

MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MARCH 16, 2009  
REVISED

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Redick called the regular meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:33 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

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

Members absent: None

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

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

V. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VI. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Wind Energy Turbine Ordinance

Waterman gave an overview of the changes that were made to the proposed ordinance.

The Public Hearing on Wind Energy Turbines was opened at 7:43p.m.

Joanne Marcetti (13648 Meadowbrook Lane) made the following comments:

Pg.7 – According to the proposed ordinance, the Shadow Flicker on a building should not exceed thirty (30) hours per year. How do you plan to prove a violation? And what would the penalty be?

Pg.8 – Item 5 – Noise. Day and night, these WET's are going to be making noise in subdivisions continuously. Does GHT want this?

Pg.9 – Item b – Lighting. What kind of lighting and by whose standard? And what's reasonable?

Pg.10 – Quantity allowed. Who's rationale for this standard concerning within 2.5 acres of land?

Pg.11-12 – Decommissioning. Marcetti states that two (2) years is too long and would like it changed to one (1) year instead.

Pg.15 – Quantity of WET's. Marcetti noted that a person with an R-1 lot could potentially have three (3) SSMWETs **and** one (1) STMWET. The quality of life is what your property is worth. Having a STMWET could destroy the entire subdivision. As far as procedural, when governing units make ordinances, they will be grandfathered in. When is the last time you stood under or heard a wind energy turbine?

Pam Park (11681 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave.) observed 240 wind generators in Illinois and couldn't hear anything. It was a beautiful sight and they were supplying 20,000 homes and noise didn't seem to be an issue.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:54p.m.

## VIII. OLD BUSINESS

### A. Proposed Wind Energy Turbine Ordinance – Discussion on Revised Version & Public Hearing Comments

Commissioners and Waterman addressed the concerns from the Public Hearing. Waterman stated that the technology is new to everyone and that is why we had Mark Knudsen (Ottawa County) come and give a presentation.

Pg.7 – Shadow Flicker.

Waterman noted that the determination of a shadow flicker is made by computer modeling systems which we would require up front. If violations occur, they will be processed like any other violation with the owner of the commercial or residential property being held responsible.

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

1. Shadow flickers are almost non-existent until you get to commercial (large WETs). What happens when vacant lots become occupied?
2. Possibly, write in more flexibility so that any occupied building or any lot of record within so many feet is able to have one.

Pg.8 – Noise (65 & 55 decibels)

Waterman noted that noise is restricted to noise ordinance levels.

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

1. If you had 20-30 mph wind, the noise is proportional to the wind. If the wind slows down, the turbine slows down and the noise decreases. Are there any sound requirements?

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. No, noise is not a safety standard.
2. Original ordinance from Ottawa County had decibels included. We decided to reference our current noise ordinance, which is more restrictive.

Pg.9b – Lighting

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

1. There is no lighting approved except to the extent by the FAA.

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. Write out more unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission.

Pg.10 – 1 STMWET allowed within 2 ½ acres.

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

1. 2 ½ acre lots allow RR which has a minimum lot width of 150’.
2. What about consideration for undeveloped property?

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. 1 STMWET allowed within 2 ½ acres came from Ottawa County and the lot would need to be at least 300’ wide.
2. There can be 1 STMWET for every 2 ½ acres. In Condo and PUD areas, the PC should be able to approve having more within these areas because the people living there are the only ones seeing them.

Pg.11-12 – Decommissioning.

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

1. 12 months unused and 12 months to remove the WET is too long. Need to change to 6 and 6.
2. Does the sale of property start the process over?
3. Would a potential buyer know that? And is that the seller’s disclosure?

4. Can this be appealed by the land owner?

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. That was the wording from Ottawa County. Will change to 6 and 6.
2. No, it shouldn't start the process over.
3. Probably not, because violations have been sold in the past. We do record PUD agreements and we could do the same with WETs. If something is recorded and the STMWET is not working, that's a good indication that you have a problem.
4. There is a check and balance by way of the ZBA.

Pg.15 – Quantity of WETS.

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

1. 3 SSMWETs **or** 1 STMWET are allowed.
2. Is there a way to address the square footage of a home?
3. Because the pole is very expensive, roof mounted units seem more feasible.

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. The wording was changed at the last meeting from **and** to **or**.
2. We are trying to balance the ability to have WETs because we want people to be able to purchase them.
3. Socially acceptable to have either 3 **or** 1.

Public Comments have been addressed so Chairman Redick asked the commissioners if they had any other concerns.

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

1. The graphics are a good idea but the dimensional text seems small.
2. On Pg.10-7 and Pg.14-B, committee members would like the word "deck" inserted in both paragraphs.
3. On Pg.15-J, committee members would like to include the following: "unless specifically approved by the Planning Commission".

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. Staff will try to enlarge.
2. Staff will include the word "deck" in both paragraphs.
3. Staff will add "as special land use".

**Motion by Sheffield and supported by Ralya to table this agenda item until the next Planning Commission meeting on April 6, 2009. Which motion carried.**

## B. Continued discussion on the Robbins Road Sub Area Plan

Waterman gave a power point presentation proposing a Tradition Neighborhood Design (TND) which the township doesn't have. TND is not reflected in Chapter 8 of the Master Plan but more language inserted on TNDs for potential developers.

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

- Like the idea of a TND but private and public roads will be a concern with the Ottawa County Road Commission.
- Sleeping Bear Dunes has a TND with a one (1) lane road.
- Harbor Transit has a \$90,000 grant for 75% of the expansion into GHT.
- Allendale approved a TND but the Supervisor is no longer there.
- TND is primarily set up for families and kids.
- TND is a good marketing tool because it speaks toward vision and it's close to schools.
- TND is a good transition from office space and it's a good spot for it.
- Reluctant to go in the direction similar to the building by Jimmy Johns & Culvers in GH City.
- Some negative comments from committee members include: potential of noisy neighborhoods, sounding like propaganda, and not convinced there is a real market for TNDs.
- Is this TND consistent with the Master Plan?
- If we move forward, it seems like a good area and likes the idea of the Robbins Road corridor.

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

- Would like a main street feel but don't want to compete with downtown Grand Haven. Presently, there isn't a safe way along Robbins Road to get to schools.
- TNDs very popular because of the ability to walk to places and be closer to your neighbors.
- Public transportation is key.
- Current standpoint of OCRC, streets have to be public, otherwise it defeats the purpose of the TND.
- Marketing Robbins Road is the goal of both GHT and GH City (*i.e. reconstruction of curbs, sidewalks, greenbelt, landscape, etc.*)
- 1996 allowed anything and everything so whatever was put in; the language was put into place.
- Master Plan provides for many types of housing but we're more suburbanized. GHT allows for PUDs and Timberview Apartments is doing very well.
- Master Plan is ready and will need two (2) public hearings. Waterman is concerned that if the PC leaves the wording at "mixed use", GHT will get a variety of different building proposals.
- A corridor study needs to be done and reconstructing of Robbins Road within the next four (4) years.
- Waterman will draft some text and market data for TNDs.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

None.

X. REPORTS

A. Attorney Report.

None.

B. Staff Report.

Wal-Mart/Murphy Oil – PUD amendment. They are proposing a 4 X 7 storage building (*i.e. steel shed*). There are concerns of the aesthetics of the building so staff sent it back to the owners to dress it up.

C. Other

None.

XI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by** Ralya and supported by Williams to adjourn the meeting. **Which motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi DeVerney  
Recording Secretary