I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Noren at 7:00 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Mierle moved to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2016 meeting as presented. TenCate seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

III. Adopt Agenda

Mierle moved to adopt the agenda as presented. TenCate seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

IV. Scott – Variance Request – 15811 Jennifer Lane

The Applicant has requested additional time to prepare drawings. This item may return at a future meeting.

V. Gentry – Authorization Request – 17862 W. Spring Lake Rd.

Jamie Kolsh presented the request for an additional storage building on their lot. He passed out additional photos of what the building could look like. The property already has a 300 square foot shed on it. They would like a much larger shed to store boats, cars, and lawn equipment. They have spoken to the neighbors and the new shed shouldn’t block anyone’s view. The actual location will be about 18 feet from the north lot line, not the 10 feet noted on the submitted drawings.

Mierle asked about the double doors. Kolsh indicated they were on the east end near the basketball court.

Postmus asked whether they were planning to have an overhang like the photo shows. Kolsh stated they were not planning on a patio/overhang, but were trying to indicate that the storage building would be attractive.

Postmus stated that the overall height would be 19’6”. Kolsh stated that they would like a 12’6” sidewall so they could have a 12’ by 12’ door.
Kolsh stated that they could remove the existing shed, but that it’s on a cement slab and they would like to keep it. It has been there about ten years.

Mierle asked if trees would need to be removed to allow access. Kolsh stated that some trees would be removed, and the property would be graded to take the shed to the level of the basketball court. They would back a boat over the basketball court to get it in the shed.

The public hearing was opened at 7:18pm.

Michael Carlson, 17876 W. Spring Lake Rd., which is northwest of the subject property, stated that his family room will look at the back of the building. He is concerned about whether items will be stored outside.

George Bennett, 17868 W. Spring Lake Rd., stated that he was not happy with the size of the building. He stated that his side of the building could be screened with trees, but he is concerned about the south side.

Hill read a letter which was received from Sharon Bedford, 17860 W. Spring Lake Rd. She is concerned that the building will look like a storage barn. She is also concerned about the location on the property.

Motion by Noren, support by Mierle, to close the public hearing at 7:22 pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Mierle stated that by right the applicant is allowed 960 square feet of accessory building, with ten-foot sidewalls and a 20 foot maximum height. He is concerned about allowing a bigger building.

Hill stated that this is an authorization, not a variance. Therefore, the applicant doesn’t have to prove there is a hardship. The total accessory building area requested is 1568 square feet.

Kolsh indicated he understands the concerns. They don’t want to upset the neighbors, and could reposition the building slightly. They could put a 660 square foot building in the same area without an authorization.

Sandi Gentry stated that she wants to be able to put trailers in the building so the lot looks neater.

Hill reviewed the criteria for authorization in Sections 306 and 902. Not all have to be true for a decision to be made.

Noren asked if the structure is consistent with the area. Kolsh stated it was.

Postmus stated he feels that after discussion the request is not well-defined and he would like additional information.
VI. P.I.G. LLC Variance Request from Section 332

Matt Purvis presented the request for a variance from Section 332, which would require three 5-acre parcels to be developed as part of a PUD along with six additional lots. Their land was divided by a simple land division process in 2015. They were allowed to rezone six acres to R2 in October, 2015. That part of their property has access to sewer. They would like to develop the remaining parcels into 5-acre lots, which do not have access to sewer. Developing the entire property under Section 332 would require the plan be reviewed as a PUD due to there being a total of nine lots. This would require sewer to be provided to all lots.

Section 332 was not in place when the applicants purchased the property, and they don’t believe that the ordinance was designed to deal with 5-acre lots. These three lots will be served by public water and gas lines, but it is expensive and difficult to provide sewer. They do have Ottawa County approval for a septic system on each of the 5-acre lots.

The public hearing was opened at 8:27pm.

John Nash, Spring Lake Township Supervisor, stated that the Board of Trustees solidly supported the choice of 8 lots to define a large scale development. However, the concerns about the sewer are appropriate because it will be too expensive to run.

Matt Izard stated that there would not be much building area on the three lots due to wetlands. Also, the lots cannot be divided for ten years after the original simple land division.

Motion by Noren, support by Mierle, to close the public hearing at 8:30pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Mierle asked about the PUD requirements compared to other subdivision types. Hill stated that the PUD has a more intensive review process, and it is more flexible for the developer and the Township. However, all types of subdivisions require sewer to be installed.

Commissioners reviewed the criteria for granting a variance.

Motion by TenCate, support by Mierle, to approve the P.I.G. LLC variance application requesting a variance from the Planned Unit Development requirement in Section 332 to allow a total of nine lots from a single parent parcel (70-03-25-200-041) utilizing the simple land division process and a site condominium or subdivision process as the application meets all of the criteria in Section 112, I, of the Zoning Ordinance with the following conditions:

a. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.

With a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.
VII. Adjournment

Mierle moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:46 p.m. with support from Noren. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Noren, Chairperson
Zoning Board of Appeals