

SAUGATUCK TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

January 22, 2007

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission met on January 22, 2007, at the township hall on Blue Star Highway, Saugatuck, Michigan 49453.

Present: Darpel, Edris, Hanson, Marczuk and Milauckas

Absent: Jarzembowski and Rausch

Also present: Planner Sisson, John Balmer, Daniel Schaafsma and Cal Becksvoort for Jet Construction's Chestnut Lane project, and various members of the general public.

Chairman Hanson called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. Milauckas made a motion, which Marczuk supported, to approve the minutes of December 11, 2006, as amended as follows: Spelling of Jarzembowski corrected throughout; Page 1, line 42 add after Mr. Velcamp "who recycles waste oil for Michel;" Page 2, line 1 "Brand" Dykstra; line 3 "Amy Cook;" line 6 should read after Special "Approval Use for a home occupation in an attached garage," and delete "Variance;" lines 23 and 41 Zoning Ordinance section should read "40-693;" delete the last sentence in lines 48-49 and substitute "Applicant is required to have on-site inspection by BLDI Engineering of fuel lines and tanks, as specified in the letter of January, 2006. 2nd Jarzembowski. Darpel commented that building design must comply with Building Design Standards of Zoning Ordinance section 40-662 (b) (1)." Motion carried.

Edris made a motion, supported by Marczuk, to approve the January 4, 2007, minutes. Motion carried.

Public comment: Ron Collins, 3468 Goodwood Dr., Grand Rapids, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Collins, original developers of the Collins Woods property, where the Chestnut Lane PUD project is located, said he did not think his father envisioned the proposed density. He thought his father would expect the newcomers to try to blend in with what is already there, rather than disrupting. The idea that this project would benefit the whole community should be decided by the existing community, not by the newcomers.

Hanson reviewed letters: Betty Van Wieren, 365 Maple, commenting on the boat sales business next door not complying with conditions of SAU; Al Ellingsen's letter to John Renaldi on 63rd St. suggesting he needs SAU for cookie business; Al Ellingsen's letter on the Millenium Properties rezoning.

Hanson invited a spokesman for Chestnut Lane PUD to explain the revised plan and to answer concerns expressed at the November 9 hearing. Dan Schaafsma, Latitude Engineering, offered a power point presentation on the process to create a 7-unit duplex of 40,000 s.f. each resulting in 14 stand-alone units, clustered to provide 35 % open space, with a community septic system, plus individual wells. The Road Commission required a new name for the private road, the Drain Commission requested that storm

water detention would be separate from the existing water course along the western property line. Buildings have been moved east to allow for a larger detention pond. The Health Department has deemed all land east of Chestnut Lane suitable for drain fields. He said the DEQ had determined where the wetlands are, as shown on the plan.

Cal Becksvort explained that the community septic system will be licensed by the DEQ, a state operator/inspector hired, an escrow account established and land for a reserve field required. Schaafsma stated that wells would be shared among three or four units. He added that with this plan there will be less pavement, and the detention pond is designed to retain all storm water on site. An earth covered emergency path for fire truck access and a dry hydrant will be provided. These homes will have two-car garages, driveways and 10' perimeter of limited common element. Becksvort said the retention pond is designed to handle two 100-year storms back-to-back, or the equivalent of 12 inches of rain in a 24-hour period, will be 8 feet deep and feature a surrounding berm. He verified for Edris that given the current water table, this pond will not go dry.

Sisson reviewed his memo of January 20, saying that there seems to be a misunderstanding of what density should be allowed in R-3B on this site. The current plan represents the maximum in a PUD, but by R3B standards, only five 40,000 s.f. lots can be achieved, giving a maximum number of dwelling units of 10 duplex units. He cited drainage problems and the fact that Lakeshore Drive is the only access as factors in his calculation. He provided Becksvort with the rough sketch he had made of the property. Becksvort said Sec. 40-332 for R3B lot area requirements does not exclude road areas, but Sisson pointed out that the definition of "lot area" excludes streets. If they insisted, Sisson said they could take it to the ZBA for interpretation.

Milauckas brought up the "encroachment agreement" to be obtained through the Road Commission so a stairway might be constructed down to the beach at Colver Street. Balmer said he inquired about it to see if it were something they wanted to do, but the county returned a letter of indemnification. Milauckas said this attempt at lake access would bring the anti-funneling ordinance into play. Hanson said it is not the Planning Commission's place to grant access to public property.

Hanson stated his big concern was the high water table, that when you put houses and paved surfaces on this land, you might be sending water downstream that you don't know about. Becksvort said the western parts of the property are wetter so the buildings there would not have basements. Hanson asked whether the retention basin would be sufficient to contain drainage from all surfaces, and Becksvort replied it was designed to do that. Becksvort said absorption of 48% of run-off will take place before it reaches the pond. Perforated storm pipes will be maintained by the association. Milauckas asked how much would be retained in the pond, and Becksvort said 52%, and what leaves the pond would be through evaporation or percolation. Milauckas pointed out that the clay layer underlying all the sand is where the water begins to go its own way. Edris added that this system would be taking run-off from the eastern higher parts of the property and funneling it toward the pond and the lakeshore. Sisson said taking trees out of the area increases the run-off as well. Becksvort suggested finding a third party to study the run-

off and whether the pond would recharge the water table. Some of the Commissioners thought this might be a good idea.

Hanson opened the meeting to public comment and Herb Bills, 6910 Bendemeer, wondered how the drainage system would seem to go uphill, and Hanson gave the sea level measurements. Controlled release from the pond was discussed, and the pipes that exist now to take water away from the area were described. Deb Matthai, 6936 Hickory Lane was concerned about pond maintenance, mosquitoes, algae and odor. Becksvoort replied that the Drain Commission requires a Section 433 Drainage District with escrow account to verify that it is maintained. Charles Van Duren, 2657 Lakeshore, thought development should conform to what is there now and the P. C. should just say NO. Hanson said if the P. C. turns down the PUD, a site condo gives the P. C. less discretion. Jim Wentzel, 2659 Chestnut Lane, said he hauled in lots of sand to build and he is the only one who does not have a sump pump running constantly and back-up generators in case of power failure.

Sisson asked how much fill they might have to use, and Becksvoort said for units 1-5, they would need five feet, for unit 8 or 9, minimal, decreasing as you go east.

Bills did not understand how we got from duplex with shared wall to two free-standing dwelling units, and thought he'd like to build another house on his property. Sisson explained that he could tear down his house and build a duplex by right, but the only way the two free-standing dwelling units happens is through a PUD, and the Planning Commission decides what is the best development possibility for that property. Milauckas pointed out that by having two free-standing units you are doubling the footprint. Bills insisted that economically five single-family homes would bring a good return.

Tim Locker, 2659 Lakeshore Dr., at the west end of the drainage area, if this were not a PUD is there any government agency that would have authority over how the drainage from five homes would affect the downstream areas. Drain Commission was the answer, but Hanson explained that with a PUD the P. C. has control over open space foliage, and Sisson enumerated all the other controls a PUD offers. In answer to Milauckas suggesting a land division, Balmer said there are only two splits left. Balmer pointed out that the pond would not be included if a land division took place, and many residents think that is a benefit for fire protection. Matthai said trees would have to be cut down for the pond next door to them, for all the lots, for the emergency fire truck path, for the septic system and community center. Wentzel wondered where the water goes when the units are built, and Becksvoort replied that they would not be excavating for the lower units, no dewatering, rather creating concrete wall and filling. John Matthai wondered if in digging the pond they would reach the clay layer, and Becksvoort said they would only be removing the sand from the water. Priscilla Mueller, 2628 Lakeshore Dr., wondered what keeps animals and children from falling into the pond, and was told that the slope might not be so steep that it would be a hazard, but a fence could be installed. Bills thought the setbacks were not in keeping with the neighboring lots as required in the deed restrictions. Jerome Post, 2675 Chestnut Lane, wondered when the units would be built

after the infrastructure went in. Balmer said the project will be done in phases with most of the infrastructure and four units first. Becksvoort said that would include the community drain field, the force main, pump system, service lines for the four units, the retention pond and necessary roads. He agreed to do a sequential schedule.

Hanson reported on a letter from the Fire Department dated January 17. Hanson also reviewed letters from Post, Locker, Wentzel, Matthai, and Allen Rutzen of 2665 Lakeshore Dr. (see attached). Matthai explained the photos she had taken of the area. Becksvoort asked if there is consensus on whether the pond should be retention or detention, and failing to receive a definitive answer, said he would come up with an optimum plan and try to get concurrence from a third party, but Balmer was hesitant to involve another firm. Marczuk thought with technology, drainage issues could be solved.

Balmer's pressing for an acceptable number of units brought out comments from some of the Commissioners that proposed density was too high. Discussion also included the existing number of homes in the neighborhood, the number allowed by the International Fire Code, traffic on the only access road, and alteration of design to a combination of duplexes and single-family homes or moving all buildings to higher ground. Darpel insisted that he would not be in favor of considering more than seven single-family homes in a PUD.

Milauckas made a motion to table the Chestnut Lane PUD project to the next meeting or as soon as possible for the developer to determine which avenue he wishes to pursue. Edris seconded and the motion carried 4-1, with Marczuk voting NO.

After a brief recess, Sisson handed out his revised Landscape Installation and Maintenance Surety Agreement and a draft of Alternative PUD Density Provisions. He had passed both by Atty Bultje for his approval. Sisson suggested making all duplexes SAU. Milauckas said he wants a step-by-step calculation for how many units you can get out of a given acreage to make it crystal clear for developers. Sisson suggested taking total acreage and subtracting 15% for large lots and 25% for small lots to get a general number of units, but he insisted it depends on the configuration of the property.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P. M. The next special meeting is February 8 at 7:00 P.M. at the township hall. The next informal review with Saugatuck LLC is February 20 at 7:00 P. M. at Saugatuck High School library. The next regular meeting is February 26, at 7:00 P.M.

Betty A. White, Recording Secretary

Sandy Rausch, Secretary

MOTIONS

1. Motion by Milauckas/Marczuk to approve December 11, 2006, minutes as amended.
2. Motion by Edris/Marczuk to approve January 4, 2007, minutes.
3. Motion by Milaucas/Edris to table Chestnut Lane PUD to next regular meeting.