first 25 feet of the front yard setback and landscaping. Slikkers noted that

the ordinance requires a setback that is not feasible in that area. Cook asked if it can be approved without that variance. Bultje said it can approved contingent on the zoning ordinance or getting a variance from the ZBA. Brown acknowledged that a variance for the setbacks is needed. Bultje asked if it would significantly affect the plan if the 25 foot front setback is not waived. Bultje said one option is to grant approval through a written report pending the completion of the ZBA process. Slikkers noted the ZBA would want the Planning Commission decision be made. Meshkin added the Section notes that the Planning Commission review the preliminary plan and make recommendations to the applicant. Bultje agreed, the idea is the applicant will review the plan and make changes prior to the final plan. Slikkers said the Planning Commission has to approve a Special Use before the ZBA will approve a variance. Bultje responded that approval of the Special Use can be contingent on the ZBA approval. Slikkers asked if the applicant would consider the parking being further upward. Brown said it really is not as tight as it is being represented. Slikkers asked if it would be a hardship to move the drive. Brown said they would probably lose some parking and not have enough for two vehicles. Howell added that the driveway and proposed carport could be put over the water line if it goes in. Slikkers said it is proposed water and could come in other places but it would be over the existing sewer line. Bultje said if any parking is lost, it may have to be off-site parking. Brown said the perceived dangers of the driveway are overstated and backing out as it relates to pedestrian traffic, it seems better to back straight out than making a turn.

Cook asked for any further questions of the Commissioners. Following discussion, **a motion was made by Linda Howell and seconded by Bob Slikkers to approve the RPE Trust Special Use request contingent on it being in compliance with provisions put forth in 38.465, 38.59 thru 65, 38.89 thru 92 and 38.487; compliance with the application submitted, with all federal, state, county and township laws and ordinances and the written and verbal representation provided at this meeting and in the minutes. Chairman Cook called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

## B. COPPERLEAF DEVELOPMENT PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Copperleaf Development, owner or agent of property located at 6401 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Holland, MI, that being tax parcel #0311-003-027-20, requests approval to construct a 31 unit condominium at this location.

Ms. Kelly Cavanaugh of Nederveld represented the client Copperleaf Development stating the proposed Planned Unit Development is a 31 unit condominium plan, sold to own and not rental properties with a private road. There would be 13 stand alone units and 9 envelopes for duplex units. An open house was held on October 1 to share the plan and allow for dialogue with the community. The major comments were on landscaping and drainage so the plan was amended to add 30 additional trees which would require a deviation on all lot lines except on 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The building are designed so none of the units will take up the entire envelope. The additional trees will provide more buffing and in most cases not affect the 30 foot setback. Work is being done with the County Drain Commission which requiring the release be limited to nothing less than the current. Cavanaugh asked to address the Commissioners after the public hearing and Cook agreed.

Chairman Cook opened for public hearing reminding the audience that many were at the public hearing for the rezoning request at which time he clarified that the request and approval was for rezoning only. This meeting will address the development plan.

Graafschap Fire Chief Doug Den Bleyker stated that he reviewed the plan and submitted the following comments: 1) Concern regarding the water flow calculations on hydrants based on the size of the homes, the plan shows one hydrant and the nationally recognized standard would call for placement of three; 2) Width of the cul de sac is 80 feet and the nationally recognized standard would call for 96 feet; 3) Entrance drive is 30 feet wide with a 10 foot island taking each side down to 10 feet, more narrow than anything previously approved in the Township, the recommendation would be at least 16 feet for fire and rescue vehicles, particularly if there are other vehicles on the drive at the time of an emergency; 4) Recommend the proposed walking path to the bike path be constructed 12 feet wide with a base that would hold the weight of a 41,000 pound fire truck to allow for an additional access point, most developments have more than access point.

Tom Harrington of 6471 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue stated he lives six houses down from 64<sup>th</sup> Street and reminded Commissioners what happened on June 21, 2009 when there was a 100 year rain for the second consecutive year. Based on his experience as an engineering technician for the State of Michigan, he does not feel the small ponds proposed in the development are adequate if a major rain occurred adding that his home, just five lots down is in a federal flood zone. Harrington also expressed concern regarding the density, too many units for an inadequate drain system. Harrington referred to Item III. b. 1. of the application addressing the development is harmonious with the character of adjacent properties. Adding this number of units and multi-family dwellings would not be harmonious with the single-family homes and would change the essential character of surrounding areas. At the very least there is double the amount of units that would be supported by the drain system.

Al Davis of 4753 64<sup>th</sup> Street stated that he lives just down the road from the proposed development and was not made aware of the open house held on October 1. He supported the Fire Chief's comments adding that this is too many units for this small of an area. The traffic will increase and it is not harmonious with the rural area we now live in. He wondered if the Pure Michigan would market this as a Michigan theme. He has almost one acre of property and he was required to get a variance for his pole barn and does not feel that 31 living dwellings should be in such a small area.

Jodi Colvin of 4675 Beech Street stated that she went to the open house and saw the plan, talked to developer and we as a community are upset that 31 units are going in our area and to see the back side of the buildings as we take walks is unfair. Now they are asking for a variance instead of a 40 foot setback they want a 30 foot setback which is enough room for landscaping. We were told they would be upscale condos but it is a small plot of land with one egress and entrance and minimal green space. We are being unfairly treated as a community.

Lisa Cruz of 4705 Cardinal Drive asked what the Commissioners' opinions are before we bombard you with comments. Cook said we are asking for your opinions now. Cruz asked for their opinions to have a conversation.

Jim Bakker of 4718 64<sup>th</sup> Street stated that he owns the property 650 feet adjacent to the north of the proposed project and expressed concern that too much is being squeezed into too small of an area. He referenced a letter that he and his wife submitted noting their concerns including comments he received from the Zeeland Township Supervisor predicting a loss on property value should the project be approved. He and his wife ask the Planning Commission to minimize the decreasing value of our property. Also noted in the letter is the concern regarding the units pushed toward the tree line on his property where 50-60 year old cherry trees lean over the property line. In the past, he worked with Wolters to maintain those trees and wonders if he would have to remove them to avoid any future liability. He further expressed concern about the storm water and how it flows in the area also noting that a sewer line might run across his property and any repercussions to this working municipal sewer system. Bakker asked about how garbage would be handled as he does not want a dumpster next to his property. Lastly, he asks that respect be given to tax payers and residents as this project is very close to his property and he and his wife enjoy their backyard and woods.

Penny Shuff of 4706 Forrest Ridge Drive expressed concern about the traffic and asked if at this stage in the planning if there is there a possibility of density roll back. She suggested 1.5 acre lots which would increase the value of all neighbors and reduce the concerns about the traffic, expense of a light at the corner and drainage issues.

Jason Teresi of 4680 Pine Drive stated he and his family recently moved here from the Chicago area as a change from the density of a city. He expressed concern about property value, traffic, potential rental of units versus owner occupied lending to people who do not care about the property. He moved his family here for the single family dwelling neighborhood and wants to keep it that way enjoying the open field. He suggested single family dwellings would be better than 31 condos.

Steve Williford of 6389 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue expressed concern about the traffic noting there could be 62 cars or 100 cars noting that he has seen drivers miss the turn on that corner and have to be towed out of the field. He also asked if the proposed walking path is designed to handle a fire engine, would others use it as a drive if the main drive is busy. Density is a concern and if the fire engine has trouble with the size of the drive, what about other vehicles like garbage trucks. Perhaps we should go back to Nederveld and hold another meeting to discuss the plan.

Sharon Harrington of 6471 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue expressed concern regarding the density and it appears that there would be a 15 foot setback on three sides of the development. Most parcels in the area of ¾ to 1 acres lots. Where would people in this development have space for recreational activities in their backyard? Harrington also noted concerns of increased traffic and the potential for rental versus owner occupation.

Jodi Colvin of 4675 Beech Street stated another concern regarding the frequency of emergency vehicles in neighborhoods with older population and the effects of having only one entrance/egress.

Isaac Anderson of 6467 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue stated that 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a 45mph zone that no one pays attention to. This is not a safe area to increase density. Secondly the bike path that we have on 147<sup>th</sup>

is a very nice area for walkers and is heavily used. When backing out of our driveway, we have to check four different areas, the road and the bike path which is a safety hazard now and to increase that with 31 condominiums is a very high risk.

Diana Elshoff of 6350 Reserve Way stated that she recently moved to the township. When she had moved to Rochester it was like this and she watched its development over time and the mistakes made there. She asked the Commissioners to think of the future when making this decision because it will have a major impact on how this area will look in the future.

Biz Ter Haar of 4695 64<sup>th</sup> Street reiterated the traffic is a real concern noting that in 40 years she has helped in many accidents on the corner, one of which was a fatality, 64<sup>th</sup> Street is a speedway. If this goes through there must be better police presence or some way to control traffic on both roads. Please keep that in mind.

Bill Smith of 6392 Blue Jay Lane said he lives just a few feet outside of the notification area and was not pleased that he did not receive a notice. Smith expressed concern about the density, the issues that the Fire Chief identified, the poor planning and dismissal of common sense. He also asked if the water system has capacity for this density, he would say not because of the low pressure he has at his house. Lastly, the decision made tonight will have vast implications for the Township as this is just the tip of the iceberg with four other very similar parcels in the area, this problem could be multiplied.

Linda Goff of 4671 Pine Drive stated that she is baffled that she did not receive any info on this meeting or the open house. This involves our community not just the four houses across the street from the project. Taking into consideration that about 14-15 houses along that strip are on close to one acre lots, this does not make sense, it is too many units for that area.

Al Davis of 4753 64<sup>th</sup> Street said he hopes that what was said tonight and at the last Planning Commission meeting has been heard. You said you could control it if it was rezoned so do it. To put this many houses in the area, is there anyone from the community that is saying lets go for it? Think about that.

Jack Eggenschwiler of 6395 Blue Jay Lane said if this goes through, will you come back around for more tax dollars for police? This affects all of us so keep the balance.

Connie Bakker of 4718 64<sup>th</sup> Street said she talked to Kelly Cavanaugh about the plants and trees as a buffer so I don't have to share my backyard with the development. We have been in a very rural area and we need to keep it harmonious with what is there. We deserve respect.

Tom Harrington of 6471 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue said it all comes down to cramming too much in too little space. We get a lot of snow and one of the concerns we have is when our driveway is plowed we are not allowed to put it on the County roads. What is left? It seems every square foot is being used so where would you put the snow from this development?

Cook noted correspondence was received regarding this request. Slikkers read correspondence from:

Karen Walters-Knoll of 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Jim and Connie Bakker of 4718 64<sup>th</sup>; Ron and Marilyn Swart of 6424 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Brian Davis of 6443 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Kurt Sale of 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Lisa Cruz of 4705 Cardinal Drive asked if there is any way to do houses instead of condominiums. Meshkin responded that we can say single-family or two-family homes are allowed in R-2 but we cannot discriminate on type of ownership. Bultje stated a single-family unit can be a condominium unit.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Jim Lorence and seconded by Randy Becksvoort to close the public hearing. Chairman Cook called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

Chairman Cook stated that he tends to agree with a lot of the comments made; not being harmonious, too dense and the drainage. We must discuss the compatibility to the area which is a single-family area with all houses facing the street.

Randy Becksvoort asked about the green space for single family dwellings and if another access to 64<sup>th</sup> Street could be added and the drive on 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue be moved to match Pine Street. He also has concerns about setbacks.

Slikkers noted concerns regarding overall density compared to surrounding parcels, traffic and drainage ponds; he would like to see the calculations for June rains. He questions the water system capacity and sewer system. He agrees with concerns about snow removal, the need for two drives, the Fire Chief's concerns, pond acreage as calculated for adequate square footage of green space, lot widths and setbacks.

Howell noted concerns for snow storage, traffic, open space drainage, where retention would be located off site, signs, street design, Fire Chief's concerns, lighting and car headlight buffers, sewer line, tree placement on property line, unit size, building envelopes, community dumpster, encroachment on the bike path and water/sewer capacity.

Lorence agreed with all concerns mentioned and particularly issues of snow removal as is his experience in the association where he lives.

Cook invited the developer to take these concerns back to the planner noting that the open space and pond calculations must be treated as individual lots and not building envelopes.

Kelly Cavanaugh responded that may be open to interpretation and the project was purposely designed with condo parcel envelopes specifically for extra green space.

Cook said he would rather see site condos with single family homes. He reiterated the calculation so asked it to be treated as such.

Cavanaugh said she would update the calculation and provide it as requested. She further addressed

the other concerns noted in the public hearing: she had already spoken to the Fire Chief and will address his concerns in the revised plan but pointed out that 96 feet road width is a recommendation but 80 feet of road width is very common; the walkway will have a gravel subbase but will not appear as a roadway to the general public; flood plain and drainage calculations have been done and FEMA and MDQ state that the property is not in the 100 year flood plain; in terms of draining and water management, the ponds are retention and enclosed storm sewer catch basins so there are multiple ways to capture storm water not just in the retention ponds; the plan meets all requirements of the County Drain Commissioners Office, all of which are based on licensed engineers; single family homes were being marketed initially for this parcel but it did not sell so this type of project is desired by the developer. Cavanaugh added that if single family parcels were sold, the drainage would likely not have been considered so this is the better option. Cook explained it would still have to come back to the Planning Commission.

Slikkers noted that Project Clarity encourages that all storm water be retained on property and have none go off on other property, has that been taken into consideration? Cavanaugh responded it had not yet been considered but would be as there is a very high water table so it is already been taken into consideration to get a lesser release rate. Slikkers said there are water issues there now. Cavanaugh said one of the things we look at are the three separate drainage districts, Kelly Drain, Virginia Drain and one more. They are working with the Drain Commissioners Office and they will probably divide the site and have the release separated into two to provide a balance.

Cavanaugh noted that concern raised about increased traffic which she feels cannot be accurately anticipated. The intention is to market to retired couples so it would likely mean 1-2 cars per unit. Traffic is unknown and it is difficult to make assumptions and decisions. Traffic studies can be done on this site and we only have to provide proper ingress and egress. In terms of speed and a traffic light, that would be addressed by the county, township or MDOT. A very serious consideration on a two corner site is not to put two entrances to avoid it being treated as a public road to cut thru for this area. In addition, one of the benefits with a boulevard is it acts as almost a second entrance with the width changes. In terms of the site density concerns, the builder cannot regulate rental property; it is the development's association that provides the rules. Garbage would be handled privately and not one common dumpster. The starting price of a unit is \$280,000 and \$300,000 for a stand-alone so there would be private garbage. The street lights will be designed using specifications recommended by the Holland Board of Public Works, also being used in a similar development on the north side of Holland. Snow removal is tough in this area but our plan like any typical development is to use private snow plow services with the snow stored within the area. The last items mentioned fall into a bigger group, the harmonious quality, density, value setback, etc. We have requested information on utility capacity and are waiting for a response. One reason for looking at this property for this development is that it fits with the Master Plan usage so the point that it is not harmonious contradicts the Township's plan. The deviation would allow us to consider a parallel plan of 25 units which has been outlined and allowed by rights. The Zoning Ordinance would allow for the 25 unit development and meet all requirements. What changes with that number is that it would be a public road and accessory structures, swimming pools, etc. would be allowed. A benefit of a P.U.D. is it allows you the control and flexibility for the project. Using the logic of R-2 allowance of single lot sales would potentially mean 25 homes. The buffer area on 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue green space does do what it can to

maintain the character; the buffer will create a more harmonious character. Lastly, Cavanaugh commented that the Zeeland Zoning Administrator has not authority to speak to peoples' home values. Cavanaugh said she would answer any questions and suggested a smaller site plan review committee open to the public for the next review, whatever is needed to keep the dialogue going.

Cook asked if the intention will be to submit a new plan. Cavanaugh said yes, she highlighted the amendments to the drawing submitted, showing additional trees, also indicating the lighting; adding note about adding the fire entrances and will address other concerns and do a resubmittal.

Butte asked if the road were public, what would the Road Commission requirement be, and would it require two entrances. Cavanaugh responded she thinks 80 feet but will look into it.

Slikkers said he would like Nederveld to respond to the concerns based on information given tonight.

Howell agrees with Slikkers and asked that when the resubmittal is done they also look at the open space calculations, issues with moving the driveway down even with Pine Street but in context with drainage and snow removal, the density may not be an issue. Howell does not think as it is shown the calculations required in the Township will not provide enough open space.

Lorence had no additional comments.

Howell asked where the other development is using the recommended lighting. Cavanaugh responded it on James and Division and the name is Saw Grass.

Following discussion, **a motion was made by Howell and seconded by Slikkers to table the Copperleaf Planned Unit Development Request until such time a revised plan is submitted. Chairman Cook called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**

#### ARTICLE V. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Phil Bollander of 4625 Forrest Lane expressed concern about the odor control at the Steele site. It is a local and public problem and must be policed. Also on the Copperleaf P.U.D., the developer mentioned all the trees for landscaping that will get in the way of the snow removal and the emergency vehicle access. You really have to listen to the Fire Department about adequate access.

Connie Bakker 4718 64<sup>th</sup> Street asked about the Copperleaf, since it has a high water table will they add fill and how high. I hope your requiring the 40 feet setback at least on our side. She said they added 30 trees and that really isn't a buffer. Will we get another chance to see what is proposed? Cook said it will likely come up every month as long as it remains tabled.

Al Davis of 4753 64<sup>th</sup> Street said he gets a big kick that we are zoned R-2 and she makes it sound like it can be worse than what this plan shows. I hope you guys stick to what is said and take control and

say 31 is not harmonious with what is around you, let's go with nine homes.

Ed Menken of 6341 144<sup>th</sup> Avenue said you asked for comments after you guys vote, how does that make sense? Steele can speak but I had no chance to defend my property. Why not bag it and let everyone go home. Cook said you know that this was not the first meeting. Menken said is different when a project is in your neighborhood and now it isn't harmonious. Slikkers said he lives six miles away from the project site.

Lori Menken of 6341 144<sup>th</sup> Avenue said as far as the odor goes, farms smell we know that but it isn't for that long, a day or two. If the composting odor lasts a week or a month, where do we go to have something done about it? Cook responded that a call would have to be made to the Township. Menken added that residents are concerned about a dumpster next to their lot and we have a dump in the back of ours.

Linda De Boer of 144<sup>th</sup> Avenue said now that you passed this and if it does smell what do we do? Cook responded a call must be made to the Township and Howell advised to send an email, too. Meshkin noted that he would also provide the right contact information for the DEQ office as they will have to address the issues at the site.

Lisa Cruz of 4705 Cardinal Lane asked when the project is tabled, will the developer come back with an updated plant and in a month from now there will be another meeting to review it and see the changes? What kind of control do you have over what they are developing? Meshkin said it depends on what they come to us with; it must be within the zoning ordinances. You can check with the Township office on any new information as it is always available for public viewing and the office is open weekdays from 7:30am – 5:00pm. Cruz said if they come back with 25 units can that happen? Meshkin said it will have to be reviewed for compliance. The Planning Commission has to balance the rights of the residents and the developer to what is dictated by the law.

#### ARTICLE VI. ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Becksvoort and seconded by Howell to adjourn the meeting at 9:48pm. Chairman Cook called for a vote on the motion. UNANIMOUS DECISION – MOTION APPROVED**