

MEETING MINUTES OF THE
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 2, 2009
REVISED

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Sheffield called the regular meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Members present: O'Neal, LaMourie, French, Ralya, Ransford, Worthington, Sheffield, Williams

Members absent: Redick

Also present: Community Development Director Waterman, Attorney Bultje and Recording Secretary DeVerney

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Williams supported by Worthington to approve the minutes of the February 2, 2009 meeting. **Which motion carried.**

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Waterman referenced a letter from FCB Solar in regards to the WET Ordinance.

VI. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING:

None.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Wind Energy Turbine Ordinance – Discussion on Revised Version

Waterman gave an overview of his memo dated February 20, 2009.

Comments and concerns from the committee members to Waterman and Bultje:

1. Under Section 21.10.3.J, are residents allowed to have both SSMWETs **and** STMWETs? Can this be clarified?
2. Will Meijer's six (6) small structured-mounted WETs (SSMWET) conflict with the Overlay District?
3. For roof mounted commercial WETS, are there guidelines to follow?
4. The AG District doesn't currently allow both small Structure-mounted WETs (SSMWET) and small Tower-mounted WETs (STMWET)? Can this be revised?
5. Three (3) SSMWETs on residential lots seems extreme.

6. Shouldn't WETs be allowed in the front yard because you're looking for the ultimate location?
7. Is the setback, under Section 21.10.3.G, for self-collapsing WETs large enough?
8. Who is qualified to determine if a WET will self-collapse properly? And is there any liability on the township?
9. Should large WETs be allowed, how high can they be?
10. Keep guy wires out? Consensus was to prohibit guy wires.
11. What about do-it-yourself-ers?
12. Does decommissioning include complete removable or should it be within 10%?
13. Can we specify that the WETs be a solid color?

Worthington stated that the PC needs to take a reasonable approach for first time approval. We can always revisit the ordinance at a later time because we don't want to allow too much, too early. We need to be more conservative on the front end.

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. SSMWET has a limit of 3 SSMWETs and 1 STMWET. If the resident wants more than 3 SSMWETs and 1 STMWET, they will have to ask for a variance from the ZBA. Since the language is not entirely clear, staff will add the "or" clarifier.
2. No, because they are reviewed as a PUD amendment and the site plan remains exactly the same.
3. Yes, under Section 20.10.3.J.
4. Yes, staff will revise accordingly.
5. No comment.
6. We specified rear yard only for a lot that has a structure. The PC may wish to include a setback requirement of 150' from the front lot line to address aesthetics.
7. 20' is the standard setback for self-collapsing WETs. If you enlarge the setback too much, you will restrict the ability for the residents to put any WET up.
8. A registered certificate from an engineer would qualify and due diligence is in place to ensure safety.
9. No maximum height for large WETs. The ordinance could be amended at a later date if there is a feasible proposal for large WETs.
10. Staff will revise accordingly.
11. They will still be required to follow UL standards, electrical standards, noise/vibration standards, and all other safety requirements and will need a building inspection for the foundation of the WET.
12. Waterman will consult with Mark Knudsen for input.
13. Staff will revise accordingly.

Jeff Fuller (FCB Solar) stated that areas such as Forest Park aren't really applicable for WETs. He noted that size of lots should be looked at and that the do-it-yourself-ers should show some type of engineering drawing.

Vice Chairman Sheffield stated that this ordinance need not go to the Ordinance Review Board for further discussion given the limited number of revisions. Waterman noted that there will be a public hearing for the Ordinance at the PC meeting on March 16, 2009.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion on Draft Version of the Robbins Road Sub Area Plan

Waterman gave an overview of his memo dated February 23, 2009. He noted that both Grand Haven City and GHT's Master Plan Committees were involved last fall in a walking tour of the Robbins Road Sub-Area along with a discussion period following. Paul VandenBerg and Bill Tysman were included in the process. The goal was to take both committees and start redesigning the Robbins Road Sub-Area while both communities are in the process of revising their Master Plans. The two (2) communities would like to establish commercial areas with some mixed use, mixed density residential incorporated.

Continued discussion at the next PC meeting on March 16, 2009.

X. REPORTS

A. Attorney Report.

None.

B. Staff Report.

None.

C. Other

None.

XI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by French and supported by Worthington to adjourn the meeting. **Which motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi DeVerney
Recording Secretary