

MEETING MINUTES  
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
JULY 6, 2015

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

Members present: LaMourie, Kieft, Robertson, Taylor, Reenders, Gignac and Wilson

Members absent: Kantrovich

Also present: Fedewa and Attorney Bultje

**Without objection**, LaMourie instructed Fedewa to record the minutes.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Without objection**, the minutes of the June 24, 2015 special meeting were approved.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Tim Pokorski – Wagenmaker Rezoning Application

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS ONLY – None

VII. PUBLIC HEARING – Rezoning application – Wagenmaker from AG to R-2

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated July 2<sup>nd</sup>.

LaMourie opened the Public Hearing at 7:34 p.m.

The applicant, Robert Wagenmaker, was not present to summarize the application or answer questions.

Michael Campbell – 15240 Steeplechase Court

- Questioned what type of development could be permitted on this parcel if the rezoning application is approved.
- Favorable to the existing woodland that provides a buffer between his lot and the subject property.

- Questions regarding the applicants' ability to acquire a private easement to gain access to sanitary sewer.

Sondra Workman – 15248 Steeplechase Court

- Favorable to the existing woodland that provides a buffer between her lot and the subject property.
- Questions regarding the applicants' ability to acquire a private easement to gain access to sanitary sewer.

LaMourie closed the Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS – Rezoning application – Wagenmaker from AG to R-2

The Rezoning application was discussed by Commissioners and focused on:

- Questions regarding when a property owner vs. developer is required to connect to sanitary sewer.

**Motion** by Robertson, supported by Gignac, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Robert Wakenmaker rezoning application of parcel 70-07-14-200-017 from Agricultural (AG) to R-2 Single Family Residential based on the application meeting applicable rezoning requirements and standards of the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, Master Plan, and Future Land Use Map. **Which motion carried.**

IX. PUBLIC HEARING – PUD application – Speedway & North Star Commercial

Wilson recused himself due to a conflict of interest – represents North Star Commercial as the Phase II developer of the PUD application.

Fedewa provided an overview through a memorandum dated July 2<sup>nd</sup>.

LaMourie opened the Public Hearing at 7:55 p.m.

The developers, among others, that were present include: Michael Bergman (Speedway), Christopher Schrank (exp US Services Inc., Engineer for Speedway), Steve Wilson (North Star Commercial), and Matt Phares (Nederveld, Engineer for North Star Commercial).

Christopher Schrank provided a summary of the project development, and described the departures requested by the applicants.

LaMourie closed the Public Hearing at 8:06 p.m.

X. OLD BUSINESS – PUD application – Speedway & North Star Commercial

The PUD application was discussed by Commissioners and focused on:

- Requested Departure No. 1 – Discussion: Increased number of parking spaces.
  - Reviewed parking requirements of US-31 Overlay Zone vs. Chapter 24 parking schedule vs. Speedway parking study.
  - Options for parking lot deferment (banking).
  - Seasonal nature of the Township influences the number of parking spaces needed (*i.e., more in summer, less in winter*).
  - If certain parking spaces were deferred there is a concern that potential overflow vehicles will park on the undeveloped Phase II section of the PUD. This is a sensitive landscape and it is possible the situation could lead to pollution.
- Requested Departure No. 1 – Findings:
  - The Commission finds the combination of the parking study provided by the applicant, plus the possibility of disrupting the sensitive landscape if certain spaces were deferred does meet the requirements set forth in Section 15A.10.10 of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore the Planning Commission is able to justify the requested 28 parking spaces.
  - **The Planning Commission notes that only verbal approval was given. No motions were made or adopted to recommend the Township Board approve the project and departures. Furthermore, the Township Board is the body granted authority to formally approve, or deny, the PUD and/or requested departures.**
- Requested Departure No. 2 – Discussion: Increased height of fueling canopies.
  - The FHWA and MDOT require a 14 foot vertical clearance for overhead structures (*i.e., bridges*).
  - Section 20.03.2.H of the Zoning Ordinance states the *canopy roof* shall not exceed 14 feet, which may create a circumstance where 14 feet of vertical clearance cannot be met. The Speedway canopy roof has a 4 foot depth, which would only permit 10 feet of vertical clearance if the Ordinance were strictly adhered to.
  - The increased height of the canopy accommodates the corbels found on the brick support columns. The drive aisle/vertical clearance is 14 feet from the driving surface to the corbel projection. Lowering the canopy height would result in the elimination of the corbels.

- Requested Departure No. 2 – Findings:
  - The Commission finds the statement of purpose for the Overlay Zone (*Section 15A.01*) is to, “provide architectural and site design standards that are more demanding than required elsewhere in the Township in order to promote harmonious development and complement the natural characteristics in the western sections of the Township.” The spirit and emphasis of this Chapter is aesthetics, therefore, the Commission finds the corbels should be kept, which in turn justifies the request for the increased canopy height of 20’6”.
  - The Commission requested the applicants considering decreasing the canopy roof depth to lower the overall height of the canopies, so the dormers on the main building are more visible.
  - **The Planning Commission notes that only verbal approval was given. No motions were made or adopted to recommend the Township Board approve the project and departures. Furthermore, the Township Board is the body granted authority to formally approve, or deny, the PUD and/or requested departures.**
  
- Requested Departure No. 3 – Increased size and height of ground sign.
  - Applicant preferred to have a 72 square foot freestanding sign 20 feet in height at the corner of US-31 and Hayes Street. However, due to the wetland location that is not possible.
  - Applicants purpose is to ensure motorists on US-31 are able to clearly see the gasoline prices, which is accomplished by a larger sign.
  
- Requested Departure No. 3 – Findings:
  - The Commission finds the wetland location precluded the applicant from maximizing the signage that is permitted under Section 24.13 of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested size is commensurate with a freestanding sign, the proposed location is setback farther than required, and the request exceeds the requirements of the Clear Vision Ordinance. Based on these conditions, the Commission is able to justify the requested departure.
  - **The Planning Commission notes that only verbal approval was given. No motions were made or adopted to recommend the Township Board approve the project and departures. Furthermore, the Township Board is the body granted authority to formally approve, or deny, the PUD and/or requested departures.**
  
- Requested Departure No. 4 – Modification and additional manual message board:

- Applicant requests a 40 square foot manual message board on the front and rear walls of the main building. Strict compliance with Section 24.12.12 of the Zoning Ordinance only permits a message board to comprise 25% of a wall sign (*maximum of 12 square feet*), and only one message board is permitted per lot.
- Aside from the requested message boards, the applicant does not propose any wall signs (*which typically include logos and advertising copy*). Section 24.13 of the Zoning Ordinance permits one wall sign per street frontage that comprise up to 10% of the wall area. This site would permit three wall signs (*US-31, Hayes Street, and the proposed access road*).
- Applicants desire that the auto and commercial fueling customers are able to preview the “specials” offered within the convenience store by way of two manual message boards.
- Requested Departure No. 4 – Findings:
  - The Commission finds the request to modify the wall sign/manual message board composition and justify a second message board for the rear wall is reasonable and is able to justify the request, so long as no other wall signs are permitted.
  - Furthermore, the proposed configuration and design is significantly less than what is permitted by Chapter 24 of the Zoning Ordinance. This justification will ensure the aesthetics gained by the US-31 Overlay Zone are sustained because the three potential wall signs will not be allowed, and therefore, the building materials will remain visible.
  - **The Planning Commission notes that only verbal approval was given. No motions were made or adopted to recommend the Township Board approve the project and departures. Furthermore, the Township Board is the body granted authority to formally approve, or deny, the PUD and/or requested departures.**
- Information was presented to the Planning Commission that indicated the applicants had not supplied the Ottawa County Road Commission (OCRC) with either the final traffic impact study (TIS) or the current site plans. In summary, the items of concern identified by the Planning Commission, staff, the applicants, and OCRC are:
  - The design of the internal access drive at Hayes Street, particularly the width. The drawings must be revised to accommodate the circulation needs of large vehicles (*including the tankers that deliver fuel to the site*) that exit the Speedway site onto the access drive and proceed to exit the development onto Hayes Street.
  - The alignment of the PUD access drive and the movie theater must improve.
  - Three traffic impact scenarios have been identified:
    - Speedway + Phase II development (*draft TIS*)

- Speedway only (*final TIS*)
  - Speedway + additional patronage for the food items prepared on site (*may require a revised impact study*)
- Each traffic impact scenario warrants different improvements to Hayes Street, which range from restriping to add a center left turn lane; addition of a right turn lane; retiming of traffic signals; and driveway ingress/egress tapers.
- The traffic impact items identified are significant enough the Planning Commission determined it is not prepared to recommend approval to the Township Board.

**Motion** by Robertson, supported by Gignac, to table the PUD application pending further information from the Ottawa County Road Commission. **Which motion carried.**

XI. REPORTS

- A. Attorney Report – None
- B. Staff Report – None
- C. Other

- Robertson noted the build out analysis that will be prepared by the University of Michigan as part of the Resilient Master Plan update must be prudently reviewed to ensure the future development of the Township is carefully, and thoughtfully, planned.

XII. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY – None

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

**Without objection**, the meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



**Stacey Fedewa**  
Acting Recording Secretary