

**Present:** Shaarda, DeHaan, Dykstra, Keppel, Larabel, Webster, Woltjer  
**Absent w/ notice:** none

**UNAPPROVED  
MINUTES**

**Innovation:** Keppel  
**Planner:** Ransford: gregory.ransford@gmail.com, phone 638-1240

**Approval of Minutes** Webster/Dykstra made motion to approve the minutes of 3/20/12 as presented. Carried

**Approve the Agenda:** DeHaan/Webster made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Carried

**Public Comment:** (Limited to 3 Minutes)

**L. Ocobock**  
**2294 Byron Rd.** I did not realize that the township was billing Gail Altman for the time/material the township incurred because of her application for change on Sec. 3.20A and Sec. 6.5. There are 21 co-applicants and we have never received information that we have been requesting from the township. She was working on behalf of all of us and based on all the leg work that she did we feel she should have been charging the township rather than the other way around. Can you tell me what the application fee goes for? Carried

**G. Altman** When it came time for printing the application, I was unable to get all 21 co-applicants on the printed document. I was the one singled out and at times I felt harassed. I would suggest that this application is a one size fits all and is inappropriate for all the different options requiring an application. I would suggest that this is changed and there be different applications based on what is being applied for.

**J. Dykstra** I would like to respond to that. As a PC we are in the process of updating our master plan. A change in that master plan would have precipitated a change to the zoning ordinances. It was your desire to seek immediate action the caused you to initiate your application. Generally, changes occur at no cost the an applicant when someone else does it such as a developer. Had you waited it probably would have been changed as part of the master plan.

**T. Larabel** A master plan triggers zoning ordinance changes. You elected to jump start the process by making your application. Fees for consulting by a third party do get charged back to the applicant and these fees are set by a fee schedule that is established by the board of trustees.

**L. Ocobock** Then as one of the 21 co-applicants, we all should all be paying a portion of the application. Why can't I get a copy of the bill when I am part of the bill. There were other people that were not even on the application that had that information regarding cost that I heard at the board meeting. Who's leaking this information from the township office. Why won't our township be accountable and be an open book. We have been continually harassed and I clearly will take more initiative to be

informed of township business in the future.

**R. Koroleski**

Jeff you said it best, this all got changed when we revised the master plan the last time and you took away my rights as a land owner. I am accountable in my own business and why won't our township be accountable and be an open book. I also intend to take a more active role my own community.

## **New Business**

### **1) Site Plans - DC Storage 4975 40th Ave., Final Development Plan**

**Planner**

The history related to this request includes a 2006 preliminary PD approval to construct an office. There was an error in not submitting the final plan and the township issuing the applicant a building permit without a final development review. The zoning ordinance does not include a time frame in which the final development must be submitted so the applicant is submitting the attached plan at this time. The proposal before us has three Phases with the first completed in 2018, the second completed in 2030 and the third completed in 2057. I believe it would not be appropriate planning to permit a plan to be constructed over a 45 year period without any oversight in relation to changing conditions. Additionally, Sec. 19.4 of the PD allows the township board to waive certain requirements based on recommendations from the PC and given that the setback was provided during the preliminary plan in 2006 we would assume that the PC appears to intend to waive.

**T. Underhill**

I am accompanied tonight by Doug Veltema and I would attempt to better define the timing of our phases in light of the economics of the past three years. We would be willing to combine Phases 1 and 2 and we would construct a building per year. This would mean seven years for Phases 1 & 2. If the applicant would continue to follow this plan as set forth, and PC could accept not meeting again until we would work our way across Ransom.

## **PC Discussion**

**J. Keppel**

With the general economic down turn, it is understandable that this business would have been impacted by either limited purchasing of RV's or the desire not to incur the cost of storage.

**D. Veltema**

We now see this business picking up. We will be building a climate controlled building this summer. When people spend 300-400,000 dollars on a RV they want appropriate storage.

**T. Larabel**

There is a Consumers Power strip which is owned by CP. We need to note in our approval that this is treated as an easement rather than free title. Approval is only needed when there is construction of vertical bldgs.

**J. Dykstra**

What are we doing here tonight with regard to the setback? Does the PC have approval without the ZBA?

<b>Planner</b>	The PC has authority within our language to approve this setback as part of a PD.
<b>T. Larabel</b>	I like the way your business looks at this time and I would like to keep it remain as indoor storage with no RV's on the outside open property.
<b>D. Veltema</b>	We now have the second generation in the business and have a desire to maintain our current standard.
<b>C. Webster</b>	I like the way it has been set up, however I am hesitant with 45 years. If we could move Phase 2 to phase 1 and phase 3 would become 2, then this would be a 7 year project. I am more comfortable with that plan.
<b>T. Underhill</b>	If we have the market we would we build them immediately! If we are still required to come back for the piece north of ransom, we can do that.
<b>T. Larabel</b>	I like the 10 year period. After 10 years we would review at that time.
<b>Motion to Approve</b>	DeHaan/ Webster made the following motion: 1) Amend the plan to combine Phases 1 and 2 to Phase 1 thus ending in 2022. 2) Complete Phase 2 by 2042 and return for construction approval in the year 2022 only if phase 2 has not commenced prior to the year 2022. 3) Maintain indoor storage <u>only</u> . 4) Waive the setbacks to the west and north property lines for the triangular shaped piece of the project just south of the Consumer's easement. It was noted by the PC that this waiver was due to the property belonging to Consumers. 5) Affirm that the waiver of Sec. 19.4 in Phase 1 for the rear yard setback was approved. 6) The applicant completes final approval per Sec. 19.14 with Ottawa County and the Township board per approved PD site plan conditions as set forth. Carried

## 2) Village of Jamestown Chapter

<b>T. Larabel</b>	This is a new chapter for the Master Plan as was previously discussed by our Planner.
<b>Planner</b>	The intent of this chapter is to separate the village of Jamestown because of its unique characteristics. Much of the language repeats itself because it provides the same recreational and/or commercial opportunities as other areas. The goal being to allow for uniform frontage along the road and having connector spaces with design incentives.
<b>J. Dykstra</b>	We originally look at the village just as we looked at the overlay along 32nd Avenue. Rockford did an awesome job with their overlay with the buildings closer to road and parking in the rear. I like the look of the village and would hope that we could maintain that here in Jamestown as well.
<b>T. Larabel</b>	I like it as well and suggest that we would preserve existing buildings where possible. Is there some way that we can do this with language?



**Planner** We can look further into what language would have to be there to prevent deconstruction.

**T. Larabel** Would this be with form based codes?

**Planner** There are pure 100% form based code where you won't care what was in the building just how the outside looks.

**T. Larabel** It looks like we are in agreement that this chapter is good as written.

**Old Business** **Residential Chapter**

**T. Larabel** It looks like our revisions on the third and fourth strategy have been corrected.

**Planner** The PC tackled this during our March meeting. One thing that we wanted to look at was the 2010 census data and you will see that Allendale Township has been substituted for Holland Township as that shows the most accelerated growth. You should also note that the expected population growth is actually slower than our current Master Plan even with the rate of growth remaining at a high percent.

**PC Discussion** This final revised Chapter reflects our discussion of last month well.

**Extended public comments regarding Agenda Items (3 minutes)**

**G. Altman** The architectural style - would that be determined by PC?  
**2724 Adams**

**Planner** You could define the desired style within the master plan and then we would jump to writing ordinances where it would be enforceable.

**Correspondence** None

**PC Comments** K. DeHaan would like to see our applications reviewed and separated as needed.

**Motion to Adjourn** Dykstra/Shaarda motion to adjourn 8:05 PM Carried

**Minutes submitted by Norma Shaarda, Sec.**