

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held
Wednesday, September 2, 2020**

Governor Whitmer's Executive Order 2020-75 provides temporary changes to the Open Meeting Act, allowing a meeting of a public body to be held electronically, including by telephonic conferencing or video conferencing, in a manner in which both the general public and the members of the public body may participate by electronic means.

Due to these Executive Orders, the following Planning Commission members were present via video conferencing: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Josiah Samy, Donna Ferguson and Richard VanderKlok. Mannette Minier, Zoning Administrator, and Rod Weersing, Assistant Superintendent, were also present via video conferencing, and 2 members of the public were also present in the audience via video conferencing.

Meeting called to order by Chairman Smit at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Josiah Samy,
Richard VanderKlok

Absent: None

Also present: Mannette Minier, Zoning Administrator

#200902-01 – Agenda for September 2, 2020

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Donna Ferguson, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Yeas: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Josiah Samy,
Richard VanderKlok

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#200902-02 – Minutes of the August 19, 2020 meeting

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Samy, to approve the minutes as presented.

Yeas: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Josiah Samy,
Richard VanderKlok

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#200902-03 – (PUD2003) Wesco Inc. (36th Ave./Baldwin PUD), is requesting preliminary (for this parcel only since the preliminary approval has expired and the rest of the site has already been developed) and final planned unit development approval for a vehicle service station and convenience store on P.P. # 70-14-17-100-024, located at 7661 36th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan. (NO public hearing)

Craig Gengler, 12033 James St., Driesenga and Associates Inc., represented the applicant and presented the request.

J.J. Westgate, Wesco, was also present.

The Zoning Administrator presented a [staff report](#).

Richard VanderKlok stated the following:

- The elevations and architectural compatibility were good.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- Although the sign would be higher than the Licari sign, it was acceptable.
- Landscaping should follow the requirement and if trees cannot be placed in the front yard due to the easement, the required number of trees should be placed in other areas on the site.
- He was concerned with the drive aisle widths and the flow of traffic based on safety issues. The plan should be redrawn with the correct width of drive aisles and the new drawing could be administratively approved.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated the following:

- The proposed building architecture was nice and there was an effort made to be consistent with the other buildings; however, the canopy was block with red, white and blue and it wasn't consistent.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- She agrees with the sign deviation but the sign should not be more than four feet in height, on top of the frame.
- The sign should not be bigger than the Licari sign to be consistent and fair.
- She agrees that the required number of trees should be placed somewhere on the site if not allowed to be in the front yard setback due to the easement.
- There is a serious issue with the drive aisles and being less than required presents a safety risk. No deviation should be granted to have the drive aisles less than required.

Josiah Samy stated the following:

- He was more in favor of have two colors rather than three and the blue color should be kept.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- The sign should be reduced and he recalled that Bricks had to do the same.
- This is a high traffic area.
- The sign should be reduced to four feet to be the same as the Licari sign.
- The required number of trees should be placed somewhere on the site if not allowed to be in the front yard setback due to the easement.
- The drive aisles should be redesigned and could be administratively approved.

Tim Smit stated the following:

- The architectural design was good and they needed the three colors because it was their brand.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- The sign should be smaller.
- The drive aisles should be redesigned to meet the minimum width.

- The required number of trees should be provided and they could work with the Zoning Administrator for placement.
- There are no bushes on the west side and should be added.

Donna Ferguson stated the following:

- She was excited to see Wesco come to the community.
- The architectural design was good because the colors of their brand were included and are important.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- The sign should be reduced.
- The drive aisles should be reworked to meet the minimum width.

Jessica Ulberg stated the following:

- She was excited to see Wesco come to the community as well.
- The architectural design was good because the colors of their brand were included and are important.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses.
- The sign should be reduced.
- Landscaping should be provided consistent with the required number of trees.
- The drive aisles should be reworked to meet the minimum width.

Tom Healy stated the following:

- The architecture fits sufficiently and their brand is a significant investment that should be maintained.
- Bricks does not have brand recognition.
- The canopy is okay and the character is okay.
- Being open 24 hours a day was okay to be consistent with other such businesses and the building is sufficiently set back from the residential area.
- The grade is different and the sign could be difficult to see; therefore, he understands the need for it to be a little taller.
- The sign should list the fuel prices rather than state there is a deli and pizzeria.
- The number of required trees should be maintained somewhere on the site and the Zoning Administrator could approve the locations.
- Only 15 parking spaces are needed and 27 are provided; therefore, there is a sufficient number to be able to be reduced.
- There is room on the lot to make adjustments for the landscaping.
- The northern side of the curbing could be moved south to increase the drive aisle width.
- He commented on the fuel truck circulation on the site.
- He agrees that the drive aisles should be redesigned to meet the minimum width requirement and the revised plan could be approved administratively.

Craig Gengler stated that they received a response from Consumers and they are unwilling to release the easement; however, they determined to plant the trees in the required front setback anyway and deal with any related issues in the future. He related the reasons the higher sign was needed. He discussed the drive aisle widths and the constraints they faced.

There was discussion about the circulation pattern and the sign height.

Josiah Samy suggest an alternate design for the sign and it was discussed. The applicant agreed to the redesign of the sign.

There was further discussion.

The chairman opened the floor to public comments. No one was present to make public comments at this time. The chairman closed the floor to public comments.

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Josiah Samy, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve the preliminary and final development plans dated 08-12-2020, and the application and narrative,

With the findings that:

- 1. The business could be open 24 hours a day.**
- 2. Trees shall be provided as required by the ordinance in regard to number, size and type.**
- 3. The architectural design, as presented, was acceptable.**
- 4. The sign itself, on top of the frame, can be no more than four feet in height.**
- 5. The plan shall be reconfigured to provide the minimum width required for all the drive aisles and the redesign may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. (Note, if any deviations are found to be necessary, the plan shall return to the Planning Commission for further review and for action.)**

based on the findings/determinations as follows:

- 1. The proposal is consistent with the Master Plan.**
- 2. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for pedestrian walkways.**
- 3. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for architecture.**
- 4. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for traffic.**
- 5. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for open space.**
- 6. The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for uses that are allowed.**
- 7. The proposal meets the standards of approval.**

Based on the further findings that:

- 1. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met:**
- 2. The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided, and**
- 3. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:**
 - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;**
 - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;**
 - c. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;**
 - d. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;**
 - e. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.**

- f. The deviations, regulatory modification from traditional district requirements, are approved through a finding by the Planning Commission that the deviation shall result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards.**

And with the following conditions:

- 1. A Storm Water Drain Permit (written approval by the Drain Commissioner's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to any approvals being granted for any parcel splits or property line adjustments.**
- 2. Utilities are to be coordinated with the DPW and Drain Commissioner's office.**
- 3. As per Sec. 22.11, a recorded PUD agreement shall be submitted to the Township prior the submission of a building permit application.**
- 4. Approved permits are required for all signs and all signs shall meet the approvals in the PUD plan or else meet the ordinance standards.**
- 5. All outstanding fees shall be paid prior to any further approvals being granted.**

It was noted that if the redesigned plan does not meet the stipulations in the motion for administrative approval, the plan shall return to the Planning Commission for further review and action.

It was also noted that this was a great operation and would be an asset to the community.

Yeas: Jessica Ulberg, Tim Smit, Tom Healy, Jeannine Bolhouse, Donna Ferguson, Josiah Samy, Richard VanderKlok

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#200902-04 – Public Comment

No one was present to make public comments at this time.

#200902-05 – Other Business

The Zoning Administrator presented a letter to the Planning Commission from Grand River Pediatric Dentistry and noted that Township staff has already responded to it.

#200902-06 – Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.