1. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2. **ROLL CALL**

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

   Absent: Garrison

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

   Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega second from Drooger, to approve the agenda as presented. All in favor, motion carried.

   Yes: 6  No: 0

4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**  July 24, 2021 meeting.

   Motion by Van Strate, second from Johnson, to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2021 meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

   Yes: 6  No: 0

5. **CORRESPONDANCE**

   Lee Schuitema – 408 Exchange St.
   Kristen Grek – 109 Stone Gate
   - Samaritas Affordable Senior Housing Development concerns on quality and size of building and added traffic.

6. **STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS – AGENDA ITEMS ONLY**

   Denise O’Neill, 129 Stone Gate, had concerns regarding size and scale of the Samaritas building
and the timeline for development. Chairman Bohnhoff explained that all that information would be provided during this meeting.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. **Electronic Message Board – McDonald’s**
   Request for a replacement electronic message board as a size for size replacement for an existing electronic message board.

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

Motion by Johnson, second from Van Leeuwen-Vega, to open the public hearing at 7:07 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6  No: 0

Commissioner Johnson asked BJ Wade, Advanced Signs, how this sign compared to the digital sign at St. Mary’s Church. Mr. Wade it would be similar. Hoisington noted that the sign exchange at McDonald’s would be size for size.

Motion by Van Strate, second from Drooger, to close the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6  No: 0

Mr. Wade said McDonald’s would like 8 to 10 second intervals between messages, however, the application requested 15 seconds. The Commission discussed transition timing and brightness and agreed to allow 10 second intervals and brightness as recommended and revisit the timing in a few months.

Motion by Drooger, second from VanderMeulen, to conditionally approve the Special Land Use request by McDonald’s at 406 West Savidge Street for a digital message center 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. Provides the timing between transitions to 10 seconds.

2. Present documentation the brightness of the electronic message board is compliant with §390-125.B.4 to the Zoning Administrator within 10 days of the installation.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6  No: 0

**REPORT**

1. This approval is based on the affirmative findings that all criteria for approval outlined in §390-105 have been fulfilled:

   A. The sign balances the rights of businesses and institutions to convey their
messages through electronic means and protects the public from unrestricted electronic signage.

B. The sign furthers the objectives of the Village Master Plan and streetscape design guidelines.

C. The sign will not adversely impact the public health, safety, and welfare of the Village.

D. The sign will not adversely impact current traffic and pedestrian access.

E. The sign promotes the aesthetic qualities of the Village.

F. The sign promotes economic development in the Village.

2. This approval is based on the affirmative findings that all standards for approval outlined in Article XVIII, §390-134 have been fulfilled:

A. That the use is designed and constructed and will be operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the area in which it is proposed.

B. The use is consistent with the adopted Spring Lake Village Master Plan.

C. The authorized use is compatible with adjacent uses of land, the natural environment and the capacities of the public services and facilities affected by this use.

D. The use is, or will be, served adequately by public services and facilities, including, but not limited to streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer facilities and schools.

E. The use does not involve activities, processes, materials and equipment or conditions of operation that is unreasonably detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of excessive traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odors.

F. The buildings, structures, and entrances are situated and designed to minimize the adverse effects upon owners and occupants of adjacent properties and the neighborhood.

G. The site plan and special land use comply with the specific requirements contained in §390-137 of this article, as applicable.

3. The application meets the site plan review standards of §390-126 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

A. The use proposed will preserve to the greatest extent practical, the existing natural features of the site, including vegetation, topography, water features, and other such features. Only the areas under actual development will be disturbed.

B. Buildings and structures are proposed to be placed in an orderly, logical fashion consistent with its surroundings and intent of the district. Where open spaces are proposed, it is located and arranged in a manner which provides view protection, visual relief, physical separation, environmentally sensitive area protection, and/or
recreational value to the site and surrounding properties.

C. The proposed use will preserve the views from adjacent properties and streets open to water areas to the greatest extent practical. Placement and height of buildings and locations of open spaces make reasonable provision for protecting existing views.

D. The use proposes proper relationships between the existing streets within the vicinity, including deceleration lanes, service drives, entrance and exit driveways, and parking areas to provide safe and convenient movements of pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles. Streets, access plans, and/or ingress/egress drives conform to the current regulations of the Village and MDOT.

E. The proposed use has given special attention to proper site surface drainage, so the removal of surface waters does not adversely affect neighboring properties, the public storm drainage system, or nearby bodies of water. Surface water will be collected at designated intervals to prevent standing water that would obstruct vehicle and/or pedestrian traffic. The standards of the Spring Lake Stormwater Management Ordinance are met.

F. All utilities for the proposed use are provided in a manner least harmful to surrounding properties and the utilities are located underground (as applicable), unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission.

G. The proposed use will be screened from view from adjoining streets and properties for any exposed storage areas, trash receptacles, machinery installations, service areas, truck unloading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas. Screening complies with Article XIV.

H. The site plan for the proposed use provides adequate access to the site and all buildings on the site by emergency vehicles.

I. The proposed use provides an orderly transition for all structures to adjacent development of a different scale.

J. The site plan for the proposed use provides outdoor common areas and associated amenities for employees, customers, and/or residents which may include public trash receptacles, bike racks, seating areas, recreation areas, shade trees, bus stop turnouts, and similar facilities; where appropriate.

K. The proposed use complies with all applicable local, state and federal approvals prior to issuing a land use permit.

L. The site plan for the proposed use is consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.

B. Preliminary PUD Application and Rezoning to Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Samaritas Affordable Senior Housing Development
Request for preliminary approval of a Multi-Family Apartment Planned Unit Development that consisting of one 4-story building comprised of 53 units.
Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington gave an overview through a memorandum dated August 20, 2021.

Joel Lautenbach, Samaritas, explained that the LIHTC funding was a competitive application that required project-based vouchers from a housing commission and since Ottawa County’s Housing Commission was newly formed and did not have any vouchers to assign to this project, they approached the Muskegon Housing Commission, who Samaritas had an existing relationship through other housing communities. Mr. Lautenbach said that according to the Muskegon Housing Commission policy they would not place 8 project-based vouchers restricted for seniors 55, they would only provide 8 vouchers for persons 18 – 54 years that were disabled or with special needs, so this application forced them to consider whether they had to apply the whole project under the open category not seniors. They were working with MSHDA and the Fair Housing Center to determine if they could still restrict the remainder of the units, which was about 86% of the building to seniors 55 and over, while maintaining the 8 project-based units for persons with disabilities.

Manager Burns explained that this was a bureaucratic process, and a lot of work went on behind the scenes including Council adopting an ordinance approving this project and Spring Lake Township would be considering it at their September meeting. Burns said that assuming Spring Lake Township adopted an ordinance, both jurisdictions were in favor of the complex as a whole and one of the goals of both the Village and the Township was to provide workforce housing, and while the senior complex did not offer that itself, as a senior moved out of their single-family stand-alone home to move into senior living, that would open up that home, potentially, to workforce housing. Burns said Hoisington had concerns with the mass and size of the building and she wanted the Planning Commission to know how they got to that point. Burns explained that when they had their preliminary meetings with James Lewis from Pinnacle, she expressed to him that Council was not in favor of large asphalt parking lots and tearing down a lot of trees, so she wanted them to understand the importance of keeping as much of the natural area as possible and in order to do that, and make it viable, they needed to go up in order to shrink the footprint of the building.

Planning Commissioner Drooger recused himself from this discussion due to a conflict of interest and asked if the Planning Commission could share some of the renderings with the residents of Stone Gate so they could get an idea of what was being proposed.

Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if there were actual income levels associated with this complex. Burns explained that this would be subsidized housing for seniors and those with disabilities and they would have to income qualify in order to live there.

Chairman Bohnhoff called for a 5-minute recess at 7:35 p.m. so that the residents could look over the plans and renderings.

Chairman Bohnhoff called the meeting back to order at 7:40 p.m.

Motion by Johnson, second from VanderMeulen, to open the public at 7:42 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

Denise O’Neill, 129 Stone Gate, asked for clarification on one of the renderings and where
access to the complex would be. **Hoisington** explained the details of the rendering and access points for Ms. O’Neill.

Chris Rollins, 105 Stone Gate, had concerns with adding more traffic to that area. Chairman **Bohnhoff** explained that Savidge/M104 was a State highway and controlled solely by MDOT. Ms. Rollins also asked that the Planning Commission not allow the building to be 4 stories.

Denise O’Neill, 129 Stone Gate, asked about the density of the building and if there would be more than one entrance/exit. Chairman **Bohnhoff** explained that due to property lines, there would not be additional entrances/exits into the complex. Ms. O’Neill was also concerned with traffic. Chairman **Bohnhoff** suggested she share her traffic concerns to MDOT.

**Fedewa** explained the different transportation departments and chain of command that would need to be followed in order to request a change.

Darcy Dye, 114 N. Fruitport Rd, said she was pleased with this process and how staff and the Planning Commission were working with the developer to try to save green space and be energy efficient.

Motion by **Johnson**, second from **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, to close the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

Yes: 5  No: 0

**Johnson** said that since approximately 80% of the population of this development would be 60 plus and the other 20% disability focused, the impact on traffic would be minimal compared to that of a young family with multiple drivers and vehicles.

Mr. Lautenbach explained that these would be one bedroom units and, in their experience with their other communities, there were less cars than residents and they could and would restrict the occupancy to two individuals.

**Hoisington** added that the plan showed 45 parking spaces and as that population aged, fewer residents would have cars. **Burns** shared that all the residents that live in this development have to be income qualified so the chances of them having two vehicles, was not likely.

The **Commission** discussed the blue house and **Van Strate** thought it would look out of place but **Bohnhoff**, **VanderMeulen**, **Johnson** and **Van Leeuwen-Vega** were in favor of keeping the house to break up the view to the larger building and give more of a homey feel.

The **Commission** discussed the landscaping plans and agreed they would like to see some light landscaping and/or garden and possibly a sitting/gathering area with a couple of benches and planters in the open area and a green belt rather than fence for screening at the property lines. The **Commission** agreed that along Savidge St. they would like taller plantings/trees and additional other plantings to make it denser to bring the line of site and scale of the building down. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** remarked how attractive it was across the street at the Ace Hardware development with their landscaping, trees and decorative fence.
The Commission had no issues with the parking numbers but asked if there was a way to preserve some of the screening between the church playground and the parking lot and fire truck turn around. The Commission discussed the required 14 bicycle racks and agreed that 8 was a fair amount.

Motion by Johnson, second from VanderMeulen, to recommend the Village Council conditionally approve the Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) application to develop an affordable senior living building by Samaritas. This also includes the associated rezoning to the PUD district. The project will consist of a four-story building comprised of 53 units located on 1.83 acres at Parcel No.’s 70-03-14-375-015, 70-03-14-375-048, and part of 70-03-14-375-049. This motion is subject to, and incorporates, the Tentative Report of Findings and directs the applicant to address the following topics prior to applying for Final PUD approval:

1. Landscaping
2. Site Lighting and Photometrics
3. Stormwater Management
4. Access Management
5. Green Space and Outdoor Living Areas

All in favor, motion carried.

REPORT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Village of Spring Lake (the “Village”) Zoning Ordinance (the “Zoning Ordinance”), the following is the tentative 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 Samaritas Affordable Senior Living Development (the “Project” or the “PUD”).

The Project will consist of a four-story building comprised of 53 units. The Project as recommended for conditional approval is shown on a site plan (the “Site Plan”), last revised 08/18/2021, referred to as the “Documentation,” presently on file with the Village.

The purpose of this report is to state the tentative recommendation of the Planning Commission concerning the Project, the basis for the Planning Commission’s determination, and the Planning Commission’s decision that the Samaritas Affordable Senior Living Development be preliminarily approved as outlined in this motion. The Developer shall comply with all of the Documentation submitted to the Village for this Project. In recommending the preliminary approval, the Planning Commission makes the following findings pursuant to Section Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. The Project meets the Site Plan Review standards of Article Section 390-126 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:
   A. The uses proposed will preserve existing natural features of the site, including vegetation, topography, water features, and other such features, which shall be preserved to the greatest extent practical. Only those areas under actual
development shall be disturbed.

B. Buildings and structures are placed in an orderly, logical fashion that is consistent with its surroundings and the intent of the district in which the lot is located. Where proposed, open spaces are located and arranged in a manner which provides view protection, visual relief, physical separation, environmentally sensitive area protection, and/or recreational value to the site and surrounding properties.

C. Views from adjacent properties and streets open to water areas are preserved to the greatest extent practical. Placement and height of buildings and locations of open spaces make reasonable provisions for protection of existing views of the significant visual resources of the Village.

D. The proposed use has a proper relationship between the existing streets within the vicinity, and proposed deceleration lanes, service drives, entrance and exit driveways, and parking areas assure the safety and convenience of pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular traffic. Proposed streets and access plan and/or ingress/egress drives conform with any street or access plan adopted by the Village or MDOT.

E. Special attention has been given to proper site surface drainage so that the removal of surface waters do not adversely affect neighboring properties, the public storm drainage system, or nearby bodies of water. As needed, temporary on-site storage to reduce peak runoff is utilized. Surface water in all paved areas are collected at intervals so that it does not obstruct the flow of vehicular or pedestrian traffic and does not create standing water in the paved areas.

F. All utility services provided on site are in a manner least harmful to surrounding properties, and all utilities are located underground, as applicable, unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission.

G. Exposed storage areas, trash receptacles, machinery installations, service areas, truck unloading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas are screened from view from adjoining streets and properties.

H. The site plan provides for adequate access to the site and all buildings on the site by emergency vehicles.

I. All structures provide an orderly transition to adjacent development of a different scale.

J. The site provides outdoor common areas and associated amenities for employees, customers, and/or residents which may include public trash receptacles, bike racks, seating areas, recreations areas, shade trees, bus stop turnouts, and similar facilities.

K. All applicable local, state, and federal approvals are in place, or that such approvals shall be in place prior to issuance of a land use permit. The failure to remain in compliance with any such approval are grounds for revoking approval.

L. The site plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.

2. The Planning Commission finds the Project meets the intent for a PUD, as described in Article XII §390-73 of the Zoning Ordinance. By approving this Project as a PUD, the Village has been able to negotiate various amenities and design characteristics as well as additional restrictions with the Developer, as described in this report, which the Village would not have been able to negotiate if the PUD Article of the Zoning Ordinance was
3. Article XII §390-77 of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 503 of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act allow for departures from Zoning Ordinance requirements; these provisions are intended to result in land use development that is substantially consistent with the goals and objectives of the Village Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance, and consistent with sound planning principles. The Village shall make specific findings when the Developer applies for Final PUD approval.

4. Compared to what could have been constructed by right, the Project is 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.

5. 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.

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

A. The Preliminary 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 Preliminary PUD complies with all of the qualifying conditions of Section 390-74.

C. The proposed PUD is not 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 is compatible with the capacities of the public services and facilities it may affect and will not place a material burden upon the subject or surrounding land or property owners and occupants or the natural environment.

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

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

G. The proposed PUD is 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 satisfies all applicable local, state, and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Site Plan Review – Tanglefoot Park

Chairman Bohnhoff introduced this item and Hoisington gave an overview through a memorandum dated August 18, 2021. Manager Burns followed up with background information, members of the Focus Group and additional details of the site plan as well as shared samples with the Planning Commission of the materials to be used in the pavilion.

Tracy Hutchinson, 3436 Leonard, GR, Civil Project Manager of Driesenga and Associates, acting as the applicant for the site plan review application, provided additional information on pavilion amenities, splashpad, picnic table locations, parking areas, bike racks, dog waste stations, and
dumpster enclosure for the project.

**Hoisington** asked the Commission if they would like to see the required planting in the landscape islands. Ms. Hutchinson explained that the heavy landscaping throughout the park was the focus, and storm drainage inside two of the islands and green areas along the road were simi-functional. **Fedewa** noted that, in her experience, the smaller the landscape island and the less attention it gets, people tend to drive over them, the grass dies and, in a year or two, it doesn’t have the aesthetic that the municipality was going for, so she had suggested ornamental grasses that were cut down every fall and the area could then be used for snow storage.

Joyce Weise, 7357 40th Ave. Hudsonville, said she was working with Ms. Hutchinson on the landscaping plan and gave an overview of the process they had gone through to determine what plantings would be best to use and where the most appropriate place would be for them. The **Commission** discussed plantings and the parking islands with Ms. Weise. Ms. Weise said she felt very strongly that the islands should be grass for drainage.

Ms. Hutchinson shared the lighting plan. The **Commission** discussed having the lights on the building be LED and able to change color as needed for events. **Burns** said she would see what the cost was for that and the practicality. **Hoisington** noted that the park was abutting residential so they did need to be concerned with offsite versus onsite bright lights shining into residential properties.

Motion **VanderMeulen**, second from **Johnson**, to conditionally approve the Site Plan Review Application for Tanglefoot Park located at 312 West Exchange Street 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 a Soil Erosion Permit prior to a building permit being issued.

2. Shall provide a revised photometric plan with lighting fixture information for staff to approve administratively.

3. Shall provide a revised stormwater management plans to be reviewed by the Village Engineer prior to a building permit being issued.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6  No: 0

**REPORT**

The application meets the site plan review standards of §390-126 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:

A. The use proposed will preserve to the greatest extent practical, the existing natural features of the site, including vegetation, topography, water features, and other such features. Only the areas under actual development will be disturbed.

B. Buildings and structures are proposed to be placed in an orderly, logical fashion consistent with its surroundings and intent of the district. Where open spaces are proposed, it is located and arranged in a manner which provides view protection, visual relief, physical
separation, environmentally sensitive area protection, and/or recreational value to the site and surrounding properties.

C. The proposed use will preserve the views from adjacent properties and streets open to water areas to the greatest extent practical. Placement and height of buildings and locations of open spaces make reasonable provision for protecting existing views.

D. The use proposes proper relationships between the existing streets within the vicinity, including deceleration lanes, service drives, entrance and exit driveways, and parking areas to provide safe and convenient movements of pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles. Streets, access plans, and/or ingress/egress drives conform to the current regulations of the Village and MDOT.

E. The proposed use has given special attention to proper site surface drainage, so the removal of surface waters does not adversely affect neighboring properties, the public storm drainage system, or nearby bodies of water. Surface water will be collected at designated intervals to prevent standing water that would obstruct vehicle and/or pedestrian traffic. The standards of the Spring Lake Stormwater Management Ordinance are met.

F. All utilities for the proposed use are provided in a manner least harmful to surrounding properties and the utilities are located underground (as applicable), unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission.

G. The proposed use will be screened from view from adjoining streets and properties for any exposed storage areas, trash receptacles, machinery installations, service areas, truck unloading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas. Screening complies with Article XIV.

H. The site plan for the proposed use provides adequate access to the site and all buildings on the site by emergency vehicles.

I. The proposed use provides an orderly transition for all structures to adjacent development of a different scale.

J. The site plan for the proposed use provides outdoor common areas and associated amenities for employees, customers, and/or residents which may include public trash receptacles, bike racks, seating areas, recreation areas, shade trees, bus stop turnouts, and similar facilities; where appropriate.

K. The proposed use complies with all applicable local, state and federal approvals prior to issuing a land use permit.

L. The site plan for the proposed use is consistent with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance.

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

Manager Burns said she very much appreciated the amount of time the Planning Commission puts in to serve their community, but she wanted the Commission to know that Fedewa and Hoisington have been working very hard on their behalf the on behalf of the community.
Fedewa complemented the Planning Commission on the way each member took a turn giving their comments and that she had implemented that procedure for her Planning Commission in Grand Haven Township, and she also complemented Chairman Bohnhoff for his skills as Chair.

10. COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no comments.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Johnson, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6  No: 0

Cassandra Hoisington, Village Planner  Stacey Fedewa, Acting Recording Secretary