

> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

Planning Commission Minutes 1/24/22

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission met January 24, 2022.

1) Call to Order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairperson Israels.

2) Roll Call

Present: D. Ihle, R. Israels, J. Helmrich, D. DeFranco, D. Webster, M. Wurth, J. Ground Also present: L. Wells, Zoning Administrator

3) Approval of Agenda

Israels added under Old Business item "A" Change in PC membership and staff position; item "B" Appointment of member to Rural Character and Conservation Committee; item "C" Discussion of Reporting Tool; item "D" Update on ODC.

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Ihle. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4) Approval of Minutes

Minutes from 11/22/21 PC Meeting

• Page 6, paragraph 3, line 6: change "lane" to "land"

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 11/22/21 as amended. Seconded by Ihle. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Minutes from 12/13/21

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 12/13/21 as written. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

5) Public Comment

1. Roy McIlwaine 3466 Riverside Drive, said that the neighbors of Riverside Drive/Dugout Rd had sent a letter to the Township in favor of establishing a historic district. McIlwaine noted that the letter had been reprinted in the Commercial Record and McIlwaine submitted to the PC a list of names of those in support of the historic district, which included Roy and Carol McIlwaine, Elie and Andrew Caruthers, Scott Wierenga,



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

Marcia Sikora, Sue and Mike Haas, Cindy Stearns, John Williams, Nick Wallace, Kathi Bely-Wallace, Diane Bily, Michael Bily. McIlwaine said he was interested in preserving the historic nature of the site, and urged the PC to consider the measure and take the next step. McIlwaine said that the City of Saugatuck had nothing comparable to an overlay district and that the PC should consider asking the City to join the Township in creating an overlay district along their river frontage.

- 2. Maria Mendoza, 2262 54th St Fennville, identified herself as the applicant for item A under new business. Mendoza handed PC members a document with answers to questions posed by Zoning Administer Wells with respect to the applicant's SAU application for adult use marijuana retailer.
- 3. Scott Wierenga, 6618 Dugout Rd, read the following letter: "Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words. As a relative newcomer to the Saugatuck area I want to remind you of what you have here. I don't imply that you don't know but sometimes it is good to see something through fresh eyes. You have a quaint, fun, 'old fashioned,' history rich, small town on the water with a welcoming and warm population; absolutely stunning natural areas-from the Kalamazoo River to Lake Michigan and from the beaches and dunes to the acres of beautiful woods. It is incredibly attractive, and it is no wonder that so many people want a piece of it. Your responsibility as a planning commission and as a Township Board, along with the Boards of the cities of Saugatuck and Douglas, is to balance the tension between old and new, keeping things the same and managing change. There do need to be improvements. Things like the bike trail, the nature trails Jon Vanderbeek is working on, Blue Star Highway safety improvements, internet infrastructure, other road improvements and affordable housing to name a few. However, too much development, or 'the wrong kind' and you run the risk of killing what we have here in Saugatuck and you just become another Holland or Grand Haven. Not that those places are bad, they just aren't Saugatuck. Figuring out what is 'the wrong kind' of development isn't always easy. I do believe there are some things you can have in place that will help you make decisions that will protect the things almost everyone here values. Expanding the Natural River Overlay District seems to me to be a very easy and powerful way to protect the natural features of the area that we all value. I encourage you work with the Township Board and pass a resolution creating the Overlay District. I also encourage you to reach out to the City of Saugatuck to partner with you in doing this as they also have many feet of frontage that would qualify for this designation and protection. I also encourage you to continue evaluating the creation of a Historic District in the Township. Thank you for your time tonight and the work you do on behalf of everyone in the Township."

Public Comment Closed

6) New Business



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

A. Public Hearing, Special Land Use, adult marijuana retailer in C-3 district, on parcel: 020-038-10. Applicant is Maria Mendoza, Be Positive, Best Buds

Wells reviewed SAU application for marijuana provision center west of Just Barns Drive along Blue Star Highway. Wells noted that there is a 20 foot easement on the north side for the property to the west, and that the applicant will make adjustments to the site plan to accommodate the easement.

Maria Mendoza, 2262 54th St Fennville, identified herself as the applicant and distributed an updated site plan to commissioners. Mendoza explained that they will use cat litter to dispose of marijuana.

Mark Zeitlow identified himself as helping the applicant with their business. Zeitlow said that the applicant wanted to support the Saugatuck community, help grow the marijuana retail business in Michigan, and that the applicant had been prequalified by the state for this business.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comment

Public Hearing Closed

Wurth said that the application appeared well prepared and saw no reason why the SAU should not be approved.

Webster looked at the application through the lens of both the master plan and the C-3 district zoning, and believed that with respect to those perspectives the proposed project was an appropriate use for that site. Webster noted that the planning commission was looking at approval of a SAU, not a site plan. Although site plan was not under review, Helmrich noted a drive-through window on the site plan distributed by the applicant which would not be permitted without a modified SAU.

DeFranco thanked the applicant for choosing Saugatuck Township to open their business.

Israels thanked the applicant for their proposal. Clarified that when the Township voted to allow marijuana businesses it was an "all or nothing" decision and there is no way to regulate the number of marijuana retail businesses that open beyond the need for those businesses to be located in the C-3 district.

Webster questioned whether all the conditions identified by Wells needed to be included in a



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

motion given that some of those conditions concerned the site plan, not the SAU. Israels noted that spelling out and including those conditions in a motion was helpful to the applicant in identifying what still needs to be done. DeFranco agreed. Wells noted it was also helpful to the Building Inspector and staff. Commissioners thought the exercise of distinguishing between SAU related and site plan review related conditions was helpful, but decided that all conditions identified by Wells should remain in an approval of the SAU. Israels reiterated that more conditions may come at a later time.

A **Motion** was made by Wurth to approve the applicant's SAU application with the following conditions identified by Wells in her staff report: (1) A detailed site plan shall be submitted as a condition of special approval use. A special approval use shall expire within 12 months if a detailed site plan has not been approved and the conditions herein have not been met. The detailed site plan shall include all utility, grading, drainage and access information as well as building renderings, a lighting plan and a landscape plan, (2) Windows and doors shall remain closed except for ingress and egress, (3) Negative interior air pressure shall be maintained at all times, (4) The applicant shall prepare written statement related to hours of deliveries, (5) All setbacks shall be met and easements shall be shown in a detailed site plan submittal, (6) The applicant shall provide the Township with a boundary survey that indicates title commitments and all easements identified, (7) Driveways shall be reviewed and approved by the Michigan Department of Transportation and/or the County Roads Commission. A letter shall be provided with the application for detailed site plan, (8) All lighting fixtures shall be downward facing and dark sky compliant. The lighting plan shall be provided, (9) The applicant shall provide in writing a description and plan for storage and disposal for marijuana, (10) A security plan has not been provided. A security plan shall be provided that indicates that marijuana will not be stored overnight in an outdoor waste bin, (11) A condition has been added that signage shall conform to the zoning ordinance, (12) The applicant shall adhere to all requirements and standards of applicable local, state and federal laws, including Ordinance 40-746 at all times, (13) The building shall be designated to meet the architectural standards of Section 40-622 of the Zoning Ordinance, including materials, roof line, transparency, etc. Rooftop mechanicals shall be screened from view, (14) There shall be no drive through operations unless a special approval use is amended, (15) All conditions as set forth by the Fire District, (16) All conditions of the Township Engineer, (17) All conditions of the utility district, Allegan County Road Commission, and other applicable review agencies, (18) All conditions shall be met by all reviewing parties, and all fees paid prior to issuance of building permit. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to seek reviews and approvals from reviewing parties and furnish confirmation to the building department prior to issuance of building permit. Seconded by Ground. Motion passed. Yeas: Ihle, Helmrich, Ground, Webster, Wurth, Israels. Abstain: DeFranco

B. Site Plan Review, six commercial warehouse buildings, located at 3500 Commercial Boulevard in the C-1 district, on parcel: 20-003-049-01. The applicant is Scott Bosgraaf, North Shore of Saugatuck



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

Wells reviewed staff report of site plan review for wholesale sales and services, phase 3, noting that this is an existing site plan for a quasi-industrial development. Wells explained that the some of the proposed site plan includes development in the critical dune area. Wells contacted EGLE and inquired about the approval process. EGLE said that there was no best practice, but that EGLE would not feel pressure to approve the project if the Township approved it, that they would determine approval with respect to their own standards. Wells said that EGLE's biggest concern was whether there were hills involved and it was more likely they would approve the project if the land was flat. Wells noted that on the site plan the tree buffer identified was not on the property in question and may not be owned by the applicant. Wells worried whether those buffers would be preserved in perpetuity. Wells noted the need to address waste removal, as an adequate waste removal plan was not part of the site plan, and wondered what the vision for waste removal was now that condos in the development had sold. While not currently included, Wells explained that if utilities become necessary, water and septic will be added. Wells noted that restrooms are not included in the site plan, but it is now known that restrooms, kitchens and lofts that could be used for sleeping have all been added to units in the development. Recommended commissioners have a discussion about the uses of these condos, because it seems that the building uses are morphing especially when they change ownership and are customized. While this is a property right, Wells felt that use should be spelled out more because of safety concerns, for instance, if hazardous materials are being stored in one building with a shared wall that is not fire rated for residential use, it could pose a clear danger to a neighbor who is using their unit in residential-related ways. Wells reiterated that residential or dwelling is not permitted in C-1. Wells said she included additional conditions for master-deeds and by-laws from the previous two phases of the project for Township records. Wells noted that the Township does have a site condominium ordinance, but that it is usually invoked at the time of site plan review; if it's not presently being proposed the Township does not review a project with respect to the site condominium ordinance. Wells noted that with what is being proposed, the condo process can happen outside of site plan review. Wells noted that the Planning Commission had received new correspondence from Fire District Chief Janik. The correspondence from Chief Janik concerned hazardous material being stored in the building, uses that might be residential, buildings lack fire suppression sprinkler systems, and that complaints have been received about people sleeping in the units.

Bosgraaf identified himself as the applicant and said that he had not seen the new correspondence from Chief Janik, but assured commissioners that there are no residential uses occurring and no sleeping in the units.

Wurth asked if it was reasonable to assume that the buildings would be used for storage of boats, cars, RVs. Bosgraaf said that he has a boat in his unit on occasion and sometimes parks his car there. Wurth noted that boat owners tend to work on their boats in the winter and that it could involve hazardous materials, which was concerning. Bosgraaf noted that the building on the



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

corner of Commercial Blvd was being used to market used cars; the floor material in the units is a highly-polished concrete that does not lend itself to heavy work and Bosgraaf did not recollect hazardous materials being used. Wurth wondered if applicant had enough experience knowing how people use the units to determine whether hazardous materials could be used. Bosgraaf said it was difficult to know how people would use the units in the future.

Webster noted the memo from the Township Engineer, who stated that the ownership structure of the condos was not clear, the site plan was insufficiently detailed, and thinks that the owner should secure a permit from EGLE first. Webster was concerned that condos could be used as "man caves," and thus involve sleeping and other residentially related uses. Bosgraaf asked to review the Engineer's letter and said that ownership was North Shore, not condos.

Israels asked Bosgraaf if his personal unit in the development had water service. Bosgraaf confirmed. Israels asked if Bosgraaf's unit had septic service. Bosgraaf confirmed. Bosgraaf said that phase 1 and 2 of the development had been approved without water service and that if water and septic was required at a later time he would install such systems. Israels said that water access was important for fire suppression and buildings with no water access would be dangerous. Israels said that the Township should have EGLE issue permits before Township gave any approvals, and that having EGLE permits prior to site plan review or SAU should be a general policy of the Township.

Helmrich asked how many units were in phases 1 and 2. Bosgraaf said that phase 1 had 8 units and phase 2 had 22 units. Helmrich asked how many units were now under different ownership. Bosgraaf said that 28 of the units were under different ownership. Helmrich noted that the overwhelming trend was for ownership to transfer from North Shore to private ownership. Bosgraaf said it was challenging to get state and federal permits prior to seeking approval from the Township, and it would be unfortunate for a developed to spend years securing an EGLE permit only to be turned down by the Township. Ihle asked Bosgraaf to clarify one of the stated proposed uses of the property because it was not legible on the application. Bosgraaf said the use was "warehouse." Helmrich thought Bosgraaf needed time to read the correspondence from Chief Janik. Ihle said that Janik was coming from the point of view of how to address barns in general. Ihle recommended annual inspections. Wurth raised the possibility of Bosgraaf creating by-laws for control uses and inquired with Bosgraaf about his plan for selling units. Bosgraaf said he was not a residential developer.

Israels asked Bosgraaf if some of the spaces are used as offices. Bosgraaf confirmed. Israels asked if some of the spaces include kitchens. Bosgraaf confirmed. Wurth asked if it was logical to expect that a potential buyer could have a range of uses and needs and that when the shell of the building is constructed, is it not necessary to have an idea of whether water and sewer will be needed. Bosgraaf said the floors will be sloped, but no plumbing is planned. Israels inquired about the need for including a triple catch basin for water and oil separation. Bosgraaf said



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

perhaps if the use of the space required it, but until the use is known that would be putting the "cart before the horse." Ground asked how many units have added water and sanitation. Bosgraaf said 24 out of 30 units added water and septic. DeFranco said that while it is difficult to definitely know what the future uses of the spaces would be, the Township does definitely know that the proposed project is located within the Wellhead Protection Overlay District and that it neighbors a site that has been identified as a potential municipal well site that the Township has the option to purchase. DeFranco said that while the applicant doesn't know what the future use of the space will be, the Township knows that the future use of a neighboring property will be to serve as a municipal well and that the Township has a heightened responsibility to make sure that land use in that area does not contaminate the aquifer. DeFranco also noted that the Township has a pretty good idea of what the future uses of the spaces could be given how the spaces are presently being used, and said that the Township must take the necessary precautions to protect the community's water supply. Wurth asked if those safeguards could be addressed when individual unit owners come before the planning commission for site review. DeFranco thought that safeguards to the aquifer should be secured with this phase of approval. Bosgraaf noted that the regulations of the groundwater protection overlay district would apply to all present and future unit owners or renters. Bosgraaf added that he believes the fire department does annual inspections of all buildings in C-1. Wells asked Bosgraaf if he would be willing to come in for additional site plan reviews as the building is converted to condos. Bosgraaf said he was not opposed to the idea, but it would be precarious to proceed with constructing six buildings and having to return to the Township for further approvals. Bosgraaf assumed that the individual owners would come before the planning commission for site plan review, not Bosgraaf. Bosgraaf said it was difficult for him because his development does not involve a single use; he does not know who the buyers would be and what uses they have planned for their spaces.

Ground asked if Bosgraaf knew how many units added water and septic. Bosgraaf said 24 units. Webster noted that the engineer report states that the site plan does not include the necessary level of detail and is inclined to agree with the Township engineer. Webster noted that there was no landscape plan, and stated that the planning commission lacked adequate site plans for both existing and proposed buildings in the development. Bosgraaf said that the Engineer's judgment is based on Bosgraaf adding water and sewer to the development, something which he is not presently proposing. Bosgraaf said that he could satisfy the engineer's requirements of showing proposed water lines, but he doesn't propose water lines and asked what the PC would like him to show. Webster said that in looking at phase 1 and 2, there are water lines installed, and given that the existing units have water it is likely that the proposed units will get water at some point. Webster asked Bosgraaf to tell the PC where he would put the water lines. Bosgraaf said he would consult with KLSWA and the TWP engineer if he were to show water lines, but he's not proposing it. Israels said that the PC is asking Bosgraaf to show where the water lines would be. Israels said that it sounds like the PC is not ready to approve the site plan. Bosgraaf asked PC to lay out the reasons for denying the site plan. Israels noted that the reasons pertain to



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

commissioners' questions and the Engineer report. Israels also noted that the project is being proposed in a critical dune area, and that approval of the site plan is not what the Township would normally do first, that first the Township would have EGLE's findings. Bosgraaf said that if EGLE does not approve the plan, he would be back before PC with a new project. Israels said that would be fine. Webster said there was no existing topography, grading plan or appropriate setbacks. Webster clarified that she was not saying the proposal was not a good project, just that the site plan application is incomplete and does not provide sufficient information to approve the plan.

Wells recommended PC provide the applicant and staff with some direction as to what they would like to see from a new site plan application, such as requiring an EGLE permit prior to site plan review, grading and drainage plan with topography, separate landscape plan with materials and height of materials. Webster asked if Bosgraaf would like the PC to postpone a decision given the engineer's report that the site plan does not include the required level of detail. Bosgraaf preferred the PC to approve his project, but if the PC does not approve it he would like to hear the conditions for denial. Webster would like to see conditions that require that topography is in harmony with the surrounding area as well as a storm water management plan. Ground said that she reviewed the Site Plan Content Requirements, Section 40-813 in the Zoning Ordinance, and noted that requirements 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 are not sufficiently detailed in the present site plan proposal and that they be addressed in any resubmittal by the applicant.

Israels said that Saugatuck is a small township and that we do not like to back into projects. Israels said that a goal for the future is to approach projects sensibly and to bring in land use experts on projects, and Israels was not comfortable with moving forward without input from EGLE. Israels said she feels responsible to people in the community who have invested their heart and soul into the community. Israels said she hopes Bosgraaf will work with the Township on the project, but Israels did not feel the project is not ready for approval.

Israels asked what commissioners would like to do. Webster said that from a site plan perspective, the current site plan has an insufficient level of detail. Webster suggested postponing a decision to give Bosgraaf more time to submit the necessary level of detail. Webster asked whether there was a storm-water calculation requirement of the applicant. Bosgraaf said that the Township has staff for that. Wells clarified that the applicant is responsible for providing such information and that the Township would review materials submitted. Webster asked Bosgraaf if he would prefer the PC to postpone a decision so he had time to provide additional detail or to reject the site plan application.

A **motion** was made by Webster to postpone a decision on site plan review, six commercial warehouse buildings, located at 3500 Commercial Boulevard in the C-1 district, on parcel: 20-003-049-01 and to have the applicant meet all the requirements of site plan review, Ordinance



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

40-813, before returning to Planning Commission. Seconded by Ihle. Motion passed. **Yeas**: Ihle, Helmrich, Ground, Webster, Wurth, Israels. **Abstain**: DeFranco

C. Historic district follow up and natural river overlay discussion

Wells discussed staff memo on the TWP's current Natural River Overlay District, Sec. 40-591. Wells noted that the boundaries of the current Natural River Overlay District mirror those of a wild/scenic river federal designation for that part of the Kalamazoo River in the Township. If the Township were to consider extending the boundaries of the natural river overlay district they should consider whether the sections of the river to be included in the new overlay district meet the criteria of wild and scenic.

Webster inquired about the origin of this agenda item. Helmrich noted that the topic of planning exploring the extension of a natural river overlay district came out of a discussion had by the Board at their January regular meeting. DeFranco explained that extending the boundaries of the existing natural river overlay district was an option explored in his report on Local Historic Districts; an extension of the existing natural river overlay district may be pursued in lieu of the creation of a Historic District ordinance. Webster requested that if items are included on the agenda that commissioners have sufficient time to review material related to those items prior to the meeting.

No action taken.

7) Old Business

A. Change in PC membership and staff position

Helmrich announced that DeFranco formally resigned from the Planning Commission, effective immediately, and had accepted the position of Operations Coordinator with the TWP.

B. Appointment of New Member to the Rural Character and Conservation Committee

DeFranco explained that the Rural Character and Conservation Committee had approved a motion at the January meeting to endorse the appointment of Chris Clark to the Rural Character and Conservation Committee.

A **motion** was made by Webster to approve the appointment of Chris Clark to the Rural Character and Conservation Committee. Seconded by Helmrich. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

C. Discussion of Reporting Tool



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

Israels reviewed reporting tool for the action items of the Advisory Committees.

D. Update on the ODC

DeFranco explained that members of the PC and Wells had spoken with the ODC and relayed to them PC feedback from the previous meeting. The ODC had responded with two options to address concerns for the mining site on Old Allegan and 133rd. The first option was specific to the mining site itself, whereas the second option addressed general mining operations best practices.

A **motion** was made by Webster to endorse option 2 presented by the ODC. Seconded by Ihle. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- E. Township Board Update: January 12 & 14, 2022 Submitted by Board and PC Member Jon Helmrich
- The Township Board met on January 12 & 14, 2022:
- · Public Comment was made on a Historic District, extending the Natural River Overlay district, and from County Commissioner Kapenga, and the Ivy House owners on the pro-posed Development Agreement regarding drainage and water issues.
- · Jon Vanderbeek gave an update on the trails plan and asked for support of the Bridge to the Beach plan. Outlined goals to add 1000 acres of parkland in the township.
- · Voted to accept a Separation Agreement between Township and the Township Man-ager.
- · Appointed Elliott Sturm to the Parks & Recreation Commission filling a vacancy.
- · Accepted receipt of Historic District report from Planning Commission; requested that PC report back on the particulars of the existing Natural River Overlay and details on possi-ble extension of the Overlay to other parts of Kalamazoo River.
- · Approved the two-option Development Agreement for Ivy House event center.
- · Approved a revised Township logo with request for a color change.
- · Acknowledged receipt of six proposals for a new website design.



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

- · Chief Janik addressed the Blue Star intersection issues with the county and the ideas for either a new traffic light or roundabout.
- · Parks & Recreation Commission presented an idea for a cross county track on land near the existing Dog Park. High School coach spoke in support of this.
- · New Office operating procedures due to Covid were approved.
- · Acknowledged that the agreements to have a Tri-Community Recycling Committee had expired and that representatives to that committee would speak in February to its future and potential change of focus.
- · Special Meeting of the Board was held on February 14 at 1:30pm.
- · Board approved filling a monthly/temporary position of Office Coordinator to help with manager transition and will make an offer.
- · Approved sending a letter in support of grant application for the Blue Star Bike Trail.

Next Board meeting is Wednesday, February 9, 2022 at 6:00pm

F. Staff Update

• Wells noted that there was a Special Land Use application for a marijuana grow facility to be reviewed at the February meeting

8. Adjourn

A **Motion** was made to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 pm by Webster. Seconded by Wurth. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Next P.C. meeting: Monday, February 21st, 2022 at 6:00 pm.



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

Motions:

- 1. A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Ihle. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
- 2. A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 11/22/21 as amended. Seconded by Ihle. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
- 3. A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 12/13/21 as written. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
- 4. A Motion was made by Wurth to approve the applicant's SAU application with the following conditions identified by Wells in her staff report: (1) A detailed site plan shall be submitted as a condition of special approval use. A special approval use shall expire within 12 months if a detailed site plan has not been approved and the conditions herein have not been met. The detailed site plan shall include all utility, grading, drainage and access information as well as building renderings, a lighting plan and a landscape plan, (2) Windows and doors shall remain closed except for ingress and egress, (3) Negative interior air pressure shall be maintained at all times, (4) The applicant shall prepare written statement related to hours of deliveries, (5) All setbacks shall be met and easements shall be shown in a detailed site plan submittal, (6) The applicant shall provide the Township with a boundary survey that indicates title commitments and all easements identified, (7) Driveways shall be reviewed and approved by the Michigan Department of Transportation and/or the County Roads Commission. A letter shall be provided with the application for detailed site plan, (8) All lighting fixtures shall be downward facing and dark sky compliant. The lighting plan shall be provided, (9) The applicant shall provide in writing a description and plan for storage and disposal for marijuana, (10) A security plan has not been provided. A security plan shall be provided that indicates that marijuana will not be stored overnight in an outdoor waste bin, (11) A condition has been added that signage shall conform to the zoning ordinance, (12) The applicant shall adhere to all requirements and standards of applicable local, state and federal laws, including Ordinance 40-746 at all times, (13) The building shall be designated to meet the architectural standards of Section 40-622 of the Zoning Ordinance, including materials, roof line, transparency, etc. Rooftop mechanicals shall be screened from view, (14) There shall be no drive through operations unless a special approval use is amended, (15) All conditions as set forth by the Fire District, (16) All conditions of the Township Engineer, (17) All conditions of the utility district, Allegan County Road Commission, and other applicable review agencies, (18) All conditions shall be met by all reviewing parties, and all fees paid prior to issuance of building permit. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to seek reviews and approvals from reviewing parties and furnish confirmation to the



> PHONE (269) 857-7721 FAX (269) 857-4542

building department prior to issuance of building permit. Seconded by Ground. Motion passed. **Yeas**: Ihle, Helmrich, Ground, Webster, Wurth, Israels. **Abstain**: DeFranco

- 5. A **Motion** was made by Webster to postpone a decision on site plan review, six commercial warehouse buildings, located at 3500 Commercial Boulevard in the C-1 district, on parcel: 20-003-049-01 and to have the applicant meet all the requirements of site plan review, Ordinance 40-813, before returning to Planning Commission. Seconded by Ihle. Motion passed. **Yeas**: Ihle, Helmrich, Ground, Webster, Wurth, Israels. **Abstain**: DeFranco
- 6. A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the appointment of Chris Clark to the Rural Character and Conservation Committee. Seconded by Helmrich. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
- 7. A **Motion** was made by Webster to endorse option 2 presented by the ODC. Seconded by Ihle. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
- 8. A **Motion** was made to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 pm by Webster. Seconded by Wurth. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Next P.C. meeting: Monday, February 21st, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully,

D. DeFranco, P.C. Sec.