

MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 1, 2009  
REVISED

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

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

Members absent: LaMourie

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

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Motion by** Ralya supported by Ransford to approve the minutes of the April 20, 2009 meeting. **Which motion carried.**

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Redick mentioned a couple of flyers from MTA and Michigan Planner.

VI. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

None.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Site Plan Pre-Application Review – Buchanan Beach Area Site Condominium

Waterman gave an overview of his memo dated 5/26/09. There were no questions from the members to Waterman.

Mr. Todd Stuive of Exxel Engineering (in partnership with David Bos) is requesting an optional preliminary site plan review by the Planning Commission for a proposed site condominium development on the vacant property near the Buchanan Beach access. The purpose of this request is so that the applicant may gain insight and direction from the Planning Commissioners on the development plan.

Bos noted that they were approached by Merritt Lane to develop on their behalf.

They wanted to keep it low density with 17 sites and protect the topographical features. Their goal is to have each site not less than one (1) acre in size. There will be virtually no cuts or fills and the public water main will be looped in the easement area.

They are proposing to create a foot path towards Beach Road that would give access to the beach at Christian Reformed Conference Grounds.

The entrance off Buchanan will be made wider to protect the neighbor to the east. Beach Road is only 33 feet, not 66 feet. They are considering closing the road. Between sites 2 and 4, they are proposing to keep it a private drive and should be able to access sites 3 and 4 without having to bulldoze.

Two (2) of the existing lots in this subdivision are non-conforming because the existing structures are too close the lot lines. Stuive and Bos added 50 feet and 10 feet respectively to these properties to make them conforming.

Comments and concerns from commissioners to Stuive and Bos:

1. Is Blue Water Drive a public road?
2. Is there a turn around for Beach and Blue Water Drive?
3. Concerned about traffic if Beach were to be closed.
4. Will the MDEQ require a critical dune permit?
5. The easement is already servicing sites 3 & 4 so why does site 3 need an access?
6. Private road is servicing two (2) sites, so will they need a variance?
7. The road is not maintained by the OCRC?
8. What was the rationale for proposing this as a site condominium design?
9. Sites 14-17 will be accessing Blue Water Trail?
10. Commissioners would like to see restrictive covenants pertaining to lots 1, 2, 3, 7-13 requiring no driveways out the backside of these sites.
11. Do sites 7 & 8 have dry easement access to lake?
12. Are the two (2) existing homeowners OK with this?
13. Need to be more specific on the buffer and foliage.
14. Note: Christian Reformed Conference Grounds have had many neighbors upset about the campground with the smoke problems.
15. Where does site 1 access?
16. Does site 17 need to pick an access?
17. Sites 7 & 8 only have a ten (10) feet wide access between them? Will this be a non-motorized access? Should we restrict ATVs to the bylaws?
18. What about storm water removal?
19. Because this property butts up to the Christian Reformed Conference Grounds off of Beach Road, you may want to consider some type of buffer (i.e. fence, visual screen) and have the pathway clearly marked.
20. What are you proposing for street lighting?

Responses to comments from Stuive and Bos to committee members:

1. Yes, and its 66 feet.
2. Discussion with Waterman and OCRC concluded that Beach is only 33 feet (i.e. non-conforming) so the proposal is to vacate Beach and create a cul-de-sac / roundabout at Blue Water Drive.
3. We are only proposing to add one (1) more site onto Blue Water Drive and only one (1) of the properties is a year round resident.
4. No, its outside of the critical dune line.
5. The rationale is that it's a private drive and they would like to put the house in the middle of the lot since they're already doing this for site 4.
6. Bultje and Waterman noted that they would have to get approval from the Board because it's a private road off of a private road.
7. That's correct.
8. Stuive and Bos wanted association control and privacy. They wanted to put good rules / regulations up front with the association for more flexibility.
9. No.
10. We can do that.
11. They have access from Buchanan Road.
12. Yes.
13. There isn't a lot of foliage. We may need to disturb and then re-vegetate but would be maintained within an allotted amount of time.
14. Thanks for the information.
15. Sites 1-3 only have access to the private road.
16. It would access Blue Water Drive as part of the cul-de-sac.
17. Absolutely a non-motorized access.
18. It's a sandy area with low impact. We are meeting with the Drain Commission next and are proposing infiltration back into the ground.
19. We will look into that.
20. We are working on proposed street lights.

Comments and concerns from commissioners to Waterman and Bultje:

1. Has the Board adopted a policy for requiring dry sewer for new developments?
2. Blue Water Drive is a presently a gravel road. Will it stay that way? If the property owners want Blue Water Drive paved someday, who pays for that?

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. There is some language for subdivisions, which could be used for site condominiums, in 5.4 sanitary sewer. The property owners along 152<sup>nd</sup> have to hook up within the next 18 months due to the Bignell Ridge project. Waterman will talk to VerBerkmoes about sewer questions.
2. For now, Blue Water Road will remain a gravel road. If it were to become paved, GHT could use a special assessment and would probably not pay the entire 100% of the project. Bos stated that there is a high likelihood that sites

14-17 may be purchased by existing residents and they would like Blue Water Road to remain gravel.

B. New Planning Commission Bylaws and Rules

Bultje gave an overview of his memo dated April 7, 2009. He noted that any capital improvements would be approved by the Board and not the Planning Commission. Also, the Planning Commission could potentially have some on the committee that is not a resident of GHT.

Comments and concerns from committee members to Bultje and Waterman:

1. Section 2.3 – Attendance – Need to change wording about unexcused absences.
2. Section 3.4.G.1 – Need to change wording about a relative being involved.
3. Section 3.4.G.3 – Need to replace the last word from “and” to “or”.
4. Section 3.4.I – Commissioners would like to strike this section from the bylaws.
5. Section 3.6 – Public Hearings – Need to move “E” before “C” and revise the wording.
6. Section 3.8.B – Mandatory Duties – The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should be stricken from this section of the bylaws.

Responses to comments from Waterman and Bultje to committee members:

1. Section 2.3 – Attendance – Last sentence should read as follows: Three (3) unexcused absences or six (6) total absences of a member from Planning Commission meetings during any twelve month period shall be reported to the Township Board and may be “cause” for that Board’s removal of the member.
2. Section 3.4.G.1 – Will replace “is involved in any request for which the Planning Commission is asked to make a decision” with “is an applicant or is formally associated with an applicant before the Planning Commission”.
3. Section 3.4.G.3 – Will change the last work to “or”.
4. Section 3.4.I – Will be stricken from the bylaws.
5. Section 3.6 – Public Hearings – Change the wording as follows:
  - C. Township Staff/Planner/Engineer/other consultants present their report and recommendation.
  - D. Applicant presents the main points of the application.
  - E. Persons wishing to speak during the public hearing are recognized.
6. Section 3.8.B – Mandatory Duties – Will be stricken from the bylaws.

**Motion by French and supported by Williams to approve the bylaws as amended. Which motion carried.**

X. REPORTS

- A. Attorney Report.  
None.

A. Staff Report.

Waterman thanked the committee members for attending the joint meeting with the Board on May 26, 2009 concerning the TND presentation. He noted that it was approved for distribution without the round about concept.

Waterman also noted that the Ordinance Review Committee would be meeting in June to review the list of ordinance amendments (i.e. overlay district, lake front lots, etc.)

B. Other

None.

XI. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by** Worthington and supported by Williams to adjourn the meeting. **Which motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi DeVerney  
Recording Secretary