

ALLENDALE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
May 17, 2010

Members Present: TerHorst, Knoper, Smit, Rozema, Obetts, Underhill

Members Absent: Guzicki

Staff Present: Brummel

1. Meeting called to order at 7:30PM.
2. Approve the April 19, 2010 minutes.

Motion made to approve the April 19, 2010 meeting minute by TerHorst
Support by Underhill. Motion carried 6-0.

3. Public Hearings:
 - A. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to establish light and sound measurements for outdoor athletic and recreational facilities with lighting and loud speakers. Amendment to article 23.10.C.7.

Jerry Alkema from Allendale Township is her , he says currently the measurement is taken by the distance of the light from the lot-line. Spillage from the lights is not currently considered- changing the ordinance will help with not having light spillage.

Nelson Morren is wondering in what has caused this to be an issue? Shouldn't all these things be placed on a ballot and have the people in the township be able to vote on it, since these items will affect a lot of people.

Matthew Camp lives close to Grand Valley, and states that Copper Beach residents were having a drinking party, and there was nothing I could do about keeping my daughter away from it. Will this have to do with the college housing, and family subdivisions?

Mr. Alkema states that the township wants to not just have an arbitrary number of distances from the lot, which is what is in place right now. This would have to do with light spillage and light pollution. This text amendment would only apply to athletic fields and recreational facilities.

Brummel states that the current set back is 50ft, and you would have to double that if you want to add a loud speaker. This establishes what we would see acceptable in decibel reading for sound and foot candle for light, instead of just a set-back. We had an electrical engineer here to see what .3 foot candles is-

it's 50 ft away from the light post in the island of the parking lot. We have looked at the City of Grand Rapids has residential property adjoining an industrial property, and that's where we got our numbers.

Renee Hoekstra says that the ball games usually get done around 10:20. The township sign says the park is closed at dusk.

Motion made to recommend approval to the Allendale Charter Township Board the text amendment to Article 23 Subsection 23.10.C.7 as submitted. I believe the proposed text amendment, as drafted and submitted, creating light and sound levels at adjoining properties, is a much better approach than assuming a certain setback distance, as the current ordinance does, will satisfy.

I believe the proposal promotes the general welfare of the township citizens with a view to conserve property values, encourages an appropriate use of land, and is much more suitable for such particular uses than the current text language. Motion made by Smit. Support by Rozema. Motion carried 6-0.

- B. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Article 7 and as a Special Land Use approval allow for subsistent agricultural facilities.

Brummel states that Allendale citizens would like to be less restrictive in agricultural areas, things that wouldn't be allowed in residential zones. Once we allow agricultural uses in residential areas, we may lose our ability control those uses. The term subsistent agriculture means to be used for and an accessory for the owners that live on the land, not a commercial venture. He then reads the wording of the ordinance for the Planning Commission.

Dave Morren states that he's pleased that they are looking at this, to keep Allendale's agricultural integrity. Will this affect farming on R-1? Will people be able to sell what they grow on this property?

Faith Keegstra wonders if someone has less than 5 acres, why they can't have a garden- that is the way it reads.

Brummel states that there is a lot of residential farming going on already, it won't affect people who just want a garden for their families.

Gerald Gurink wonders why there is a limit to a certain amount of the property.

Brummel states that this just makes sure that the people don't build a huge building that overtakes the residential aspect.

Underhill states that he's hearing that this is a good idea; it is something that will be beneficial to the agricultural character of Allendale.

Motion made to table this so Mr. Brummel will have time to look at the issues from the Public Hearing and change some wording in the ordinance made by Knoper. Support by TerHorst. Motion carried 6-0.

C. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Article 3.

Brummel states that there are 7 amendments to Article 3, and most of the things we're dealing with are considered accessory structures.

~There are currently no restrictions on tree houses and similar structures.

There have been a few built in Allendale in front yards, and have been some complaints.

~The change for the 10ft from the property line for fencing is to help with dogs that are not friendly. It will help with children putting their hands into fences right on the lot line.

~There was no restriction on buildings for bus stops and there have been complaints. This will help keep them looking acceptable, and where they can be placed.

~There is a 15 ft setback for 48in high fences- this stays out of the 10ft of underground wiring, and the next 5 ft helps with not blocking the vision of people leaving the property.

~ This will help with trailers not being stored out in front yards of houses.

Dave Morren wonders what prompted these recommendations. Section 1, what will be regulated- cosmetics, will they need to be to code? I feel that the neighbors should try to figure things out themselves.

Brummel states that tree houses are currently not admitted at all. There is ambiguous language that could be seen as not being allowed at all. This just makes it so that we can regulate the location of the tree house, and it should be 100 sq. ft or less, then it wouldn't need a building permit.

Dave Morren states that with the fencing with 10ft setback, not everyone's dog is vicious. I feel that government should intervene when health and welfare are at risk. I have concerns with not allowing people to grow crops to feed their families. I feel that the by-laws of condos and associations should help keep these types of rules in place.

Matthew Camp wonders if we could not allow dangerous animals, instead of changing the fence lines.

Obetts states that it is very hard to determine what a dangerous animal is, and hard to enforce a rule like that.

Faith Keegstra states that the more regulations we have, the more money is spent trying to have people follow the rules. I feel that we should follow the less is more motto.

Sharon Morren states that they help people who have a hard time, and we would like to tell them that they should grow a garden. Now this is showing that we are going to restrict them from growing their gardens.

Gerald Geurink wonders about the bus shelter- it doesn't apply in the agricultural areas. Is it true that most of this doesn't apply to the grandfathered in people who used to be agricultural?

Brummel states that if someone wants to add one of these things, they would have to comply with these restrictions. It doesn't matter if they used to be agricultural, they are residential now.

Obetts states that we are not trying to add more rules for the township, we are trying to keep people safe. We have had these issues in front of us numerous times; we have not come across these lightly. We have been working on them a lot and we have labored over making sure this is what is right for the community.

Underhill states that he has some issues with these ordinances, but I feel that we should possibly take them one at a time and make sure they are what are right. I don't think that some of these issues have certain circumstances in mind. How are we going to be able to follow up on these issues if they aren't being followed?

Knoper states that we have looked at these issues over and over, and I feel that we have come up with a good document that will help the general public.

Motion made to recommend to the Allendale Charter Township Board the approval of the proposed text amendments to Article 3, Subsections 3.11.C.1.c., 3.11.C.1.d., 3.11.C.1.m., 3.11.C.2.c., 3.11.C.3., 3.11.C.3.b., and 3.11.C.3.f. as submitted. I believe the proposed amendments solve certain issues the planning commission and zoning enforcement officers have struggled with for quite some time and believe that these amendments are being made with reasonable consideration to the character of the township, encouraging the most appropriate use of land and to be in keeping with the general trend and character of population needs and community development. Motion made by Rozema. Support by TerHorst. Motion carried 5-1.

- D. Special Land Use request from Allendale Charter Township for the community park including a lighted ball field and parking lot.

Jerry Alkema is here to talk about the items being changed in the township park.
~With lighting field 3, it will help make it compliant with the new terms of the foot candles of light.

~With the parking lot, we don't think the detention pond will work, so we would like to do possibly porous pavement or something like that.

~The landscaping will change from the plan; the trees will be in the islands.

~There will be handicapped parking somewhere; we just don't know where they would be best located.

~There will be a pickle ball court located in the tennis courts also.

~There will be a splash pad in the lawn area by the picnic area.

Obetts reads the standards of 20.06 for the Planning Commission and public.

Rozema wonders about the hours of operation, how many kids will be allowed in it at one time, non-potty-trained kids being in the splash pad...

Brummel states that the Board will possibly need to put some regulations into place with the management of the splash pad. The hours of operation could be an issue with 20.06, and if it is, we need to address that. Staff could be empowered with the authority for the drainage commission, parking lots complying, and photometric plan for the foot candles with lighting, and the landscaping.

Motion made to approve the proposed improvements of the park, with Staff making sure the current/future ordinances with lighting, parking, landscaping, and storm-water retention meets the standards made by Underhill. Support by Smit. Motion carried 6-0.

4. Site Plan review:

A. Jemco Logics Final Site Plan

Joe Grochowalski states that there is not final resolution on either issue that we left off with last time.

~There were some things that the road commission has reviewed and they approved the two drives; they're just waiting for us to submit the permit.

~We have enough room in the pond to make the storm water retention work, but we still have to submit the plans to the Ottawa County Drain Commission and get approved.

~There are some discrepancies between the two plans because we have changed some items and they didn't show up on both of them.

~There are some triangles that were requested to be curbed landscaped areas- I would request that we just stripe them out.

~There will be underground irrigation on all lawn areas- we can add landscaped areas if needed.

~We can move the sheds to 5 ft off the property lines.

~The sign will go 5ft to the east, and the spillway will go 5ft to the west- so that the water never pools at the bottom of the sign.

Underhill wonders if we are content to have Phil address these items? There are a lot of issues that have already been addressed- I would personally be comfortable with it.

Brummel states that he is comfortable with doing that.

Motion made to approve the plan numbered C1.01, revised May 13, 2010 and landscape drawing L-1 based on applicant meeting proposed changes in the Staff report by Underhill. Support by Rozema. Motion carried 6-0.

5. New Business:

A. Minor changes made to Hidden Forest PUD.

Brummel states that they would like to propose 4 new spruce trees on the back of the each property.

Josh Grann- would like the no-disturb zone to be set aside, and add the 4 blue spruce per lot.

Brummel states that they would be able to add accessory buildings and things like that in the no-disturb area if they plant 4 spruce trees at the rear of their properties.

Motion made to consider this a minor change and further allow 4, 6ft tall blue spruce per lot in exchange for the no-disturb zone by Underhill. Support by Rozema. Motion carried 6-0.

6. Old Business:

A. Continued discussion on the Master Plan.

1. Future Land Use Plan in particular the footprint of the University village and the possibility of an overlay zoning.

Brummel states that the language is fuzzy about the lines of the University Village. I think it makes more sense to look at what we should be doing horizontally, not vertically. Should the University Village line include east of 52nd St, and south of M-45? Would we take it all the way to Pierce, where would the transition be made? We maybe need to add some language in there to state that they are transition areas, not hard lines. These are things that should be looked at and discussed to figure out what we should do.

7. Township Board Report. (Ken- nothing to report)

8. Public concerns and comments concerning items not on the agenda.

9. Meeting adjourned at 10:06

The next meeting is on June 21, 2010 at 7:30 PM.