A. Call to Order

Masson called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

B. Approval of Agenda

Ketchum made a motion, support by Tiles, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Approval of Minutes

Lindquist made a motion, support by Ketchum, to adopt the December 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Public Comments

A time for public comment was provided. No comments were offered.

E. Spring Ridge PUD – Preliminary Review

Rick Pulaski, the project planner from Nederveld, presented the proposed site plan for the Spring Ridge PUD. Dale Kraker, the developer, was also present to answer questions.

Masson asked about why the subdivision wasn’t built after the previous approval was given. Pulaski stated that the subdivision was approved in September, 2013. After that approval, additional permits were required. The subdivision adjoins Smith’s Bayou, so an Army Corps of Engineers permit is required. That permit took until late 2015 to be approved. Bultje stated that under state law, the developer has one year following preliminary approval to get final plat approval. As the approval was not received in that time, the Board of Trustees did not grant an extension to the previous approval. Since that time, the Zoning Ordinance has changed to require developments of more than eight units to go through the PUD process.
Pulaski stated that the site is on Van Wagoner, east of 168th Ave. It is approximately 29 acres, and is zoned R2. The site has a considerable area of wetlands. They are proposing 53 lots, for a density of 2.8 units per acre.

Commissioners stated that they had concerns with the overall density of the development, stormwater management, and open space. They were especially concerned that the open space areas are all wetlands, and there is no space for active use. Tiles would prefer an area to play within the subdivision. Ketchum stated that the northeast corner of the site, where the lots front onto Van Wagoner, should be considered for higher density homes, such as town homes.

Hill presented the concerns addressed in his preliminary review. Overall, staff feels the proposal does not qualify as a PUD based on the following items:
1. There is a general lack of innovation on this site and this development does not appear to offer substantial or unique benefits to the community.
2. No mixes of uses or range of housing types are proposed.
3. The proposed public road does not serve a public purpose and should be private. There is no substantial connectivity to the street system other than the one access point on Van Wagoner.
4. Density levels are too low and do not meet the minimum 3-5 units per acre for a residential development.
5. While wetlands have been preserved, other critical environmental areas have not been identified for protection.
6. A sewer agreement between the Township and the applicant would need to be in place prior to any formal action on the PUD since the applicant is proposing to obtain sewer in a manner that is not consistent with the Spring Lake Township Utility Master Plan.
7. Lots within new developments typically have driveways access from an interior road. Lots 28, 47-53 have direct access to a county road, which appears to be due to wetland considerations.
8. None of the open spaces are usable areas, such as parks, open fields or trails.
9. Per the Spring Lake Township Master Plan, the Medium Density Future Land Use Designation calls for the following:

Based on the discussions, the Commissioners directed the applicant to modify the plan and return for further discussion.

F. **Commissioner Comments**

1. Township Board: The Board of Trustees has directed the Township Manager to look into technology improvements at Barber School. The Village DPW director has resigned; the Township and Village DPW staffs will work together as staffing is reviewed. The fire station construction is going well.
2. Zoning Board of Appeals: No report.
3. Community Development Director: Ottawa County is providing board member training if anyone is interested.
G. **Adjournment**

Ketchum moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:38pm. Masson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Ketchum, Secretary
Planning Commission