

MEETING MINUTES OF THE
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 15, 2010
REVISED

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Redick called the regular meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:32 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Members present: Taylor, LaMourie, French, Ralya, Redick, Ransford, Worthington, Zambetis, 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 French supported by Williams to approve the amended minutes of the March 1, 2010 meeting. **Which motion carried.**

V. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VI. BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Zoning Text Amendment – Keeping of Chickens

Waterman gave an overview of his memo dated March 8, 2010 and corresponding maps that were received by the commissioners.

Chairman Redick proposed alternative language to the commissioners for the keeping of chickens. The idea would be to prohibit chicken-keeping in most traditional subdivision or condominium developments, having a zoning that is R-2 or higher density (where there is reasonable expectation that this type of activity will not occur), but yet, subject to that prohibition, otherwise allow chicken-keeping on lots having a minimum area of $\frac{3}{4}$ acre.

Chairman Redick explained that this approach addresses the situation of having certain R-2 subdivisions that actually have some lots that are larger than $\frac{3}{4}$ acre, despite the 13,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area of the R-2 District. This way, if you're in a subdivision or condominium development that is based on R-2 zoning (or higher-

density zoning, such as R-3, R-3.5, etc.), one could not keep chickens in that same development, irrespective of actual lot size.

Waterman asked why we weren't including the R-1 District in the keeping of chickens. Chairman Redick stated that he intended to provide some flexibility and by not including R-1, it was a compromise to make the keeping of chickens more available to residents.

Commissioners suggested that they could revisit the keeping of chickens ordinance in the future if problems arise.

Zambetis stated that he felt the additional subdivision clause was too restrictive, and that the $\frac{3}{4}$ acre minimum lot size was sufficient. He stated that he did not believe this would be a concern, and that chickens are not a nuisance animal.

After discussion, the majority of the Commission concurred with the proposed alternative language. The following motion was then offered:

Motion by Chairman Redick and supported by Ralya to recommend to the Township Board approval of the proposed zoning text amendment relating to the keeping of chickens, as drafted (draft dated 3/8/10) with Section 4 revised as follows:

- 4. The keeping of chickens as an accessory use may be permitted in residential districts if authorized by the Zoning Administrator. In considering authorization for chickens, the Zoning Administrator shall require that all of the following requirements are met.**
 - A. The keeping of chickens shall not be permitted in any platted subdivision, or condominium or site condominium development that is zoned in the R-2, R-3, R-3.5, R-4 or R-5 District, or which is zoned in a residential Planned Unit Development District having a parallel plan based on the development density permitted by the R-2, R-3, R-3.5, R-4, or R-5 District. This prohibition shall not apply to lands within a Supervisor's Plat.**
 - B. Subject to the prohibition stated above in Section A, the minimum lot size for the keeping of chickens shall be three-quarter (3/4) acre (32,670 square feet).**

Roll call vote

Ayes: Taylor, LaMourie, French, Ralya, Redick, Ransford, Williams

Nays: Worthington, Zambetis

Which motion carried.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Nu-Union Credit Union – Site Plan Review

Citing a conflict of interest, Chairman Redick elected to abstain from the discussion and turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Ransford, noting that his firm has an interest in the owners of this property.

Waterman gave an overview of his memo dated March 9, 2010.

Questions and concerns were raised about the signs on the property. Waterman noted that one of the two free standing signs are non-conforming (only one is allowed per the ordinance) and that if one were moved as proposed, it would lose its grandfather status and could not be put back up.

The applicant responded that he would prefer to redesign the drive in this area so that he could maintain the existing sign. Attorney Bultje noted that this would be acceptable.

Questions and concerns were raised about the lighting on the property. Waterman stated that the current light fixtures are fully shielded, but the bulb wattage (in the parking lot) is presently too high. Nu-Union representatives would like to have the lights remain as they exist, arguing that Nu-Union would still be under the maximum allowable watts/square foot limitation. The Commissioners agreed that because the lighting was not being expanded in its non-conformity, it may remain without further modification.

Concerns were raised about the condition of approval language pertaining to closing the existing Robbins Road driveway in the future. Commissioners questioned “fully” implemented compared to “substantially” implemented. It was proposed that the language be revised to require if/when Whittaker Way is realigned in the future, Nu-Union would then have to come back to the township for site plan approval for their relocated drive. A note should be added to the site plan indicating that the current Robbins Road driveway is “temporary”.

Commissioners discussed Nu-Union’s landscape plan. It was agreed that additional plantings should be added on the berm in the parking lot and near the south west corner.

Commissioners discussed the access drive between Macatawa Bank and Nu-union. The Commissioners agreed that one way access is preferable to two-way after discussing the logistics of the site. They were also concerned about the possibility of traffic cutting through to get out to Robbins Road.

Lee Ott, Macatawa Bank representative, echoed his concerns with the cross access.

The Planning Commission concluded that the following changes to the proposed site plan would be necessary:

1. If non-conforming sign is to remain, Nu-Union will need to redesign the radius at the SW corner to meet the Fire/Rescue requirements.
2. Additional landscaping must be added per Section 20.13.6.
3. Parking at the south end should be changed to angle.
4. A note should be added on plan indicating that the existing Robbins Road driveway is to be relocated at some point in the future in the event that Whittaker Way is realigned.

Motion by LaMourie and supported by French to table the request until the requested changes are made. Which motion carried with Chairman Redick abstaining.

IX. REPORTS

A. Attorney Report
None.

B. Staff Report

Waterman noted that Grand Haven Club met with the Construction Board of Appeals for a variance to renew permits under the 2000 Building Code. The variance was approved. The tentative closing date is March 22, 2010. The project needs to be completed with 18 months, but the new owners are planning to complete in 2010.

C. Other

Congratulations to Ransford on his new son, Easton.

The April 5th meeting is going to be held on March 29th instead due to Spring Break.

X. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Ransford and supported by Williams to adjourn the meeting. Which motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi DeVerney
Recording Secretary