1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bohnhoff called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Bohnhoff, Drooger, Garrison, Johnson, VanderMeulen, Van Leeuwen-Vega, and VanStrate

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


Motion by Drooger, second from Van Strate, to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2021 meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

5. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS – AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

There were no statements of citizens

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. PUD Amendment – Marina Bay Condos

Request for a PUD Amendment to complete the construction of two condominium buildings and a detached garage structure for which foundation was previously poured, but then abandoned and buried.
Motion by Van Strate, second from VanderMeulen to remove the Marina Bay Condos PUD Amendment from the table. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7  No: 0

Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington provided an overview through a memorandum dated June 22, 2021.

Then applicant Gary Smith of Smith Development, 15100 Hickory, and Project Engineer Bruce Callen, Callen Engineering, 108 E. Savidge, were present to answer any questions and provided the following information:

- 17 trees would be planted, for a total of 32 trees noting there would be no more than 5 of the same species.
- Once a building plan was put together a lighting plan would be provided for the proposed wall mount fixtures.
- They were still working the landscaped island because there was an issue with the condo association regarding what had been replanted by the Village after the removal of a sewer lift station project.
- Roll out carts for trash had been proposed but they had been asked to participate in using the existing dumpster and provide and pay for a new masonry dumpster enclosure, which had not been a requirement during the time of construction for the original phase.
- Snow Storage was proposed south of the retaining wall in the wetland area but a location east of the garage structure was also a consideration.
- The applicant was proposing no additional screening along the west side lot lines due to the wetlands.

Hoisington explained that, because this PUD Amendment was an amendment to the entire site, anything on site was fair game, so even though the dumpster enclosure was not part of this phase specifically, but it was on site, it had been talked about at the last meeting and the same thing applied for the entryway landscaping, just because it was approved previously under a past ordinance, didn’t mean that it necessarily met the requirements of today and that was why there were certain things that might not apply specifically to this portion of the development but was still part of the Marina Bay Condo’s.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- The entrance landscaping issue between the Condo Association and the Village’s lift station right of way project and who was responsible for additional planting and maintenance.
- Roll out carts versus requiring the applicant to be obligated to provide a new masonry enclosure for the existing dumpster for a cost of approximately $12,000.
- Remove the dumpster enclosure from the Condition of Approval in lieu of a revised landscaping plan for the entrance landscaped Island.
- Existing screening and supplementing with greenery per EGLE approval.

Motion by Garrison, second by Johnson, to conditionally approve the Special Land Use request by Gary Smith of Smith Development for 930 W Savidge Street for PUD
Amendment to finalize the construction of two six-unit condo buildings and a detached garage for which existing foundations are buried because the application meets the standards of the Spring Lake Village Zoning Ordinance. This motion is subject to the report of findings and the following conditions:

1. Shall obtain an EGLE permit or correspondence indicating one is not required prior to a building permit being issued.

2. Shall provide a revised landscaping plan for staff to approve administratively.

3. Shall provide lighting information for staff to approve administratively, including fixture count and location information. A photometric plan may also be required to verify compliance.

4. The revised stormwater management plan shall be reviewed by the Village Engineer prior to a building permit being issued.

5. Shall provide height information (measured from grade to top of wall) for the proposed retaining wall as a notation on the plans.

6. Shall provide alternate snow storage plans for staff review.

7. Shall provide supplemental plantings along the western property line.

8. The exterior appearance for buildings in this phase of construction shall appear substantially similar to the existing buildings.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7  No: 0

REPORT – PUD AMENDMENT – MARINA BAY CONDOS

Pursuant to the provisions of the Village of Spring Lake (the “Village”) Zoning Ordinance (the “Zoning Ordinance”), the following is the report of the Village of Spring Lake Planning Commission (the “Planning Commission”) concerning an application by Smith Development LLC (the “Developer”) for approval of a Marina Bay Planned Unit Development (the “Project” or the “PUD”). The Project amendment will consist of finalizing the construction of two six-unit condo buildings and a detached garage for which existing foundations are buried. The Project as recommended for conditional approval is shown on a site plan (the “Site Plan”), last revised 6/18/2021, referred to as the “Documentation,” presently on file with the Village. The purpose of this report is to state the decision of the Planning Commission concerning the Project, the basis for the Planning Commission’s determination, and the Planning Commission’s decision that the Village at Marina Bay Planned Unit Development be approved as outlined in this motion. The Developer shall comply with all of the Documentation submitted to the Village for this Project. In granting the approval of the proposed PUD application, the Planning Commission makes the following findings pursuant to Section Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance.
1. Compared to what could have been constructed by right, the Project has been designed to accomplish the following objectives from Article XII, §390-73.B of the Zoning Ordinance:

A. Provide for flexibility in the regulation of land development;

B. Encourage innovation in land use and variety in design, layout, and type of buildings and structures;

C. Achieve economy, efficiency and sustainability in the use of land, natural and historical resources, energy, and the provision of public services and utilities;

D. Encourage the use of land in accordance with its character and adaptability;

E. Encourage useful open space;

F. Promote the enhancement of housing diversity, employment, traffic circulation, pedestrian movement, and recreational opportunities for the residents of the Village;

G. Provide for the regulation of a variety of land uses not otherwise authorized within a single zoning district;

H. Create better living, working, and shopping environments; and

I. Create developments that achieve the standards and best practices of smart growth and sustainable, energy efficient design.

2. The Project meets the following qualification requirements of Article XII, §390-74 of the Zoning Ordinance:

A. A PUD may be considered for any property in the Village. However, the applicant must demonstrate that the PUD would result in recognizable and substantial benefits to the ultimate users of a development and to the community in general, where such benefits would be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved under the conventional requirements of this Ordinance.

B. A PUD shall be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as streets, pedestrian ways, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications.

C. A PUD shall be compatible with the capacities of public services and facilities it may affect.

D. The parcel shall be under the control of one owner, or the subject of an application filed jointly by the owners of all properties and shall be capable of being planned and developed as one integral unit. Applications for a PUD must be made with the written authorization of all owners of the site. If a PUD application is filed by a prospective purchaser or option holder, written consent of all property owners must be submitted as evidence of their concurrence with the PUD application.
E. A PUD shall result in a development that is substantially consistent with the goals and objectives of the Village’s Master Plan, including, but not limited to creating a walkable, sustainable, and attractive community and protecting reasonable waterfront views and access for all waterfront developments.

3. This approval is based on the affirmative findings that all standards for approval outlined in Article XII, §390-80 have been fulfilled:

A. The proposed PUD is consistent with and promotes the intent of this article and represents a development opportunity for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.

B. The proposed PUD complies with all of the qualifying conditions of Section 390-74.

C. The proposed PUD shall not be hazardous to adjacent property or involve uses, activities, materials, or equipment that will be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, dust, or glare.

D. The proposed type and density of use shall be compatible with the capacities of the public services and facilities it may affect and shall not place a material burden upon the subject or surrounding land or property owners and occupants or the natural environment.

E. The proposed development shall be compatible with the adopted master plan of the village and shall be consistent with the intent and spirit of this article.

F. Safe and efficient ingress and egress has been provided to the property, with particular reference to pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow and control and access in case of fire or another emergency.

G. The proposed PUD shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to be an integrated and harmonious development, appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of adjacent property, the surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the development.

H. The proposed PUD shall satisfy all applicable local, state, and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

B. Special Land Use – Digital Message Center – St. Mary’s Church

Review the previously approved timing and lighting for the digital message center. The applicant is requesting to shorten the time between messages.

Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington gave an overview through a memorandum dated June 18, 2021.

Then applicant, Father David Gross of S. Mary’s Church, was present to answer any
questions and provided the following information:

- Noting multiple service and confession times plus other miscellaneous messages with 30 second intervals.
- Proposed 10 second intervals.
- Brightness sensor.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Trial and error per public comment/complaint.
- Language needs to have longevity.
- Residential versus Commercial/Downtown districts.
- Multiple colors per message.
- Sensor (built in) location.

Motion by Van Strate, second from Van Leeuwen-Vega, to direct the applicant to adjust the timing between transitions to 10 second and adjust the brightness levels to a normal brightness with auto adjust pursuant to the special land use application approved on 1/26/2021. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7  No: 0

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Revisions to the Planning Commission Bylaws

Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington gave an overview through a memorandum dated June 15, 2021.

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson to approve and adopt the amended Planning Commission bylaws. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7  No: 0

B. FY2020 – Appointment of Officers

Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington gave a brief overview through a memorandum dated June 18, 2021.

The Planning Commission discussed nominations.

Motion by Van Strate, second from Johnson, to nominate Bohnhoff for Planning Commission Chairperson, Van Leeuwen-Vega for Planning Commission Vice Chairperson and Garrison as the Planning Commission Secretary. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7  No: 0
8. **TRAINING – HOUSING**

   A. Housing is a hot button issue in many communities. This presentation covers how a community should assess its housing needs as well as strategies for ensuring those needs are met. State and federal housing laws are also addressed in this comprehensive workshop. Next steps for implementation are also included.

9. **STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS – NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

   There were no statements of Citizens on non-agenda items open.

10. **COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

    There were no additional comments from the Planning Commission.

11. **STAFF REPORT**

    There was no additional Staff Report.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Motion by Garrison, second from Johnson, the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

    Yes: 7  No: 0

_______________________________   __________________________
Cassandra Hoisington, Village Planner   Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk