ROBINSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
October 27, 2026

The regular meeting of the Robinson Township Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM. at the Robinson Township Hall.

Present	Absent
Shawn Martinie	Kathy Kuck
Bill Maschewske	
Phil Crum	
Steve Ambrose	
Lydia Brown	
Michelle Gillespie	

Also present were Township Attorney Ron Bultje, Zoning Administrator Luke Petsch, and thirteen members of the public. The attendance sheet is attached.

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Lydia Brown and seconded by Michelle Gillespie to approve the agenda of the October 27, 2026 meeting as written.
The motion carried unanimously with one member absent.

Adopting of Previous Minutes

A motion was made by Michelle Gillespie and seconded by Shawn Martinie to approve as written the minutes of the October 8, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.
The motion carried unanimously with one member absent.

Non-Commission Member Inquiries and Questions

Rhonda Mancia – Stated her husband owns a farm on 104th Ave. and she is interested in starting a wedding venue on it. Further discussion with Chairperson Martinie revealed the access to the approximately 30 acres was by private easement that also served residential properties. It was noted by the Planning Commission that this location may be problematic for a wedding venue based upon the criteria currently in the draft Zoning Ordinance text.

Reports and Communications

Steve Ambrose reported the Township Board had approved the Zoning Ordinance Map amendment for the Emerald Lake site from A-1 to M-1 to permit expansion of the current mining operation.

Announcements

Chairperson Martinie inquired regarding Township Attorney Bultje's schedule with Ottawa County. Township Attorney Bultje reported that his Ottawa County commitments did not conflict with Robinson Township Planning Commission meetings for November or December. Following December was unknown.

New Business

Public Hearing for the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Request from Allison Church to add Agritourism and Wedding Venues to the Agricultural Zoning District

As scheduled, the public hearing was held for the request from Allison Church for a Zoning Text Amendment to add Agritourism and Wedding Venues as uses in the Agricultural Zoning District. Chairperson Martinie gave an explanation of the rules of procedure for the public hearing and declared the public hearing open at 7:08 PM.

Ryan Church was present to represent the applicant, Allison Church.

At this time, copies were made of the current draft, number four, for interested persons attending. (A copy of draft four, along with the Memorandum from contracted Planner Gregory Ransford Regarding Allison Church (Evermore) Zoning Text Amendment Application – Fourth Revised Draft are attached.)

Comments were requested by Chairperson Martinie from the Planning Commission.

Bill Maschewske had the following comments and questions relative to the content of Revision 4 of the draft text and the directive the Planning Commission made at the September 22, 2026 Planning Commission meeting regarding revisions to Draft 3.

1. Section 6.3(F)(1) – Documentation regarding evidence that an applicant's property has been a working farm for at least the last 5 years was not included. The consensus of the Planning Commission agreed it should be included.

2. Section 6.3(F)(5) – Text was included showing preference for lantern lights for lighting and a reference to meeting the Outdoor Lighting requirements of Section 4.34 of the Zoning Ordinance. It is believed these requirements are incompatible with lantern lights. This issue will be investigated.

3. Section 6.3(F)(8) – This Section should reference Section 4.44 Signs regarding the Agricultural Sign.

4. Section 6.3(F)(16) – Question regarding chronological timing of the Planning Commission review and the termination of Agricultural Special Events if the Special Use is not renewed. The question was answered and no revisions are necessary.

5. Section 6.3(F)(18) – Suggested adding the following language since it was included in the Planning Commission direction from September 22, 2026: "The Agricultural Special Event must be owner-operated and not leased to another individual or entity to operate." The consensus of the Planning Commission agreed.

6. Section 6.3(F)(1) – Add the requirement for an existing agricultural building to be on the site for at least 5 years as requested at the September 22, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Item 1 above already added the requirement for the agricultural use on the property. The consensus of the Planning Commission agreed.

Steve Ambrose – He is concerned about the suitability of buildings from a safety perspective and meeting building code requirements.

Township Attorney Bultje – Noted that Section 6.3(F)(12) already requires compliance with the Building Code and that is all the Township can require in this regard. The consensus agreed that no changes were necessary.

At this time, Chairperson Martinie requested comments from the public.

Ryan Church – What documentation is required to show commercial agricultural activity on the parcel for five years and for the existence of the agricultural building for 5 years.

Township Attorney Bultje and Bill Maschewske – An affidavit by the applicant for the five- year period. The Township may require additional supporting information.

As a result of the above question, it was agreed by the Planning Commission to add the following wording to Section 6.3(F)(1): "Supportive evidence by signed affidavit and other evidence deemed necessary by the Township."

Robert Buist – Suggested a total of three wedding venues maximum for the Township.

Chairperson Martinie – Explained the issues associated with trying to limit the number of wedding venues.

Cody VandenBosch – Expressed concern about ingress/egress being permitted within the setback.

The Planning Commission agreed with the above concern and in response agreed to add the following or similar language as follows to Section 6.3(F)(15) – "Parking **and driveways are** prohibited within any required setback. Driveways are only permitted through the required front yard setback."

Jim Mancia – Noted his farm has an easement off 104th Ave. and it runs along the property line.

Jim Mancia – Further noted that the easement is quite long and has three dwellings on it. He also stated his agricultural parcel has no frontage on 104th Ave.

Chairperson Martinie – The easement for access may be problematic.

There were no further comments or questions from the Planning Commission or the public.

A motion was made by Michelle Gillespie and seconded by Lydia Brown to close the public hearing at 7:50 PM.
The motion carried unanimously with one member absent.

Chairperson Martinie noted that draft four regarding Agricultural Special Events would need further editing.

Detailed Site Plan Review for Cody and Kyle VandenBosch, 104th Ave. and M-45

A Detailed Site Plan had been received from Kyle and Cody VandenBosch for parcel no. 70-08-26-200-018 located at the South West corner of M-45 and 104th Ave. The parcel is zoned B-2 Commercial. The applicants are requesting to construct two 10,200 square foot multi-use buildings on the site.

Both Cody and Kyle VandenBosch were present in addition to Chris Gilbert of Holland Engineering to represent the application.

Chairperson Martinie – Questioned the lighting plan as it did not seem readable.

Bill Maschewske – Noted the Lighting Summary provided values that did not meet the requirements of Section 4.34 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Martinie requested the Planning Commission review the Site Plan relative to the required content in Section 31.7 of the Zoning Ordinance first. Content was found acceptable except as noted otherwise.

Bill Maschewske questioned the following.

1. Section 31.7(O) – Will there be any air conditioning units and will they have screening?

The applicants noted there would be A/C units, however they are not shown on the Site Plan. Additionally, modern units may be wall mounted and may not need screening.

2. Section 31.7(P) – The fact the picnic table(s) offered for the Civic Space can be moved is a concern.

The applicants agreed to make the table(s) permanently fastened to the concrete slab.

3. Section 31.7(R) Lighting – The proposed lighting plan does not quite comply with mandatory requirements in that the maximum of 10.0 foot- candles for the parking area is exceeded.

4. Should a condition be included regarding no dwelling units in compliance with the applicant's previous statements to the Planning Commission?

Township Attorney Bultje noted that since living units were not included in the Site Plan, they would not be allowed without the Site Plan revised and re-reviewed.

Chris Gilbert – They have shown space assigned for the required sidewalk in Section 31.8(B) and questioned if the sidewalk needs to be constructed at this time since it would be a sidewalk to nowhere.

Chairperson Martinie -- Noted the Zoning Ordinance states a sidewalk "shall" be required, therefore, the Planning Commission cannot waive the requirement.

A discussion followed regarding various means of providing relief for the applicants for sidewalks required in Section 31.8 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission was receptive to amending the Zoning Ordinance, as part of an ongoing Zoning Ordinance review following adoption of the latest Master Land Use Plan. An amendment could provide options for isolated commercial properties not within an Overlay District. For at least some isolated commercial properties, to construct the sidewalk at the time of Site Plan approval would not provide the anticipated benefit of connectivity. A contract could be considered that would require the space to be reserved for a sidewalk that could be required to be constructed at a later date as the Township develops. It was noted that Section 4.54 of the Zoning Ordinance already has an exception for sidewalks in developments not requiring a Site Plan. Township Attorney Bultje noted that these requirements are not inconsistent in that Section 4.54 applies in general and Section 31.8(B) applies only to projects requiring a Site Plan.

5. Section 31.7(AA) – No statement regarding the flood plain relative to the Site Plan.

The applicant noted the required text was included on Sheet V-101 of the Site Plan materials. The text was acceptable.

6. Chairperson Martinie – Noted there appeared to be no statement regarding the proposed projects impact upon existing infrastructure as required in Section 31.7(Y).

The applicants noted that a separate sheet was included that made the required statement. Chairperson Martinie found the sheet including the statement in the Preliminary Sketch Plan documents and this was acceptable.

Next to be reviewed was the Site Plan relative to the Standards in Section 31.8 of the Zoning Ordinance. Content was found acceptable except as noted below.

Chairperson Martinie stated that screening of the project on the South side of the parcel appeared minimal. Any trees for screening were mostly located on the adjacent parcel to the South. The Zoning Ordinance requires a 6 ft. tall fence or landscaping.

Kyle VandenBosch – He noted there were no lights or doors on the South side of the proposed buildings.

Chris Gilbert – Stated he was willing to talk to the neighbor to the South and see what they prefer.

Chairperson Martinie – Stated that a fence cuts the glare of headlights of vehicles entering the parcel. The bulk of the existing screening belongs to the neighbors.

Bill Maschewske comments.

1. Section 31.8(G), Applicants Sheet C-503 – What does it mean that topsoil and subsoil can be "wasted" outside of the roadways?

Chris Gilbert explained that it means it will be used for fill.

2. Section 31.8(K) – A/C units not shown in addition to possible screening for them.

3. Section 31.8(M) – Questioned if a water and sewer agreement would be required.
The answer is no per Township Attorney Bultje.

4. Section 31.8(N) – The sign that was shown on the Preliminary Sketch Plan could not be found.

Chris Gilbert – The sign has been deleted since the Preliminary Sketch Plan review. There will be no sign based upon the usage of the units.

Following discussion, it was agreed the applicants should address open issues found in the Site Plan for review prior to a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Township Board.

Old Business – None

Pay Bills

A motion was made by Lydia Brown and seconded by Shawn Martinie to pay salaries for the October 27, 2026 Planning Commission meeting (six members present, one member absent). The motion carried unanimously with one member absent.

Any and All Other Business That May Come Before the Board

An email inquiry from Contracted Planner Gregory Ransford regarding where MDOT ingress/egress requirements apply was discussed. It was agreed to discuss this issue in person with Planner Ransford at a future meeting.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Lydia Brown and seconded by Michelle Gillespie to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:10 PM.
The motion carried unanimously with one member absent.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Maschewske, Secretary
Robinson Township Planning Commission

Attachments:

- Attendance Sheet for the October 27, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting
- Memorandum and draft Zoning Amendment Text from Contracted Planner Gregory Ransford dated October 9, 2026 regarding Allison Church (Evermore) Zoning Text Amendment Application – Fourth Revised Draft
- Memorandum from Zoning Administrator Luke Petsch dated October 9, 2026 Regarding 104th Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive Final Site Plan Review.

SIGN IN SHEET
Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission
Tuesday, October 27, 2026 - 7:00 pm

PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE
JEFF Elzinga	
LORRIE POTTER	
ALAN BROWN	
Chris Gilbert	
CHRIS MARKATOS	

Fresh Coast Planning
Grand Haven, MI 49417
www.freshcoastplanning.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Robinson Township Planning Commission
From: Gregory L. Ransford, MPA
Date: October 9, 2026
Re: Allison Church (Evermore) Zoning Text Amendment Application – Fourth Revised Draft

Pursuant to your direction at your September 22, 2026, meeting, attached is the fourth revised draft to the text amendment proposed by Allison Church to accommodate Agritourism uses in the Agricultural Zoning District. As you will recall, you directed us, along with the Township Legal Counsel, Ron Bultje, to draft the following provisions.

- Section 3.7A – Strike "outdoor entertainment activities"
- Section 6.3(F) – Strike "centers"
- Section 6.3(F)(2) – Reverse wording of maximum percentage
- Section 6.3(F)(3) – Strike "parking structure" and relace with "parking area"
- Section 6.3(F)(6) – Revise "event" to the plural form
- Section 6.3(F)(9) – Strike all language after "persons" and end the sentence
- Include purpose language, original building and proposed building use, parking surface, lighting, removal of temporary structures, and responsible party language from the Crockery Township sample

We believe the attached accomplishes your direction. As always, proposed changes are shown in the Track Changes feature of Microsoft Word.

Additionally attached is the Zoning Text Amendment Ordinance, which presents the language in "clean" form. As you know, you directed us to schedule the proposed text for a public hearing at your October 27, 2026, meeting. Given this, we prepared the Zoning Text Amendment Ordinance for your consideration.

If you have any questions, please let us know.

GLR
Planner

cc: Adam MacMillan, Supervisor

Attachments

Section 3.7A AGRICULTURAL SPECIAL EVENTS

Agricultural special events are farm-based activities conducted for educational, entertainment, recreational, cultural, hospitality, or commercial purposes that allow members of the public to experience agricultural operations or activities, which may include, but are not limited to, weddings and private events, celebrations, educational activities and workshops, ~~outdoor entertainment activities,~~ tours, tastings, temporary outdoor gatherings, and other similar activities customarily associated with or promoting agricultural operations, excluding overnight accommodations.

Section 6.3(F) AGRICULTURAL SPECIAL EVENTS ~~CENTERS~~

The purpose of this section is to allow for adaptation of farm buildings to enhance and financially support existing farm operations for the benefit of the rural character and promotion of agriculture within the Township. In order to preserve compatibility with the neighborhood and the road system, and in recognition of a lack of public water, sewer, and other public services, the operation of ~~A~~agricultural special events, including associated event spaces, accessory structures, portable restrooms, tents, greenhouses, barns, bonfire areas, and other outdoor gathering areas, shall be permitted as an accessory use to a permitted agricultural operation, with limited hours of operation, and other appropriate requirements. Such uses shall remain incidental and subordinate to the principal agricultural use of the property and shall be conducted in accordance with the following.

(1) Except as noted below, any building proposed to house the agricultural special event shall have originally been constructed for farming or agricultural purposes on the same lot and shall not be the only building used for continued farming or agricultural purposes. Where at least one (1) building exists on the lot and is used for active farming or agricultural purposes, the owner may construct a new building to use for the agricultural special event; any such new building shall be barn-like or at least agricultural in appearance.

~~(1)~~(2) Parking areas may utilize a dustless surface including gravel, crushed stone, grass reinforcement system, permeable surface, or similar rural surface materials deemed appropriate by the Township in order to preserve rural character and reduce impervious surface coverage.

~~(2)~~(3) Not ~~less~~ more than twenty~~seventy~~-five (2~~7~~5) percent of the lot area shall be used for ~~active~~ agricultural ~~production~~special events.

~~(3)~~(4) Any building, parking ~~structure~~area, equipment, dumpster, gathering area, temporary erection, or other area used for the agricultural special event shall be no less than one hundred (100) feet from all lot lines.

~~(4)~~(5) Small lantern lights not exceeding eight (8) feet above grade level are encouraged. All outdoor lighting shall comply with Section 4.34 of this Ordinance.

(6) Waste disposal shall comply with Section 4.35 of this Ordinance.

~~(5)~~(7) Toilets and lavatory facilities shall be provided in accordance with the Michigan Building Code and applicable health department regulations, including handicap accessibility when required, but in no event shall less than two (2) separate toilets and lavatory facilities be provided. The applicant may use portable facilities which, if used, shall be located as shown on the site plan.

~~(6)~~(8) No signage shall be permitted for agricultural special events. Only farm signage may be permitted.

~~(7)~~(9) No amplified sound shall occur outside of an enclosed building and any amplified sound shall be contained to the interior of an enclosed building. In any event, noise from the agricultural special event may not exceed sixty-five (65) decibels at any lot line.

~~(8)~~(10) No agricultural special event shall be conducted on a lot with less than six hundred (600) feet of width nor less than twenty-five (25) acres in lot area.

~~(9)~~(11) At no time shall the use exceed one hundred (100) persons~~ per twenty-five (25) acres of lot area~~.

~~(10)~~(12) The total floor area of all buildings engaged in an agricultural special event on a lot shall not exceed two thousand four hundred (2,400) square feet. All buildings shall comply with applicable State construction codes. Temporary structures shall be included in the total floor area and may include structures such as tents, outdoor domes or igloos; they shall not be erected prior to April 1st and shall be removed at the end of the outdoor season but in no event later than December 1st.

~~(11)~~(13) No area included in the agricultural special event shall be located within two hundred (200) feet of a side or rear lot line. The Township Board may grant a reduced setback to the side or rear lot line, or both, when one (1) or more of the following exist (but in no instance shall any area included in the agricultural special event be less than one hundred (100) feet from any side or rear lot line):

(a) All adjoining lots to the side or rear lot line in question are vacant;

(b) There is a one hundred (100)-foot landscaped buffer maintained along the side or rear lot line in question, which landscaped buffer contains an eight (8)-foot tall berm with trees planted no more than six (6) feet apart, along the length of the berm; or

(c) The applicant proposes alternative methods to protect adjoining lands and uses from impacts of the proposed agricultural special event, and they are found by the Township Board to be comparable to any of the above options.

~~(12)~~(14) No food shall be prepared on site except for crops produced on the property or within an approved food truck or trucks.

~~(13)~~(15) Parking is prohibited within any required setback.

~~(14)~~(16) An agricultural special event is subject to an annual review by the Planning Commission. Before that review, the special use holder shall provide an annual report to the Planning Commission containing the following information:

(a) The total number of events held during the previous calendar year on the lot;
(b) The total number of attendees at events on the lot during the previous calendar year;
(c) The total number of events planned to be held on the lot during the following calendar year;
(d) The total number of acres in active agricultural production on the lot at the current time, including crops and animals;
(e) The lot's total area; and

(f) Details regarding any complaints received by the Township or law enforcement regarding agricultural events on the lot during the preceding calendar year.

The annual report shall be provided no later than January 31st of each year, for the preceding calendar year. If the Planning Commission is not willing to allow the special use to remain in effect on the basis of the annual report, the special use holder must either cease operations by the December 31 following the year for which the annual report was submitted or else apply for a renewed special use permit, following the procedure in Chapter 32 of this Ordinance.

(15)(17) When considering a special use application for an agricultural special event, the Township Board shall process the application in accord with Chapter 32 of this Ordinance, and shall consider the following additional factors:

(a) The hours of operation, which shall end by or before 11:00 p.m., with all music or amplified sound ending by or before 10:00 p.m.;
(b) The floor area for the special use;
(c) The area, height, bulk, and location of any building[s] to be used for the special use and their relationship to neighboring properties and land uses;
(d) The outdoor storage, display, and screening of goods, inventory, and equipment;
(e) Motor vehicle and/or pedestrian traffic and its circulation on and off site;
(f) The amount of off-street parking provided;
(g) The number of associates, employees, contractors, and assistants involved with the proposed special use;
(h) Water usage and the adequacy of the water supply;
(i) Solid and human waste generation and the proposed means and adequacy of treatment, storage, and disposal;
(j) The number of events proposed per year;
(k) The maximum capacity of each building (the capacity of any building shall refer to individuals inside the structure at any given time; the capacity of the building shall not include individuals outside of the structure); and
(l) Screening and/or buffering for the benefit of adjoining properties.

(18) The property owner shall maintain responsibility for the agricultural special event on the lot and shall provide a cellular or other phone number for contact in case there are problems during the course of the event. As a condition of special use approval, the property owner shall be responsible for compliance with the conditions of this special use approval, regardless of whether violations are actually committed by employees, contractors, guests, or others.

Fresh Coast Planning
Grand Haven, MI 49417
www.freshcoastplanning.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Robinson Township Planning Commission
From: Luke Petsch
Date: October 9, 2026
Re: 104th Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive Final Site Plan Review

---

Pursuant to your direction at your September 22, 2026, meeting, attached are revised site plans from Cody Vanden Bosch and Kyle Vanden Bosch (the "Applicant") to construct two 10,200 square foot multi-use buildings at the Southwest corner of the intersection of 104th Avenue and Lake Michigan Drive, parcel number 70-08-26-200-018 (the "Property"). The Property is located within the B-2 Commercial (B2) Zoning District. Per Section 13.2 – Permitted Uses of the Robinson Township Zoning Ordinance (RTZO), the proposed use is a permitted use in the B-2 District.

As you know, the Planning Commission completed a preliminary sketch plan review of the application at your September 22, 2026, meeting and conveyed that there were items the Applicant should address before final review. A list of the items conveyed is included here:

A. Section 31.8(B) Connectivity: The Planning Commission indicated that sidewalks are required under this section and to resolve the issue. Applicant has added a sidewalk outside of the Right of Way on Lake Michigan Drive and 104th Avenue to the updated site plan.
B. Section 4.34 Outdoor Lighting: The Planning Commission indicated the need for pole lights in the parking lot to address the commercial lighting requirement. Additionally, the Planning Commission indicated that door pack lights may be required under the building code. Applicant has provided pole lights on the site plan and an illumination plan to demonstrate that illumination is compliant.
C. Chapter 22 Parking. The Planning Commission encouraged applicant to consider all the possible uses and their calculations regarding parking. Applicant has indicated that total parking will serve as a cap or limiting factor for the number tenants permitted in the proposed buildings.
D. Ingress/Egress. The Planning Commission expressed concern that the proposed driveway would not be permitted by MDOT due to its proximity to an approach to an intersection with Lake Michigan Drive. Applicant was encouraged to contact MDOT to ensure access compliance. Applicant has indicated they will comply with all MDOT and Ottawa County Road Commission requirements.
E. Soil Removal. Planning Commission expressed concern that an indeterminate amount of soil was proposed to be removed. They indicated removal of less than 600 cubic feet of soil requires a permit from the Zoning Administrator. Additional removal would fall under the Earth Change Ordinance.

The applicant has submitted an update site plan and illumination plan to address the concerns raised by the Planning Commission. Given this, the proposal has been scheduled for a final review by the Planning Commission at your meeting on October 27, 2026.

Section 31.8 Standards for Site Plan Review

As you know, when deliberating regarding a site plan you shall consider the standards outlined in Section 31.8 – Standards for Site Plan Review of the RTZO. For your convenience, below we have included the standards in their entirety. Where appropriate, we have included our response in Italics to assist with your review.

A. Master Plan and M-231 Sub-Area Plan. Proposed uses and development activity shall be substantially consistent with the Robinson Township Master Plan, as supplemented by the M-231 Sub-Area Plan.

The parcel does not sit within the Lake Michigan Overlay District or the Lincoln Street Overlay District. The parcel is currently zoned B-2, which is in line with the Master Plan Map, indicating this as a Commercial (C) parcel and area.

Multi-use and multi-tenant buildings that break up their space are identified as a primary growth area in commercial in the Robinson Township Master Plan. Further, it is encouraged that efforts are made to break up units and utilize landscaping to soften visuals. Applicant indicates substantial vegetative screening around the parking lot and the use of two buildings to achieve this goal. Pending Planning Commission review, it appears this standard has been met.

B. Connectivity. Pathways for bicycles and pedestrians shall be incorporated throughout the development and along all perimeter streets to ensure connectivity between internal uses and with adjacent properties.

During preliminary review, it was noted that the proposed "future sidewalk" would not address the connectivity standard. In response to this feedback, Applicant has added sidewalks to the site plan along both perimeter streets to establish connectivity with adjacent properties and a concrete sidewalk running along the front of the building creating connectivity between internal uses. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

C. Traffic Circulation. The number, location, size of access and entry points, and internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation routes shall be designed to promote safe and efficient access to and from the site, and circulation within the site. In reviewing traffic features, the number, spacing, and alignment of existing and proposed access points shall be considered relative to their impact on traffic movement on abutting streets and adjacent properties.

The site proposes a drive apron off 104th Avenue. The parking lot provides space for turn lanes for both cars and trucks loading and unloading. Features have been provided to protect critical infrastructure such as placing barrier rocks around wells. The site appears designed to provide for safe and efficient access to the site. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

D. Interior Street Connectivity. Streets or private roads may be required to be extended to exterior lot lines in order to allow connection to existing or planned streets on adjacent parcels, to provide for secondary access, to establish continuity of the circulation system, and to reduce traffic and impact to the transportation network.

There are no interior streets or private roads on the site or proposed. The parcels to the West and South are residential uses. There also does not appear to be streets or private roads on neighboring parcels that would require a connection from Applicant's parcel. The Planning Commission may find it appropriate to require internal easements for future connectivity. As such, this standard appears to be met.

E. Natural Resource Preservation. Site design shall prioritize the preservation of natural features, such as steeper slopes, wetlands, significant hardwood tree stands, streams, and other significant site characteristics. Applicants must demonstrate how alternatives were considered during the planning process and shall provide justification for the selected development alternative.

The project proposes to preserve existing trees along the southern and western parcel lines. Other vegetation will be removed to prepare for the proposed buildings. The site is largely flat and does not represent steeper slopes, wetlands, significant hardwood tree stands, streams or other significant characteristics. Applicant proposes significant tree and shrub vegetation planting as part of the site plan. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

F. Stormwater. Stormwater detention and drainage systems shall be designed so the removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or public stormwater drainage systems and shall maintain or improve predevelopment conditions.

Applicant has proposed two retention basins on either side of the proposed driveway. Two catch basins have been placed in the driveway with drainage feeds to the proposed retention basin. Applicant has indicated all work will be done to Ottawa County Water Resource Commission standards. A condition of compliance with Ottawa County Water Resource Commission's office may be appropriate. Pending Planning Commission review and discussion of possible conditions, this standard may be found to be met.

G. Landscaping. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing unnecessary tree and soil removal, and any grade changes shall be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas. Provision or preservation of landscaping may be required to ensure that the proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another internally and from surrounding property.

Applicant proposes keeping tree line on the South and West edge of parcel to act as screening from the residential use properties. Note that Section 4.54(B)(1) indicates screening along residential uses is meant to be a continuous line. The Planning Commission should consider the southeast portion of the parking lot and note the shade tree and screened dumpster serve as screening and the Planning Commission will need to determine if this meets the standard.

During preliminary review, it was noted that the quantity of soil removal was unclear and that certain thresholds required permits from the Zoning Administrator, or even earth change applications. Applicant indicates on sheet C-503 that, "sod and loam topsoil shall be removed the width of the subgrade and can be wasted outside of the roadway."

The Planning Commission may find it appropriate to condition any recommendation with compliance with applicable soil removal or earth change ordinance provisions. Pending Planning Commission review and discussion of conditions, this standard may be found to be met.

H. Screening. Where commercial uses abut residential uses, appropriate screening consisting of attractively designed, opaque fencing or equivalent landscaping shall be provided to shield residential properties from noise, headlights, and glare.

Applicant proposed to maintain the tree line on the South and West boundaries of the parcel that serve as screening to residential uses. The land to the North appears to be in Agricultural use. To the

East and northeast are commercial use properties. Applicant proposes vegetative screening to the North and East with a mix of shade trees and shrubs. As such, this standard appears to be met.

I. On-site Treatment. Outside of utility service areas or prior to sanitary sewer availability, land use intensity shall be scaled appropriately based on the capability of on-site systems to adequately accommodate usage. On-site treatment systems shall be designed to protect groundwater and surface water quality to the maximum extent possible.

Applicant proposes new septic systems with a 1,000 square foot drainfield and a 1,008 square foot reserve drain field on the West portion of the parcel and notes are included on sheet C-301. All drainfields should be permitted and inspected by the Ottawa County Health Department. Placing a condition of compliance with Ottawa County Health Department permits and standards may be appropriate. Pending Planning Commission review and discussion of conditions, this standard may be found to be met.

J. Utility Service. All utility service shall be underground, unless deemed impractical by the Township, on the basis of the size of the development, the cost of placing utility service underground, the character of the area, and such other factors as are deemed important by the Township.

Applicant has indicated the existing power pole on the parcel will be removed as part of the demolition plan and the site will be served by underground power lines. The applicant is proposing on site well and septic systems. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

K. Exterior Uses. Exposed storage areas, machinery, heating and cooling units, service areas, loading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas shall be located to have a minimum negative effect on adjacent properties, and shall be screened, if reasonably necessary, to ensure compatibility with surrounding properties.

Applicant has proposed an outdoor dumpster enclosed by a six-foot-tall cedar fence with lockable, swinging gates for access. Loading areas are present along the North side of the proposed buildings. There were no identified utility features requiring screening identified on the site plan. Applicant has provided vegetative screening to the North of the parking lot that will screen loading zones from traffic on Lake Michigan Drive. Finally, Applicant proposes to maintain the tree line on the South and West edges of the parcel to screen from neighboring residential uses. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

L. Emergency Access. All buildings and structures shall be readily accessible to emergency vehicles. Prior to approval or as a condition of approval, building layouts, internal circulation, and other site characteristics that affect life safety shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate public safety official or fire marshal.

The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed plans and indicated no concerns with the site as proposed.

M. Water and Sanitary Sewer. Water and sanitary sewer installations shall comply with all Township, County and State specifications and requirements, and the utility service area policies outlined in the M-231 Sub-Area Plan, as applicable.

Applicant proposes septic and well service and that they will be permitted and installed to Ottawa County Health Department standards, the Michigan criteria for subsurface sewage disposal and EGLE rules and regulations. Applicant has also provided detailed information on the proposed septic systems. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

N. Signs. Signs shall be located to avoid the creation of distraction and visual clutter. They shall be designed to be visually compatible with the architecture of the principal structure. Sites with multiple signs should incorporate common design theme.

Applicant proposes a 100 square foot sign at the proposed entrance off 104th Avenue. The sign is shown in a compliant location and does not appear to create distraction or visual clutter. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

O. Building Design. To the maximum extent reasonable, new or substantially remodeled buildings shall be reasonably compatible in appearance with, or shall enhance, the established general character of other buildings in the immediate vicinity or development.

Applicant proposes steel siding and roof with a 42" tall stone façade on the East, West, and North sides of the building. The design appears to be reasonably compatible with the general character and immediate vicinity and compliance with the B-2 Zoning District. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard appears to be met.

P. Civic Space. At least one (1) civic space shall be provided per development, including but not limited to small parks, playgrounds, fountains and sitting areas, or other similar elements. The developer shall provide civic space that is designed and sized commensurate with the scale of the proposed development, intended user, level of public access, occupant load, and type of lot.

Applicant proposes placing picnic tables to create a sitting area between the buildings. The space will serve as place for breaks and meals for those working on the site. While of benefit to employees, picnic tables can be moved and are not in and of themselves a permanent feature. It is unclear whether this is publicly accessible. The Planning Commission may find it appropriate to condition additional detail on the proposed civic space. Pending Planning Commission review, this standard may be found to be met.

Considerations

As the Planning Commission deliberates regarding this application, we believe the following warrant your review and consideration. These items are listed in no particular order.

A. Chapter 22 Parking. The Planning Commission encouraged applicant to consider all the possible uses and their calculations regarding parking.
B. Whether the proposed deciduous tree and dumpster location are sufficient to serve as parking lot screening to the residential use to the west.
C. Ingress/Egress. The Planning Commission expressed concern that the proposed driveway would not be permitted by MDOT due to its proximity to an approach to an intersection with Lake Michigan Drive. Applicant was encouraged to contact MDOT to ensure access compliance.
D. Soil Removal. Planning Commission expressed concern that an indeterminate amount of soil was proposed to be removed. They indicated removal of less than 600 cubic feet of soil requires a permit from the Zoning Administrator. Additional removal would fall under the Earth Change Ordinance.

E. Section 31.8(P). Civic Space. Applicant has indicated picnic tables between the two proposed buildings. The Planning Commission may condition around moved or additional elements to the proposed civic space.
F. Section 31.8 – Standards for Site Plan Review

Conditions

As you know, the Planning Commission may apply conditions, restrictions, and improvements as determined necessary. Section 31.13 – Conditions establishes this authority and is included in full below.

> Section 31.13 CONDITIONS.
>
> In approving a Detailed Site Plan, the Township Board may impose and attach such conditions and restrictions and require such improvements as shall be determined to be necessary and/or appropriate.

Considering this, and after a thorough review of the application and site plan, the Planning Commission may find it appropriate to place certain conditions of approval upon their recommendation. Below is a list of items that may be appropriate for your recommendation.

- Adherence to Michigan Department of Transportation and/or Ottawa County Road Commission requirements regarding driveway access.
- The applicant shall grant the necessary easements to the Township for the sidewalks outside of the public right-of-ways. In addition, the proposed location of the easement ends shall be reviewed and found appropriate by the Township Engineer for future connection in terms of grading, topography, and any other obstruction.
- Site Plan review by the Planning Commission and Board shall be required prior to the occupancy of each individual unit
- Compliance with Ottawa County Health Department and Water Resource Commissioner's office.
- Compliance with applicable Earth Change permitting.

Recommendation

Pending the results of your deliberations, the Planning Commission must determine if the proposed meets the standards provided in Section 31.8 of the RTZO and if any conditions are appropriate. Following this conversation, a recommendation may be made to the Township Board of Trustees.

The proposed is scheduled for your October 27, 2026, meeting. The applicant is expected to be in attendance. If you have any questions, please let us know.

Luke Petsch
Planner

Attachment

cc: Adam MacMillan, Supervisor