



**VILLAGE OF SPRING LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
February 25, 2020 7:00 PM**

**Barber School Community Building
102 West Exchange Street
Spring Lake, MI 49456**

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by **Martinus**, second from **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, 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 **Drooger**, second from **Johnson**, to approve the minutes from the January 28, 2020 regular meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. 108 Mason Street: The Planning Commission will consider a Special Use permit application to expand a legally non-conforming dwelling.

Planning Commission Member **Johnson** recused himself for conflict of interest as a neighbor.

Chairman **Bohnhoff** introduced this item and **Fedewa** gave an overview explaining that the applicant desired to expand the single-family home located at 108 Mason Street by adding a 325 square foot addition to the west side of the home. **Fedewa** said that the existing home was a nonconforming structure as it related to the front yard setback with the required front yard setback being 25 feet in the SFR-A District; the existing house had a front yard setback of 9.6 feet.

Fedewa explained that the proposed addition would have a front setback of 13.5 feet, which would not increase the non-conformity but would add bulk within the required front yard and would

maintain a side yard setback of over 20 feet on both side yards where only 10 feet was required. **Fedewa** noted that this addition was part of a larger remodel project designed to improve the functionality of the home.

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Martinus**, to open the Public Hearing at 7:04 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6 No: 0

Dan & Carol Sedlock was present to answer any questions.

Chelsea Morrison, 217 N. Buchanan St, asked if the owners had any intent in turning the home into a Short-Term Rental.

Carol Sedlock said they had no intention of turning the home into a rental, but they did let another neighbor's out of town guests use the home for a wedding. Mrs. Sedlock said that her daughter, husband and 5 children from Illinois stay in the home when they visit and the home had become too small for their family to stay comfortably with only 2 bedrooms and a bath and a half. Mrs. Sedlock said they also wanted to update other areas of the home.

Eric Johnson, 109 Mason, said that the Sedlock's had been good neighbors and he did not have any concerns that the property would be inappropriately used and that it was a good addition to the neighborhood.

Chelsea Morrison, 217 N. Buchanan St, asked if the style would be in keeping with the rest of the home. **Martinus** shared the site plan with Ms. Morrison, which answered her question.

Mrs. Sedlock explained that there would be an entire new roof on the house so that it all matched, and the addition would be in keeping with the look of the original house and the neighborhood.

There being no further comments, Motion by **Van Strate** second from **Drooger**, to close the Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6 No: 0

Martinus said he liked the plan and thought it was a good addition to the neighborhood.

Van State and **Nauta** agreed they liked the plan and had no issues.

Drooger and **Van Leeuwen-Vega** both liked the plan but asked for clarification on the non-conformity. **Fedewa** explained that the addition added bulk to the non-conformity, but it did not go closer to the road, so it did not increase the non-conformity by encroaching on the front setback.

Bohnhoff also, liked the project.

Martinus questioned the set-back and the size of the yard. **Johnson** explained that this particular street had a 66-foot right of way. **Fedewa** explained that the right of way is not included in the front yard setback measurement, so there is more yard between the house and edge of pavement.

Motion by **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, second from **Van Strate**, to approve the request by Carla Hernandez on behalf of Sedlock Trust for a 325 square foot expansion of a nonconforming structure pursuant to Section 390-25.D.1, which is located at 108 Mason Street (*Parcel No. 70-03-15-331-004*). This is based on the application meeting the requirements of the Spring Lake Village Zoning Ordinance.

Report of Findings – 108 Mason Street

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The use does not involve activities, processes, materials and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odors.
4. The site plan proposed for such use demonstrates compliance with the special land use specific requirements contained in § 390-199 of the Zoning Ordinance.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 6 No: 0

Johnson rejoined the Planning Commission.

- B. 307 E Exchange Street:** The Planning Commission will consider a Special Use permit application to expand The People Center food pantry.

Chairman **Bohnhoff** introduced this item and **Fedewa** gave an overview explaining that Nate Hill of Westwind Construction, representing The People Center, was requesting to expand an existing nonconforming building per Section 390-25.D.1, of the Zoning Ordinance which would require both a site plan review and a special land use because it was considered a community support facility.

Fedewa explained that the applicant desired to expand the facility by adding 260 square feet of interior floor area, which equated to 295 square feet when measuring the exterior dimensions, to expand their food pantry which would allow them to add a larger door and more shelving allowing them to expand their charitable impact to the community. **Fedewa** said that relocating the addition to a compliant side yard setback would not work well for the layout because it would no longer be connected in a seamless fashion.

Fedewa suggested that there be discussion regarding a Burning Bush that was so large and out of control it looked like a tree from the aerial view and that even though the ordinance had no direct requirement for replacement, she felt it was a good idea to discuss if the bush should be replaced or not. **Fedewa** also noted that no additions were needed to parking and the lighting

spec sheet was provided by the applicant which was compliant with the lighting ordinance so if Planning Commission chose to approve this request, she would recommend removing item #2.

Motion by **Drooger**, second from **Van Strate**, to open the Public Hearing at 7:22 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

Darcy Dye, 114 N Fruitport Rd, thanked the People Center for expanding their facility and taking care of people and feeding those in need. Dye also mentioned that the Burning Bush was an invasive species so replacing it with a tree might be a better option.

There being no further comments, Motion by **Nauta** second from **Drooger**, to close the Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

Van State, **Nauta** and **Martinus**, all agreed this was a great addition. **Johnson** liked the addition and suggested they speak to their neighbors about the construction. **Bohnhoff** also liked the addition. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** suggested adding some landscaping in place of the Burning Bush. **Fedewa** said she would suggest removing the bush. Karen Reenders, People Center, said they were planning on landscaping dedicated to a family member who passed.

Motion by **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, second from **Johnson**, to approve the request by Nate Hill of Westwind representing The People Center for a 261 square foot expansion of a nonconforming structure pursuant to Section 390-25.D.1 and Section 390-199.24, which was located at 307 E Exchange Street (*Parcel No. 70-03-15-452-027*), this was based on the application meeting the requirements of the Spring Lake Village Zoning Ordinance.

Report of Findings – 307 E Exchange

1. The application meets the special land use standards of Section 390-199 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:
 - 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, 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.
 - C. The use does not involve activities, processes, materials and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odors.

- D. The site plan proposed for such use demonstrates compliance with the special land use specific requirements contained in § 390-199 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The application meets the site plan review standards of Section 390-189 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the Planning Commission finds as follows:
- A. Existing natural features of the site are preserved to the greatest extent practical. Only those areas under actual development are disturbed.
 - B. Buildings and structures are placed in an orderly, nonrandom fashion such that an uncrowded, open appearance is maintained.
 - C. Views from adjacent properties and streets open to water areas are preserved to the greatest extent practical.
 - D. Driveways, parking, and circulation.
 - i. Vehicular access to the site is designed to provide reasonable access to the site, while minimizing the impact of driveways on the efficiency and safety of traffic operations along the public roadways.
 - ii. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation facilities are designed so as to provide for safe and efficient movement of vehicles and pedestrians.
 - iii. Where possible, access driveways on opposite sides of a street shall either be directly aligned or at an appropriate offset.
 - iv. If applicable, separation distance between driveways and/or public street intersections shall be maximized.
 - E. The site provides proper site surface drainage so that the removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system.
 - F. All new utility distribution lines are placed underground, when applicable.
 - G. Screening is in accordance with Article XXI, Landscape Regulations.
 - H. Outdoor activity areas have been designed and located to minimize conflicts with nearby residential neighborhoods.
 - I. The site plan provides for adequate access to the site and all buildings on the site by emergency vehicles.
 - J. Exterior lighting is located and designed so that illumination is directed away from adjacent properties and streets.
 - K. Landscaping is in accordance with Article XXI, Landscape Regulations.
 - L. Structures adhere to the design standards of the district, as applicable.
 - M. Structures provide an orderly transition to adjacent development of a different scale, as applicable.
 - N. The site plan 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 turn-outs, and similar facilities where appropriate.

All in favor, motion carried,

Yes: 7

No: 0

6. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Darcy Dye, 114 N Fruitport Rd., gave an update on the Adopt-A-Garden program reporting that volunteers were getting in gear for the 2020 summer and this year they would be concentrating on the downtown area where there had been much damage from construction and snow plowing since the ground did not freeze over the winter.

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

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by **Van Strate**, second from **Drooger**, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7

No: 0

Stacey Fedewa, AICP, Village Planner

Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk