

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

**Charter Township of Kalamazoo
Minutes of a Planning Commission Meeting
Held on November 7, 2019**

8 A regular meeting of the Kalamazoo Charter Township Planning Commission was conducted on
9 November 7, 2019, commencing at 7:00 p.m., at the Township Hall.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Present were:

17 William Chapman
18 Denise Hartsough
19 Warren Cook
20 Christopher Mihelich
21 Fred Nagler, Chairman
22 Henry Dingemans
23 Jeremy Hathcock

24
25
26
27

Absent was:

28 None.

29 Also present were Township Manager, Dexter Mitchell, Township Planner Patrick Hudson,
30 Township Attorney Roxanne Seeber, and approximately 5 additional interested persons.

31
32
33

Call to Order

34 The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

35
36
37

Roll Call and Recognition of Visitors

38 Nagler welcomed those in attendance.

39
40
41

Approval of the Agenda for the November 7, 2019 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

42 The Commissioners received the meeting agenda in their packets. Nagler wished to add
43 election of a new secretary and vice chairperson of the Planning Commission to the agenda.
44 Upon motion of Mihelich, supported by Chapman, and unanimous vote, the agenda was
45 approved as amended.

46
47
48

Approval of Meeting Minutes of the October 3, 2019 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

49 The next item on the agenda was the approval of the October 3, 2019 regular Planning
50 Commission meeting minutes. Copies of the draft meeting minutes were provided to the
51 Commissioners in their agenda packets. Mihelich proposed one change to properly identify the

1 person supporting the motion on page 8. Cook moved, supported by Hartsough to approve the
2 minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3
4 Seeber made the revision to the draft meeting minutes. The minutes were signed by Dingemans
5 and forwarded to Hudson for transmission to the Township Staff.

6
7 **Scheduled Reviews**

8
9 None.

10
11 **Public Hearings**

12
13 **2528 E. Main Street – Kalamazoo Youth for Christ – Special Exception Use and Site Plan**
14 **Approval**

15
16 The next item on the agenda was a public hearing for the request of Kalamazoo Youth for Christ
17 (applicant), 2528 E. Main Street within the Township, for special exception use approval and
18 site plan approval for a proposed indoor recreational facility (community center) at 2528 E.
19 Main Street (Parcel No. 06-13-121-011) under Section 12.02.B.6 of the Township Zoning
20 Ordinance. The subject property is located in the “R-2” Single and Two-Family Residential
21 District Zoning Classification and is approximately 1.38 acres in size. The standards for
22 consideration of the special exception use by the Township Planning Commission are set forth
23 in Section 8.02.LL of the Township Zoning Ordinance. The standards for site plan review are
24 contained in Section 26.02 of the Township Zoning Ordinance.

25
26 Section 8.02.LL.2 of the Township Zoning Ordinance states, in relevant part,

27
28 **2. Indoor Recreation Facilities**

29
30 Indoor recreation facilities, such as, but not limited to, bowling establishments,
31 billiard halls, indoor archery and shooting ranges, indoor tennis courts, indoor
32 skating rinks, arcades, indoor driving ranges, and similar indoor recreation uses
33 shall comply with the following regulations:

- 34
35 a. **Setbacks.** Indoor recreation uses shall be set back a minimum of seventy-five
36 (75) feet from any property line that abuts a residentially zoned or used district.
37 b. **Adverse Impacts.** The location, design, and operation of an indoor recreation use
38 shall not adversely affect the continued use, enjoyment, and development of
39 adjacent properties. In considering this requirement, particular attention shall be
40 focused on the adverse impact resulting from noise, smoke, odor, dust, dirt,
41 noxious, gasses, glare, heat, or vibration generated by the use, and loitering on
42 the premises.
43 c. **Accessory Uses.** Uses accessory to the principal recreation use are permitted,
44 including refreshment facilities, retail shops that sell items related to the

1 principal use, locker rooms, restrooms, administrative Article 8 Site Development
2 Standards Zoning Ordinance of the Charter Township of Kalamazoo Page 8-36
3 office, maintenance and storage facilities, spectator seating, and service areas.

- 4 d. **Access.** Indoor recreation uses shall have direct access onto a County primary
5 road.
6

7 Hudson prepared a staff report, which was provided to the Commissioners in their agenda
8 packet. The subject property is currently occupied by a religious institution which will continue
9 to hold Sunday morning services. Hudson said that the applicant proposed to add a gymnasium
10 without any seating. A setback variance was previously granted by the Zoning Board of
11 Appeals. Hudson noted that the properties to the west, south and north are zoned R-2 and are
12 occupied by single-family dwellings. The property across Lum Street to the east is also zoned
13 R-2, but the remainder of the north part of that block is zoned C-1 Local Commercial and is
14 occupied by a large grocery store.
15

16 Hudson said that the Schedule of Regulations is contained in Section 25.02 of the Township
17 Zoning Ordinance. The minimum lot area is 13,200 square feet; the subject property's lot area
18 is 52,140 square feet. The minimum lot width is 80 feet; the subject property is 275' wide on
19 Main Street and 177' wide on Ira Street. The maximum permitted building height is 30 feet; the
20 proposed gymnasium will be 33' tall measured to the top of the windows. The maximum lot
21 coverage is 25%; Hudson noted that the ZBA granted up to a 29% variance. Hudson said the
22 front yard setback requirement is 75 feet; Hudson noted that the ZBA granted setback
23 variances for the construction of the gymnasium. The side yard setback requirement is 75 feet.
24 Hudson stated that the existing building is 20' from the east side and 42' from the west side.
25 The rear yard setback requirement is 75'; Hudson said the existing building is 3' from the south
26 side property line. Hudson stated that he had received road commission approval for the
27 driveways earlier in the day.
28

29 Hudson discussed off-street parking, which is regulated by Article 4, Section 4.01(D)(7) & (5) of
30 the Township Zoning Ordinance. Hudson concluded that 304 total spaces are required and only
31 70 parking spaces are depicted on the site plan. Hudson discussed grading and surface drainage
32 and said that the calculations submitted by the applicant are sufficient. He also discussed the
33 landscaping requirements under Section 5.02 B and F of the Township Zoning Ordinance.
34 Hudson said that 15 trees are required, but noted that the applicant's site plan depicts only 5
35 trees. Hudson stated that 6 ornamental trees are required, but only two ornamental trees are
36 shown on the applicant's site plan. He indicated that 117 shrubs are required, but the
37 applicant's site plan only depicts 40 shrubs. Hudson noted that the applicant's site plan does
38 not depict any interior landscaping areas where 7 are required. Hudson discussed the
39 applicant's photometric plan. Hudson said that the applicant proposed to remove the existing
40 sign. No new signage is depicted in the site plan. Hudson stated that the site plan includes
41 three 100 gallon trash bins, but they are not screened.
42

43 Hudson summarized the standards of Site Plan Approval contained in 26.02.F of the Township
44 Zoning Ordinance. Hudson recommended that the Planning Commission review the Township

1 Fire Marshal's comments. Hudson said that the Fire Marshal noted that there is insufficient
2 aisle width on the west side of the building. Both driveways' ingress/egress width must be 26
3 feet.

4
5 Hudson stated that the main item for discussion should be the landscaping and screening from
6 the adjoining property. He indicated that a neighbor had commented on the condition of the
7 fence. The occupant load, he stated, is limited by the number of available parking spaces to
8 140 people. Hudson stated that he had spoken with the road commission about the parking on
9 the east side of the site. The road commission indicated that it did not have any jurisdiction
10 because the driveway and access was on private property.

11
12 Scott McCloughan, executive director of Youth for Christ addressed the Planning Commission.
13 He had also been in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the variances. The mission of the
14 organization is to serve teens in Kalamazoo. It has been around for 75 years. The goal, he said
15 was to reach out to local middle and high school students, to provide mentoring, summer
16 camps, and mission trips. The proposed facility will provide Youth for Christ with an
17 opportunity to reach out to east side residents in a whole new way. The east side, McCloughan
18 said is fairly underserved. They wished to set up a teen center to allow the teens to grow, learn
19 and mature in healthy ways. The church in which the facility was to be placed was in favor of
20 the youth center. The congregation will use the building on Sunday mornings and it will be
21 used by the youth center all other times, he said.

22
23 Steve Hassevoort of Inform Architecture was present to answer questions about the design.
24 Gary Barton appeared as the owner's representative.

25
26 Hassevoort stated that the project is mostly an existing building. He pointed out the
27 gymnasium addition area and the courtyard. They planned on redoing the roofline and
28 changing the façade. Otherwise, Hassevoort stated, the layout of site will remain unchanged.
29 He pointed out that the parking on the east side of the building was changed from parallel to
30 perpendicular. He noted that the Township had considered the use a "health club". He
31 disagreed, indicating that health clubs typically have a lot of vehicular traffic. This facility
32 would not because it was intended to serve youth without driver's licenses. They would mostly
33 be walking to the facility, or they would get dropped off by a parent or a caretaker that would
34 not stay. He had been unable to find a particular "use" for parking calculations. Without a
35 comparable use in the zoning ordinance, he had used the parking parameters for "unspecified
36 uses". Under this calculation, they would need 61 parking spaces. He felt like even that was
37 more than enough parking for what they planned on doing at the site.

38
39 The percolation calculations were back and established that water would be retained on site.
40 The new impervious area would be only that of the roof over the new gym. Hassevoort
41 continued, indicating that there is a lot of pavement and not much available space on the
42 existing site for landscaping. His plans meet the landscaping requirements along East Main.
43 They will add some hedging bushes between the sidewalk and the parking area where the chain
44 link fence is located. They will also repair the panels of the existing fence. He explained that

1 the posts need to be repaired. They will put the same fence along the residential properties,
2 along the northwest and south property lines.

3
4 Next Hassevoort addressed dumpsters. He read the ordinance to permit a distinction between
5 a “trash bin” (Herbie Curbie) and a dumpster. Only the dumpster requires screening under the
6 ordinance, he said. The existing driveway on the west side is 26 feet in width, Hassevoort
7 explained. The driveway on the other side will be increased in width by 16 inches in order to
8 meet the 26-foot-wide fire standard. The applicant will remove the existing signs. Because
9 they don’t know what, if any, signs they will need, they will make a separate application for
10 those in the future. They will be replacing all of the exterior lighting in the parking lot area.
11 Photometrics had been provided.

12
13 Chapman noted that the East Side neighborhood association is about three blocks away. He
14 inquired about the number of Herbie Curbies. Nagler stated that the plan had three shown.
15 Hassevoort indicated that they would be in the small parking area on the southeast corner of
16 the building. They will be shielded from the residential area by the fence. There are
17 mechanical devices on that side as well, he stated. Hartsough inquired as to whether there will
18 be times when families are invited to participate. McCloughan stated that they will welcome
19 parent participation, but that they don’t know to what extent it will be taken advantage of.
20 Hartsough stated that her question really went to the parking situation. She could understand
21 if the children were too young to drive, but if there is a family day, there will be a problem with
22 overflow. McCloughan stated that he had worked out a relationship with the adjoining grocery
23 store to provide overflow parking in such a situation. Hardings has about 50 extra parking
24 spaces that they can use as overflow, he said. Even with 100 students participating, he would
25 be surprised if there are ever 50 cars on site. Dingemans inquired as to how the parking was
26 calculated. Hassevoort explained his reasoning based on the ‘unspecified uses’ category and
27 the square footage calculation. He stated that the center is designed for about 100
28 participating youth. Nagler stated that an occupancy limitation could be stipulated. Seeber
29 stated that she has a cross access parking agreement that could be modified for this situation.
30 The group considered whether the number of parking spaces would be available if there were
31 volunteers. In response to an inquiry from Dingemans, Hudson stated that he had not yet seen
32 the parking calculations. Hassevoort pointed this out on the submittal. The group discussed
33 whether to place an occupancy limitation on the building. Hudson stated that there was no
34 seating in the gym. The maximum building capacity according to the fire marshal is 210
35 people. If you figure three people per car, they have enough parking on site.

36
37 Chapman inquired as to whether there were tournaments planned. McCloughan said that the
38 gym is only half size, so there will not be teams coming in from other areas. At most, he said,
39 there would be three-on-three tournaments. No public tournaments were planned. Hartsough
40 inquired about the patio/outdoor grilling area. McCloughan stated that it was really for
41 occasional use with a family-size grill. It would not be a permanent installation. They would
42 just drag it out when needed. A parking space could be used as well, he said.

1 Hartsough agreed with the architect that there did not appear to be much room for
2 landscaping. Nagler pointed out a couple of areas where some could be added. Chapman
3 wished to ensure that the parking was ADA compliant. Hassevoort indicated that the parking
4 areas would be ADA compliant. Additionally the interior of the building would be upgraded to
5 be ADA compliant as well.

6
7 Nagler opened the public hearing and invited any interested party to give public comment in
8 support of or in opposition to the applicant's special exception use request for a proposed
9 indoor recreational facility (community center) at 2528 E. Main Street. No one spoke for or
10 against it.

11
12 Hathcock wished to ensure that the number of parking spaces was based on the number of
13 people that would be in the building. He wanted to ensure that there was an occupancy limit
14 provided and an overflow agreement with Hardings. The group discussed the sidewalks, which
15 were in disrepair in some of the locations on the site. While the Planning Commission noted
16 that sidewalks are expensive, walking was also the only way that some of the youth would be
17 getting to the facility. Seeber suggested that a time limit on the repair/replacement of the
18 sidewalks could be made a part of the special use or site plan approval.

19
20 Upon motion of Hathcock, supported by Hartsough and unanimous vote, the request of
21 Kalamazoo Youth for Christ (applicant), 2528 E. Main Street within the Township for special
22 exception use approval for a proposed indoor recreational facility (community center) at 2528
23 E. Main Street (Parcel No. 06-13-121-011) under Section 12.02.B.6 of the Township Zoning
24 Ordinance was granted because the standards contained in Section 8.02.LL.2 have been
25 satisfied, and with the following conditions: 1) repair the sidewalks within two years of receipt
26 of an occupancy permit from the Township Building Department; 2) occupancy of the building is
27 limited to 210 people; 3) if occupancy is ever higher than 210 people, an overflow parking
28 agreement with Hardings shall be implemented.

29
30 Nagler next directed the group to the site plan review and approval. Upon motion of Cook,
31 supported by Dingemans, the request of Kalamazoo Youth for Christ (applicant), 2528 E. Main
32 Street within the Township for site plan approval for a proposed indoor recreational facility
33 (community center) at 2528 E. Main Street (Parcel No. 06-13-121-011) under Section 12.02.B.6
34 of the Township Zoning Ordinance was approved because the standards contained for site plan
35 approval contained in Section 26.02.F of the Township Zoning Ordinance were satisfied with the
36 following conditions:

- 37 1) Expand the driveway by 16 inches;
- 38 2) Fencing will be re-supported as needed;
- 39 3) Obtain an overflow parking agreement from Hardings for occasional times when
40 occupancy may be over 210 people;
- 41 4) Occupancy limited to 210 people;
- 42 5) No screening is required for the three Herbie Curbies;
- 43 6) The landscaping will be improved as shown on the site plan; however, no additional
44 landscaping is required on the east side of the property where there is not room for it.

1 7) The use of a grill pad in the area shown is limited to occasional use of a residential-style
2 grill and cannot be used for a permanent structure.

3
4 Dingemans inquired as to the status of the church. McCloughan stated that there are about
5 60 members now. The uses, he said, would never overflow onto each other. The motion passed
6 unanimously.

7
8 **New Business**

9
10 **1825 Ravine Road – Bishop Construction – Site plan Amendment**

11
12 The next item on the agenda was the request of Bishop Construction, 1825 Ravine Road, for site
13 plan amendment for an existing business. Hudson had prepared a report, which was provided
14 to the members of the Planning Commission in their packets. The owners, he said, wished to
15 demolish the original office building and construct a new one. The property is located in the
16 “LI” Light Industrial district where a contractor’s yard is a special use. The use of the building,
17 Hudson explained, is not changing. He felt that it would have been considered a minor site plan
18 amendment, except that there was an 1816 square foot building to be demolished and
19 replaced with a 4000 square foot building. Some additional circular storage was to be added as
20 well. This, he said, made him ask the Planning Commission to review the site plan amendment.

21
22 The site is located well up on top of a hill. The number of required parking spaces is based on
23 the number of employees. Hudson stated that the use of the property will remain a
24 contractor’s yard. He noted that an existing 200 square-foot building, a 720 square foot
25 building and a couple of 8’ in diameter circular storage tanks would be retained. The larger
26 storage building and the storage tanks are legal preexisting nonconforming structures as to
27 setback from the right of way. The building is 24’ from the right of way and the tanks are 12’
28 from the right of way. Hudson read through his report. He noted the fire marshal’s
29 recommendations as to the need for a Knox Box.

30
31 Chandler Bishop, owner, indicated that he had no problems with the requirements of the fire
32 marshal. The Knox Box would be added. He was, he said, looking for some leniency on the
33 landscaping requirements. The access to the property is steep; however, the Kal Haven trail is
34 there as well. He wants to dress up the property and remove the trailers so that it is a better
35 representation of their business. In that respect, he was planning on cleaning up the front of
36 the property. They also own a landscaping company. As such, he was concerned that the
37 abundance of landscaping that would be required would be difficult to manage, particularly
38 when it is on a hill. He indicated that he was willing to widen the driveway. The landscaping
39 on the steep hill will wash out, he said.

40
41 Hartsough was willing to make some exception for the front landscaping and the group
42 discussed whether to allow the zoning administrator to accept a modified landscaping plan.
43 Nagler noted that the plan provided met all of the standards of the Ordinance. There were a
44 few trees along the widened driveway area that could be dispensed with, as the Planning

1 Commission felt that it was more of a safety issue with the Kal Haven Trail and the widening of
2 the driveway.

3
4 The group discussed whether the landscaping could be moved to an alternative area on the
5 site. Hudson and Bishop commented that anything off of the street would not be seen because
6 the elevation was so much higher than the street. Hartsough inquired as to who was coming
7 in and out of the driveway. Bishop indicated that it was all employees and contractors. There
8 was no access for retail purposes and no clients.

9
10 Dingemans stated that it was more important to widen the driveway than to add the
11 landscaping. Nagler identified 4 trees near the driveway that would not be required. In
12 response to an inquiry from Chapman, Bishop stated that the Kal Haven trail is on the opposite
13 side of the road. The group discussed whether to allow for administrative review of a
14 landscaping plan. Bishop wished to have some kind of guidance in terms of reduction, whether
15 it be a percentage or something else. He pointed out the areas where the trucks parked on
16 site; as well as the area near the retaining wall where he was concerned that the addition of
17 landscaping would only wash out. They needed something that looks good, but that will not
18 wash out.

19
20 Hudson was not comfortable reviewing a modified landscaping plan administratively. He
21 suggested that the applicant could deposit an escrow with the Township for the provision of
22 the landscaping. The site plan could then be approved to allow for temporary occupancy. If
23 the applicant returns to the Planning Commission with a modified landscaping plan and it gets
24 approved, the escrow could be returned. If the applicant did not modify the plan, or if it did not
25 get approved by the Planning Commission, then the Township could use the escrow money to
26 implement the approved landscaping. The members of the Planning Commission voiced
27 agreement with this proposal. Nagler directed the group to the possibility of removing 4 trees
28 on the corner near the widened driveway. All thought that this was a good idea.

29
30 In response to an inquiry from Nagler, Bishop indicated that the sand banks on the property
31 were all located behind the buildings. Hudson indicated that the property is generally made up
32 of clay. There was no additional discussion.

33
34 Hartsough moved, supported by Mihelich to approve the amended site plan for the building
35 and other physical elements; to approve the removal of the 4 trees near the driveway and to
36 permit the applicant to post a bond for the landscaping as shown in the amount of 125% of the
37 value of the landscaping; and to allow the applicant to return to the Planning Commission with
38 an amended landscaping plan prior to April 2020. If there was no amendment to the
39 landscaping portion, the Township would be permitted to call the bond and to implement the
40 landscaping as shown on the site plan. The motion passed unanimously.

41
42

1 **2702 Ravine Road – Hillside Gravel – Site Plan Amendment**

2
3 The next item on the agenda was the request of Don Balkema (applicant) of Hillside Gravel,
4 2702 Ravine Road for a site plan amendment. Hudson stated that this property is located in the
5 I-2 Industrial district zoning classification. The request was to expand an existing office building
6 to just about double its size. The primary use of the property would remain the same. Hudson
7 considered this to be a minor site plan amendment; however the property was being operated
8 as a special use and therefore all amendments had to go to the Planning Commission. The
9 property is 59 acres in area with 400 feet of road frontage. The lot coverage calculations were
10 not provided, but they were not necessary as the applicant was nowhere near the limitation.
11 The fire marshal had approved the access road. Hudson stated that one parking space is
12 required for each employee. The applicant had indicated that there would be 27 employees.
13 He was concerned that only 12 parking spaces were shown. The landscaping is existing, he said.
14 Nagler inquired about the number of paved parking spaces. Josh Balkema, representing the
15 applicant, indicated that there are only 7 to 10 people in the building at any given time. There
16 were 12 paved parking spaces, but the entire site was basically a gravel lot. He parks in the
17 back of the building so as to allow the office employees the ability to use the paved parking
18 areas. Hudson noted that optional parking had been designated on the site plan, but it was
19 not paved. Nagler inquired if everyone parked in front of the building. Balkema indicated that
20 only the office staff park in the front. The other employees generally park closer to the area in
21 which they are working.

22
23 Balkema indicated that the new pole barn was approved earlier in the year. Chapman inquired
24 as to whether there was school parking to the east. Balkema stated that the school was a half
25 mile down the road. Cook inquired as to whether the scale would be removed to make room
26 for additional parking. Balkema stated that the access to the rest of the site is to the rear of
27 the scale. Mihelich commented that striping might just be the issue. He didn't have a problem
28 with the 12 paved spaces so long as the gravel areas were reserved for parking of other
29 vehicles. Nagler agreed that it made no sense to pave when the entire site was basically a large
30 parking lot. The group discussed how to allocate the parking per the square footage of the
31 building or based on the number of employees. Mihelich moved, supported by Hathcock, to
32 approve the amended site plan with the condition that the office personnel be permitted to use
33 the paved parking spaces in the front of the building and that the applicant designate 1520
34 square feet on the site for parking of other employees. The motion passed unanimously.

35
36 **Election of Officers**

37
38 Chapman nominated Hartsough as Vice Chair. Cook supported the motion. The motion passed
39 unanimously.

40
41 Hartsough nominated Cook as Secretary. Mihelich supported the motion and it passed
42 unanimously.

1 **Old Business**

2

3 **Master Plan 5-year Mandatory Update**

4

5 Hudson said that a preliminary draft was e-mailed to the Commissioners. No one had received
6 it. Nagler moved, supported by Hathcock to table consideration of the 5-year master plan. The
7 motion passed unanimously.

8

9 **Capital Improvement Program – update for 2019**

10

11 Hartsough moved for approval of the Capital Improvement Plan Update for 2019. Chapman
12 supported the motion and it passed unanimously.

13

14 **Recreational Marijuana Text Amendment**

15

16 Hudson stated that the Township Board sent the proposed adult use (recreational) marijuana
17 text amendments back to the Commission for further consideration regarding designated
18 consumption areas and event organizers. The Township Board, Planning Commission and
19 Zoning Board of Appeals held a joint session with Attorney Kaufman at which items related to
20 the recreational (adult use) marijuana were discussed. In response to this discussion, Hudson
21 had made some changes to the proposed text amendments. He described what he had done
22 to the Planning Commission. Basically, he had removed the 5 uses that LARA had added in the
23 administrative rules. Additionally, he aligned the recreational uses with the medical uses.

24

25 The group discussed whether the licensees using the same parcel must be under the same
26 ownership. Hathcock commented that he never understood why the separation distance was
27 made between uses. Hudson indicated that the police department didn't want dispensaries
28 adjacent to each other. Hathcock indicated that there is no such separation distance between
29 liquor and pornography shops. Dingemans felt that the requests by the police department
30 should be honored. While the Planning Commission members may not have a good
31 understanding of why, the fact that the police department wanted a separation distance was
32 good enough for him. Hudson indicated that the proposed ordinance allows the medical and
33 recreational to cohabitate in the same building. The group discussed the amendment to the
34 liquor separation distances, with Hudson commenting that there is still an alcohol regulating
35 agency. The group questioned whether there is a requirement for separate entrances in the
36 state law. Mitchell stated that there are separate licensing requirements. The state would
37 likely control in this area as well. He commented that excess growers wouldn't need
38 separation requirements because of how the administrative rules are written.

39

40 Mihelich commented that the product would likely be the same for both, but the price point
41 would be different. He reasoned that this was because of the need for a doctor's prescription
42 for medical, as well as the differing standards for testing and tracking. The group discussed
43 whether the medical would ultimately go away, with the introduction of recreational into the

1 same areas. Hathcock felt that this had been the goal all along. Mihelich commented that the
2 tax rate for medical verses recreational was different as well.

3
4 Mitchell asked the group if it was satisfied with the language as presented. Seeber indicated
5 that a public hearing had already been held by the Planning Commission on the text. The
6 amendments removed items from the text. It did not add to it. Thus, she reasoned, that a new
7 public hearing would not be necessary. Hudson agreed. The group discussed co-location.
8 Hathcock was in favor of it. Hudson highlighted a “subsequent construction” provision which
9 would basically grandfather existing uses and allows recreational on the same parcel, even if a
10 new structure was placed into the setback area. For example, he said, you cannot build a
11 school next to a medical facility with the intention of limiting the use there to medical. Nagler
12 approved the language, as did the rest of the group.

13
14 Hudson was not inclined to add any of the 5 special uses to the text amendment that had been
15 prepared. It would cause a lot of problems with drafting, he said. There was no additional
16 discussion. Hathcock moved, supported by Mihelich, to recommend approval of the text
17 amendments as written to the Township Board for adoption. The motion passed
18 unanimously.

19
20 Hathcock was disappointed that some of the additional uses were not included, but he
21 understood that the Planning Commission needed more time to consider these uses. Thus, he
22 commented, the amendment was satisfactory.

23
24 Hartsough did not consider the excess grower to be a big problem. The infrastructure was
25 already in the ordinance for that. Hudson stated that he would need to retain a different
26 special use section in the proposed ordinance. He asked the group to save discussion on this
27 and the other unusual activities for another day. The group discussed this. No one felt that
28 excess growers would be a big problem. Hartsough moved, supported by Hathcock, to add the
29 excess grower as Item xx in the industrial district zoning classification to the text amendment.
30 The motion passed unanimously.

31
32 **Open Discussion – Members of the Audience**

33
34 None.

35
36 **Report of the Zoning Administrator.**

37
38 Hudson stated that there are issues with the flood plain in the lake street area. Most of the
39 properties were not available for single family residences because they were located in the
40 flood plain. He stated that the building department would have to deny a rebuild if a house
41 were damaged or demolished. Some of the area, he said, was suitable for commercial uses.
42 He wanted the Planning Commission to be aware of this situation.

1 **Report of the Township Board Representative**

2
3 Hathcock stated that he appreciated the work of the Planning Commission.

4
5 **Report of the Township ZBA Representative**

6
7 Nagler reported that there had been no ZBA meeting.

8
9 **Comments from Planning Commission Members**

10
11 Chapman inquired about the gas station that was proposed to be heard at the January Planning
12 Commission meeting. Hudson and Nagler reported that the property currently holding Talli's
13 market had been sold to Benipal, who was going to renovate the building and was not going to
14 place a gas station there. At Cook's request, Mitchell gave a progress report on the Graphics
15 Packaging project. Mitchell reported that Senator Gary Peters had toured the area and was in
16 favor of the 131 ramp expansion project. Mihelich stated that there were new tax incentives
17 for solar for residential uses. He thought that it would be a good idea for the Planning
18 Commission to have a look at the Zoning Ordinance's solar provisions and see if they needed
19 updating, particularly in the area of residential uses. Seeber stated that she will provide some
20 samples of recently-updated solar amendments from other townships. Dingemans announced
21 that he was resigning from the Planning Commission after the December board meeting.

22
23 **Report of the Township Attorney**

24
25 The Township Attorney commented that the group had worked extraordinarily well together,
26 even in light of the absence of Cripps.

27
28 **Adjournment**

29
30 There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, upon motion of
31 Hathcock, seconded by Mihelich and unanimous approval, the November 7, 2019 regular
32 Planning Commission was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

33
34
35
36 _____
Henry Dingemans, Secretary

37
38
39
40
41 **SYNOPSIS OF ACTIONS**

42
43 The Kalamazoo Township Planning Commission undertook the following actions at the
44 November 7, 2019 regular Planning Commission meeting:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

1. Approved the request of Kalamazoo Youth for Christ (applicant), 2528 E. Main Street within the Township for special exception use approval for a proposed indoor recreational facility (community center) at 2528 E. Main Street (Parcel No. 06-13-121-011) under Section 12.02.B.6 of the Township Zoning Ordinance, with conditions; and,
2. Approved the request of Kalamazoo Youth for Christ (applicant), 2528 E. Main Street within the Township for site plan approval for a proposed indoor recreational facility (community center) at 2528 E. Main Street (Parcel No. 06-13-121-011) under Section 12.02.B.6 of the Township Zoning Ordinance, with conditions; and,
3. Approved the request for a site plan amendment for 1825 Ravine Road, with conditions; and,
4. Approved the request of Don Balkema for a site plan amendment for 1825 Ravine Road; and
5. Recommended the recreational marijuana text amendments to the Township Board for approval.