Pursuant to Executive Order No. 2020 – 75, the Village of Spring Lake will conduct its business via conference call to mitigate the spread of COVID-19.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

   Chairman Bohnhoff, called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL**

   Present: Bohnhoff, Drooger, Johnson, Martinus, VanderMeulen, Van Leeuwen-Vega, and Van Strate.

   Absent: None

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

   Motion by Drooger, second from Johnson, to approve the agenda as presented. All in favor, motion carried.

   
   Yes: 7  No: 0

4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: January 28, 2020 Regular Meeting**

   Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson, to approve the minutes from the February 25, 2020 regular meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

   
   Yes: 7  No: 0

5. **STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS ON AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

   If you would like to comment on agenda items only you may now submit your comments via Facebook Live Stream found at [www.facebook.com/villageofspringlake](http://www.facebook.com/villageofspringlake), email sfedewa@ght.org, or call (616) 260-4982 when prompted.

   There were no statements of citizens on Agenda items only.

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

   A. **Review and Discuss Draft of Proposed Zoning Ordinance & Map**

      Stacey Fedewa provided an overview of the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance and Map through a memorandum dated May 20, 2020 from Williams&Works.

      Fedewa explained that she was surprised to see that Section 390-25 C no longer permitted the Planning Commission to approve the enlargement of a nonconforming structures through a
special land use because she did not remember that having been discussed. Manager Burns said she did not recall any discussion on that either. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked why that section had been added. Fedewa said she did not have an answer to that but her recommendation to the Planning Commission was to have them continue to review special land use requests.

**Without objection**, the Planning Commission requested that enlargements, Special Land Uses remain with the Planning Commission.

Cassie Hoisington provided an overview of the changes to Zoning Districts and Map.

Drooger asked what the difference was between multi-family and a planned unit development. Fedewa explained that a Planned Unit Development was a type of development that could be used in a broad spectrum, any use, such as commercial, industrial, single or multi-family. In comparison, a multi-family was a standard use that was allowed in a district.

Fedewa gave an overview of the Waterfront Overlay District and Landscaping and Screening. There were no questions from the Planning Commission.

Fedewa gave an overview of the Sign Ordinance. Hill added the specifics to the addition of digital signs to the Ordinance. Fedewa shared details of the digital signs noting that five-minute intervals were proposed, which was an extraordinarily long time compared to other local municipalities, so that was an option that could be discussed and/or negotiated. Fedewa said she had asked the consulted to add a Statement of Purpose that described the Village’s position of being apprehensive on having digital signs and to have more statements of what would and would not be allowed on digital signs. Johnson asked if the intensity of light should be included. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if digital signs could be evaluated on a case by case basis instead of committing to this on paper. Burns explained that the ZBA had heard the Library’s request to upgrade their digital reader board and the ZBA had said a very firm “no”, making their position known, where the DDA and Council had a different position, so from her perspective it seemed like it would be a lot easier if the business’s sign met the standard and could come to Planning Commission or be allowed by right. Fedewa said that they could also require digital signs to be a special land use so all applicants wanting a digital sign would have to come before the Planning Commission and all neighbors within 300 feet around would be notified of the request and could comment during a public hearing. Johnson asked Burns her thoughts on digital signs. Burns said the only thing that gave her pause was the 5-minute timing, which seemed like a really extended period of time, but there was a need and a demand, and they had the technology and a way to regulate the signs to not be obnoxious. Van Leeuwen-Vega, Drooger and Johnson agreed that a special land use would give the surrounding neighbors input. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked about the parameters of a sign that referenced 8 sides and how that figured into something like a die-cut sign that might have a half moon or a unique shape. Fedewa suggested the consultant prepare the typical boiler plate option along with an illustration to give the Planning Commission an opportunity to look at the two and see what their preference was in measuring a sign. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if a study or comparison of neighboring community sign requirements had been done. Fedewa said she did remember that being talked about and she could pull that information together if the Planning Commission wanted her to. Fedewa said that pictures for a visual of lighting would also be very helpful.

Fedewa explained that the Parking Standards were generally suggesting that less impervious surface was desired so maximum numbers would be established rather than minimums which
was the typical way most communities were going, and they were also encouraging shared parking arrangements. Martinus asked why grass driveways were not allowed when they were better for drainage in high water areas. Fedewa explained that a grass driveway made it unknown to traffic and also leaking fluids from vehicles contaminate groundwater. Fedewa said that high water was a short-term problem, but contaminated water was long-term. Burns added that grass driveways eventually turn into mud which gets tracked out into the street and runs into storm drains and the storm drains then have to be cleaned out. Johnson said that section 390-117a expanded on that giving more examples of surfaces that could be used for more flexibility.

Fedewa explained that the Site Plan Review chapter now gave the responsibly of reviewing new businesses to the Zoning Administrator if there were no exterior changes and to approve minor changes such as a dumpster enclosure or color change of siding. Fedewa said both of these changes were in support of the Redevelopment Ready Community’s projects allowing businesses to move through the approval process faster.

Fedewa shared that the Special Land Use Chapter had been cleaned up and reordered accordingly to support the whole ordinance and the Master Plan.

Hill gave an overview of the Zoning Board of Appeals Chapter, explaining that the standards had been modified to be more encompassing in the consideration of the application.

Fedewa gave an overview of Article 20, 21 and 23, Administration and Enforcement, Wireless Communication Towers and Wind Energy.

Fedewa said she would share the Commission suggestions with the consultant and bring the revised version back to the them and, at that time, they would go over the last details of digital signs to make them a Special Land Use.

7. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

If you would like to comment on non-agenda items you may now submit your comments via Facebook Live Stream found at www.facebook.com/villageofspringlake, email sfedewa@ght.org, or call (616) 260-4982 when prompted

There were no statements of citizens on items not on the agenda. Fedewa said that Tony Verplank, who was not able to attend, was interested in having the Planning Commission discuss the new regulations for the keeping of chickens and bees.

8. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS – There were no comments from the Planning Commission.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson, the meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

Stacey Fedewa, AICP, Village Planner Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk