

**CITY OF GRAND HAVEN  
GRAND HAVEN, MICHIGAN  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
June 11, 2024**



A regularly meeting of the Grand Haven Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chair Galligan at 7:00 pm. Upon roll call, the following members were present:

**Present:** Magda Smolenska, David Skelly, Tamera Owens, Vice-Chair Ryan Galligan, Amy Kozanecki, Joe Pierce, Jennifer Smelker, Dan Borchers

**Absent:** Chair Mike Dora

**Also Present:** City Planner Brian Urquhart, City Manager Ashley Latsch, Mayor Monetza, and members of the public.

**Approval of Minutes**

Motion by **Kozanecki**, seconded by **Smolenska** to approve the minutes of the May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting as written. All ayes. **Motion passes.**

**Approval of Agenda**

Motion by **Kozanecki**, seconded by **Skelly** to approve the agenda. All ayes. **Motion passes.**

---

**Call to the Audience; First Opportunity**

Steve Deitsch, 615 S. Griffin St., spoke stating he was in support of the Cherrette group due to the fact of it's economic and educational development it would bring to the city.

Brent Clark, 820 S. Harbor spoke stating he felt like it was the wrong time for the build out of Chinook Pier, and prefers the city to wait and coordinate with the Harbor Island development, and does not feel the proposals reflect what is needed in the area.

Barb Rowe, 215 S 4<sup>th</sup> St., spoke stating she would like to express her opinions regarding the three Chinook Pier proposals. She began by stating the Cherrette group proposal would not be like an outdoor discovery concept as she's heard some people mention. She also spoke stating that she did not feel like it would be as busy as what was being proposed, due to the comparison being the Grand Rapids Children's Museum.

She also mentioned the Geerling Group proposal stating what was proposed already existing between the YMCA and the empty storefronts in the downtown area.

Lastly, she spoke on the Copper Rock proposal and stated that she felt it would be an obstruction and clog the waterfront view. She also mentioned that she felt the city should wait to see what is happening with the Harbor Island Development before buiding Chinook.

Borcher also asked to know what the driver for this project is. Urquhart stated there was an importance and value of community in the site that the city felt it was worthy of going out for bid to receive development opportunities. He stated that the timing was right to be able to do something with the three to four acres.

Borcher stated that he felt there was merit in all three proposals and the possibility of keeping the green space. He didn't want to commit himself to anything specific at the time. He also stated that he would consider obstruction implications. Borcher noted that he was concerned about getting used eight out of the twelve months and the need for density and mass to draw in business.

Pierce stated he felt similarly in the aspect he felt there were both merits and qualms with all three proposals. He mentioned he would like to see the farmer's market year-round, and feels it would draw more people to the downtown. He also liked the idea of having a rooftop bar and felt as though it would draw in the younger crowds. Pierce stated he would also like to see buildings full and utilized year-round. Pierce stated there was a beauty in the Farmer's Market drawing for Copper Rock. This could provide an opportunity for an iconic feature. Pierce also stated he has concerns about having an unused building that blocks views of the water and greenery.

Smelker stated she is very pro-children's museum; however, not at the waterfront and it needs more space. Smelker didn't feel as though the Cherrette group captured from the community was reflected in the proposal. She stated it didn't flow well or make sense for the parcel.

Smelker stated that she liked the Midwest Construction proposal due to the fact they incorporated the train with the putt-putt golf. She also felt that there was a disconnect with the flow. She felt there were creative elements in some aspects, and in other elements gave what the community already had.

Smelker felt that the green space or parking in the CopperRock proposal was less of a focus. However, felt it was disappointing the putt-putt golf was eliminated while there was plenty of space for it. Smelker felt out of three the flow was the best, and felt more like a waterfront development. She did state she felt that office space would be a good idea to help with the year-round aspect. She also mentioned that having an incubator kitchen would also present more opportunities. She echoed Pierce's sentiments in saying that a rooftop bar would be exciting in the restaurant.

Skelly wondered if there was any opportunity for public engagement besides the meeting. Urquhart stated that the public can participate through public meetings, letters of support, and ways of giving their input. He also mentioned there was a three month window for public input submittals.

Skelly asked if there would be any opportunities for public engagements or meetings after it goes to council. City Manager Latsch spoke stating that the decision is now up to the decision-making body. The intent was to present to Council the feedback that was given during the boards and commissions, public meetings, general public conversations, or email inquiries as a whole package to Council on their July 15<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. Skelly mentioned that he's gotten used to all the green space over the years. He also mentioned he does not want to see another lights-out development, but would rather see something that provides year round engagement. Skelly also stated he would like to see another opportunity for public engagements.

Kozanecki stated she echoed David regarding providing additional opportunities for public engagement. She also mentioned she wasn't in full support of any of the three proposals, but did like certain aspects of each. She implored that to make sure enough time was taken to get the development on Chinook Pier right.

Owen mentioned that wasn't fully supportive of one proposal but would liked certain pieces. She mentioned she was intrigued by the Children's Museum proposal as it's the only proposal that provides a year-round, family-friendly indoor destination. She stated she feels the Farmer's Market should also be enclosed to give a year-round option as well. She also stated she had concerns about the parking in front of the museum. She stated that this would be her preferred proposal.

Vice-Chair Galligan said he liked and agreed with most of the comments from his fellow commissioners. He stated that he liked the Midwest proposal's idea to keep the mini-golf and feels it would bring people downtown as well as bring the lowest impact. He also loves the rooftop bar.

Vice-Chair Galligan stated he liked the waterfront center, but wondered if it would need to follow the zoning standards. Urquhart replied saying it would strongly be encouraged. Galligan continued stating it would be the most enjoyable walkway out of the three proposals.

Vice-Chair Galligan also commented on the Cherrette Group stating that he initially liked the thought of having the children's museum; however, he believed parking may be an issue and wondered if it would be the best use of waterfront space. He also does not like the open farmer's market.

---

**Case 24-20: A public hearing to consider a Special land use request for short term rental at 126 Prospect St. (parcel #70-03-29-154-005)**

Urquhart presented the case. Kylie Summers of BVW Unsalted Vacations, on behalf of property owners Karen and Doug Shimmel of 2091 Oakshire Ave. Berkley, MI 48072, has submitted an application for a Special Land Use Permit for a Short-Term Rental located at 126 Prospect St. (parcel #70-03-29-154-085). Short-term rentals are permitted by special land use in the Dune Residential District per Sec. 40-406.02.

Section 40-513 of the Zoning Ordinance provides a list of ten (10) regulations and conditions for a Short-Term Rental. The review of the Special Land Use Permit application is also subject to the standard regulations and conditions of all Special Land Uses outlined in Section 40-116.03. The applicant has provided a narrative that responds to these review standards and a scaled site plan depicting the parcel information and floor plan.

The home contains 5 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. The second level contains a deck facing Prospect St. and a concrete patio deck in the rear yard. There are 4 parking spaces in the front of the home. The total parking spaces can support a sleeping occupancy of up to 12 people.

As of the date of this staff report, the city has received no written public comments regarding this request.

Applicant was present.

Vice-Chair Galligan opened the public hearing at 8:06 p.m.

No public comment.

Motion made by **Owen's**, seconded by **Smolenska** to close public hearing. Vice-Chair Galligan closed the public hearing at 8:07 p.m.

All ayes. Motion passes.

Skelly asked for clarification on who would be handling the property management. Homeowner Doug Shimmel of 2091 Oakshire Ave. Berkley, MI spoke stating BVM Unsalted Vacations (who are local) would be assuming property management responsibilities. No other issues.

Kozanecki stated she did not have any issue with the case. She did mention she would like to see a map of short-term rentals. Urquhart responded that he is working with Ottawa County to get this completed.

Smolenska, Owen's, Smelker, Borchers, Pierce, and Vice-Chair Galligan did not have any issues with this case.

Skelly inquired about screening. Homeowner, Doug Shimmel stated there was no fencing but the landscaping was done in front of the property and there is shrubbery in between properties.

Motion made by **Smolenska**, seconded by **Smelker** to approve case 24-05, a request for a Special Use Permit for a Short Term Rental located at 126 Prospect St. (parcel #70-03-29-154-085) based on the information submitted for review.

Roll call vote. Yeas: Kozanecki, Owens, Borchers, Smolenska, Pierce, Smelker, Skelly, Vice-Chair Galligan.  
Nays: None. **Motion passed.**

---

**Case 24-21: Site Plan Review for an addition to 1729 Airpark Dr. (parcel #70-03-34-177-001)**

Urquhart introduced the case. Jared DeVoursney of Westwind Construction, on behalf of property owner Future Industries, Inc., has submitted a site plan application for a 47,970 sq. ft. addition to their manufacturing building at 1729 Airpark Dr. (parcel#70-03-34-177-001). The addition will function as additional room for manufacturing and warehouse uses, both permitted by right in the Industrial district per Sec. 40-420.02 B. In August 2023, the Planning Commission recommended approval for rezoning 626 Columbus Ave. from OT – Old Town to NMU – Neighborhood Mixed-Use and within the Centertown Overlay. The City Council adopted the rezoning in September. The rezoning created a land assembly of 4 parcels under the same zoning district for a mixed-use redevelopment. A mixed-use is permitted by right per Sec. 40-411.02.A. The Centertown overlay was vital to site plan preparation, which allows lot coverage of up to 100%, and building height of up to 40 ft. or 3 stories, whichever is less. The proposed building is 3 stories and just under 40 ft. in height and includes approximately 90% lot coverage.

As shown on sheet 2, site preparation of the 4.55-acre site includes removal 0.57 acres of trees and brush in eastern portion of the property. The applicant will keep the existing vegetation along the south, east, and north property lines serving as a buffer to the adjacent properties. Village Green is located directly to the north, and agricultural farmland is located in Grand Haven Township to the east. The applicant will also remove the existing pavement and stormwater structures.

With the increase in impervious surface and building coverage, a proposed stormwater detention pond is shown in the northwest corner of the site. Stormwater in the improved parking lot will be directed to catch basins and directed through storm sewer line to the detention basin. Sheet 4 denotes that stormwater off the building will be directed into 3 catch basins installed along the south and east sides of the building addition. The Public Works Dept. is reviewing the stormwater calculations and will provide the necessary permits to the applicant. A condition of site plan approval is recommended.

The 47,970 sq. ft. pre-engineered metal structure will be 30 ft. in height and sided with pre-finished vertical panel metal. The addition will have a pre-finished ribbed metal roof, and metal eave cap. Although not specified, it is expected the siding will match the color of the existing building. All building height, building form standards setbacks, and lot coverage in the Industrial District are met.

For a manufacturing facility, Sec. 40-604.03 requires 1 space per employee on the largest shift and 1 space per 2,000 sq. ft. of floor area. In addition, a warehouse requires 5 spaces plus 1 space per employee on the 2 largest shifts. According to the materials submitted, the parking calculations indicate that 50% of each use would apply to the parking requirement. Therefore, it was concluded that 63 spaces were required for manufacturing use and 25 spaces for warehouse use.  $63 + 25 = 88$  spaces. Taking into account half of each use,  $88/2 = 44$  spaces. The applicant is proposing 44 total spaces, with 28 spaces shown on the site plan, and 16 spaces along the south lot line banked or "deferred". Sec. 40-604.01.B allows the Planning Commission to provide a portion of required parking to be deferred until a future date, provided that adequate space on the property is reserved for future parking and the reserved area is used as open landscaped space until the parking is constructed. Due to the location of the property, and anticipated parking demand from the proposed use, a deferred approach would be appropriate for this project. Per Sec. 40-605.05, a building over 20,000 sq. ft. requires 2 loading spaces. The applicant has proposed 4 loading spaces into 14' tall overhead doors as shown on the elevation plans.

The site plan does not depict any additional signage. The application notes 5 wall five-pack light fixtures will be installed, illuminating the parking lot, loading area, and entry doors.

As noted on sheet 2, the existing vegetation buffer along the north, east, and south lot lines will be preserved to the greatest extent possible. The landscape plan on sheet 8 also includes a landscape row along the south property line of red maple and arborvitae plantings. The proposed landscaping plan satisfies the ordinance.

The application states it is to be determined if rooftop mechanical equipment will be installed. Sec. 40-322 states that rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened from view, unless in the Industrial District. Due to the adjacency to residential uses, it may prove beneficial to screen rooftop equipment but is not required.

The Fire Marshal requested a 26 ft. wide gravel fire access road around the exterior of the entire building. The fire truck turn path is shown on sheet 8 of the site plan.

Although not specified on the site plan, the application denotes the 2 dumpster bays will be located near the scrap dock area, and enclosed of a steel material that matches the building. As a 5-acre site, snow removal may not be a challenge in comparison to smaller industrial sites. However, the site plan should be amended to depict the location of snow storage.

Smolenska, Owen, Smelker, Kozanecki, and Pierce did not have any issues with this case.

Skelly mentioned there were concerns with parking and multiple shifts. Urquhart clarified that there was only a discussion of the first and second shift at this point.

Smelker raised a question regarding a deferred parking expiration date. Urquhart offered deferment within 6 months of occupancy.

Urquhart also asked for clarification regarding job creation and traffic in and out of the area.

Pete Oleszczuk, President of West Winds, stated there would be 20 full time employees operating there. The reason for the expansion is to accommodate raw materials and space for larger-scale raw material efficiencies in production. Deliveries would be made based on production and demand. With producing larger bulk materials, deliveries are not expected to be as much as smaller productions.

Motion made by **Skelly**, seconded by **Smelker** to approve case 24-21, a request for a site plan review for an addition to 1729 Airpark Dr. (parcel #70-03-34-177-001) based on the information submitted for review, and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All conditions of the DPW shall be met.*
- 2. The fire access road shall be maintained as requested by the Fire Marshal.*
- 3. Upon receiving the certificate of occupancy for the building addition, the applicant shall provide a land use permit for the 16 deferred parking spaces as shown on the plan for 6 months.*
- 4. Applicant shall provide details of the dumpster enclosure material and location of snow storage on an amended site plan.*

Roll call vote. Yeas: Kozanecki, Owens, Borchers, Smolenska, Pierce, Smelker, Skelly, Vice-Chair Galligan.  
Nays: None. **Motion passed.**

---

**Case 24-16: Grand Landing PD amendment - lot adjustments (parcels #70-03-21-100-013, #70-03-21-100-014, #70-03-21-100-015, and #70-03-21-100-016).**

Urquhart presented the case. The City Council approved the Planned Development for Grand Landing in 2006. Subsequent amendments were also approved, including changes to mixes of uses, building placement, and the full amendment of the area north of Adams Avenue. The applicant is proposing a lot adjustments of to the commercial phase of the development located north of Adams Ave. and east of Miller Dr. (parcels #70-03-21-100-013, -014, -015,-016).

The applicant approached the City late last year on potential changes to the approved Grand Landing Planned Development. The first step was to consider a lot adjustment of the northeast section of the development (parcel #70-03-21-100-013, -014, -015, -016). Staff determined lot adjustments of this nature to the approved final development would be considered a minor amendment and not subject to administrative approval. The lot adjustments do not include any relocation of structures, driveways, roads, or any changes that would have a significant impact on adjoining properties.

However, there is guidance on how to determine what changes would be considered major or minor can be found in Section 40-421.11.B of the Zoning Ordinance. These examples are meant as a guide to aid the Planning Commission decides.

*B. Modification of a final development plan. Minor changes to a PD final development plan may be approved by the planning commission, as follows.*

*1. The relocation of structures, the relocation and reconfiguration of roads, planting areas, parking areas, signs, lighting, and driveways provided that all such improvements remain in the same general location as approved by the planning commission and provided further that all such changes shall result in no significant additional impact on adjoining properties than would result from the original development.*

Summary of Proposed Changes

- Lot adjustments of parcels #70-03-21-100-013, #70-03-021-100-014, #70-03-21-100-015, #70-03-21-100-016
- The remaining 2 parcels will be 3.69 acres and 1 acre as shown in the lot survey

Applicant is not present.

Owens and Smolenska did not see this as a major change but were ok with the minor changes.

Kozanecki and Skelly both felt they needed to be convinced it was a minor change.

Smelker was ok with the minor changes.

Pierce felt as though it should be a major change.

Borchers felt as though there were too many unknown variables to make a decision.

Vice-Chair Galligan was ok with minor changes.

Motion made by **Kozanecki**, seconded by **Skelly** to postpone Case 24-16 until the next meeting on Tuesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024 to allow for further clarification of Zoning Ordinance Section 40-421.11.

Roll call vote. Yeas: Kozanecki, Owens, Borchers, Smolenska, Pierce, Smelker, Skelly, Vice-Chair Galligan.  
Nays: None. **Motion passed.**

---

**Case 24-22: Lot Split of 1600 Kooiman St. (parcel #70-03-20-301-016)**

Urquhart presented the case. Property owner Mike Wilson has submitted an application to split 1600 Kooiman (parcel #70-03-28-301-016) into two (2) lots. The parcel is approximately 5 acres located in the TI – Transitional Industrial District and northeastern and eastern portion is within the Sensitive Area Overlay. Because of the parcel's location within the sensitive area overlay, staff determined a review by the Planning Commission would be appropriate.

1600 Kooiman parcel

- Frontage off Kooiman

- Lot area: 3.82 acres
- Lot width: 533 ft.
- Interior lot
- Outside of Sensitive Area Overlay

New parcel

- Frontage off Kooiman
- Lot area: 1.08 acres
- Lot width: 219.9 ft.
- Interior lot
- Within Sensitive Area Overlay
- Proposed use: TBD

There is no minimum lot width or lot size in the Transitional Industrial District. However, the applicant has proposed lot size and width that would provide the necessary building envelope to accommodate the required setbacks for future buildings. Included in the packet is an EGLE permit, however, that does not authorize zoning approval. Following an approved lot split, at a minimum, a site plan application and sensitive area overlay permit would be required.

Applicant Denny Dryer, 220 ½ Washington, was present stating the wetland situation needed to be addressed before the sale of the property, and split.

Borchers, Pierce, Smelker, Skelly, Kozanecki, Smolenska, Owens, and Vice-Chair Galligan did not have any questions.

Motion made by **Pierce**, seconded by **Smolenska** approves Case 24-22, a request to split 1600 Kooiman St. (parcel #70-03-28-301-016) into two (2) lots as shown on the site plan.

Roll call vote. Yeas: Kozanecki, Owens, Borchers, Smolenska, Pierce, Smelker, Skelly, Vice-Chair Galligan. Nays: None. **Motion passed.**

---

**Case 24-23: Discussion of Sensitive Area Overlay Removal for Salvation Army Housing Development (parcel# 70-03-21-328-031)**

Urquhart presented the case. Denny Dryer, Tom Reinsma, and Bill Holman approached the city for a possible attainable housing development of 27 townhomes on the Salvation Army's property off Fulton St. (parcel #70-03-21-328-031). Last month, they provided public comment to the Planning Commission for consideration of removing the sensitive area overlay designation of the 2.09-acre parcel. The zoning map (attachment B) denotes the majority of the parcel is within the sensitive area overlay.

The applicant's memo indicates the property is not necessary for Salvation Army operations and is presently overgrown brush. In addition, they assert the sensitive area overlay precludes the development of the site for housing. The underlying zoning district is NMU - Neighborhood Mixed-Use, in which a multiple family dwelling is permitted by right in this district.

The applicant is requesting a determination from the Planning Commission of what content would be necessary in an environmental survey. This process is outlined in Sec. 40-422.06 of the zoning ordinance.



The applicant noted the wetland is not regulated by the State of Michigan, nor does it appear to be connected to other wetlands/streams or sensitive ecosystems. According to Sec. 40-442.02.B. A wetland is determined to be sensitive because it provides flood and storm control, wildlife habitat, pollution treatment, water recharge, and storage area, benefits to water quality, and erosion control.

Removing a sensitive area overlay is a two-step process. The first step is obtaining the necessary information to make an informed decision on whether to remove the sensitive area overlay. The environmental survey is imperative to the applicant's request. The second step is to amend the zoning map, which is treated as a rezoning, with final approval by the City Council.

Items for the Planning Commission to consider:

- Is there justification for removing the sensitive overlay for the proposed use?
- What is the compatibility of the proposed use and the future land use and Master Plan?
- What environmental qualities does this site contain, or does not contain, to continue the sensitive area designation? Is there a negative impact on wildlife habitat? Water recharge and storage? Pollution treatment?
- What content within the Environmental survey will be necessary to make a qualified determination?

Applicants Denny Dryer, 220 ½ Washington Ave, and Jacob Horner from Growing Place Grand Rapids were present and asked the commission for specific criteria needed to submit the environmental report.

Smelker spoke stating according to Sec. 40-442.02 the specifics for the environmental report could be found there. She encouraged the applicant to an environmental science firm to assist with getting the various tests done.

Pierce mentioned he loved the idea of the project but feels as though environmental due diligence needs to be done.

Borchers stated he sat on the Salvation Army Board and felt as though most of the area was already filled.

Skelly encouraged the applicant to reach out to an Environmental Firm to get the most accurate information.

Kozanecki and Smolenska agreed that they were in line with the previous comments about reaching out to an Environmental firm to get professional guidance. They also like the project.

Owens had nothing further to add.

Vice-Chair Galligan summarized the discussion stating Planning Commission had encouraged the applicant to contact some type of Environmental Consultant to show them the ordinance to give proper guidance and gain the report from them.

No motion was made at this time.

Kozanecki reported two cases were presented. Shape Corporation asked for a new sign to be placed in the right-of-way, which was approved. The next case was 520 Elliot for a garage house addition which approached lot lines was denied.

---

### **City Planner Report**

#### **Child Care Center in Industrial District**

After a slight delay in review, the City Council approved the first reading of the zoning text amendment to allow child care centers in the I - I-Industrial District by special land use. The ordinance is expected to be adopted at the June 17<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

#### **Diesel Plant Update**

In February 2023, the Planning Commission approved the site plan for the former diesel plant at 518 S. Harbor Dr. Included in the packet is a brief update from Grand Power Works. It appears the developer is continuing to pursue funding from the MEDC for the project. They do not it would take approximately 12-18 months for construction to occur. The developer has noted that September 1<sup>st</sup> will be the start date, however, that date is not yet confirmed.

#### **PC Membership**

All members who were up for another term were reappointed at the June 3<sup>rd</sup> City Council meeting.

---

### **Call to the Audience; Second Opportunity**

Steve Dietsch, 615 S. Griffin St., stating the Children's Museum received 317 responses from a survey that was conducted. 90% of those respondents stated they would be interested in having a membership. 73% of those respondents stated they visit a Children's museum a few times each year. He stated the Children's Museum would be something that would be open throughout the week, which would make the space something used all year round.

Jeffrey Miller, 1120 S Harbor Drive made observations stating he didn't feel there needed to be a rush on deciding for Chinook Pier and voiced concern that no public meetings were held. He felt as though a town hall was needed. He also wanted to encourage participation in the Harbor Island meeting.

He also mentioned that he was concerned about the Farmer's Market and the farmers being able to load and unload their produce.

Brent Clark, 820 S Harbor, stated there was already an event center at the community center, the Diesel Plant was also supposed to be an event center, and Harbor Island could also likely be an event space. He mentioned his concern about blocking the waterfront view. He stated the waterfront area is one of the most valuable things we have. He also mentioned he felt it wasn't necessary to rush.

Jean Sherman, 421 Sand Drive, felt there should be some type of community information or town hall. She felt that there needed to be more time for people to be involved and to have coordination with what was happening at Harbor Island.

Planning Commission Minutes  
June 11, 2024

Nancy Lowe, 435 Sandpiper, stated she would also like an opportunity to have a town hall to be able to have more discussion on the details of each proposal.

Mayor Bob Monetza, 945 Washington, thanked the Planning Commission for their thoughtful comments and various perspectives. He also stated that he appreciated the public comments surrounding the Chinook Pier RFP's. He stated Council is listening and will consider all comments. Timelines are never set in stone, but thoughts and ideas will be captured. He thanked the Commission again for the work done and assured them that this was exactly what was expected.

---

**Adjournment:** Vice-Chair Galligan adjourned the meeting at 9:19 pm.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Melissa Bos', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Melissa Bos, Executive Assistant to the City Manager