

Minutes of the Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission

Regular Meeting held May 23, 2024, at 7 pm

8555 Kalamazoo Ave., SE, Caledonia, MI 49316

MEMBERS PRESENT: Billips, Rober, Waayenberg, Wiersema, Thomas, Haagsma

MEMBERS ABSENT: Giarmo, with notice.

STAFF PRESENT: Dan Wells, Community Development Director; Dakota Swan, Assistant Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Rober called the meeting to order at 6:58 PM.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING AGENDA

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Thomas to add agenda item VII.b to discuss a special Planning Commission meeting in the upcoming months.

DISCUSSION: None.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

III. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

Consideration of the April 25th, regular Planning Commission meeting minutes.

Commissioner Wiersema pointed out that there is a typo in the second paragraph on page six.

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Haagsma to approve the minutes of April 25th, 2024, with corrections.

DISCUSSION: None.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

IV. INQUIRY OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Rober opened the public hearing at 7:02 PM.

Randall Scot, 6467 Avalon Drive, expressed that he is displeased with the Township's sign ordinance after receiving a code enforcement letter addressing an unlawful sign advertising his business, Oskar Scots. He is seeking an amendment to the sign ordinance and explained to the Planning Commission that he would like to get that on the agenda for a meeting in the future.

Yvonne Pratt, 2490 Crystal Meadows, expressed concerns regarding controlled burning happening at the Alexander Trails site that is blowing smoke towards her home and causing asthma flare-ups. She explained that she is not pleased about the development, and questioned how they intend to handle clearing the brush without further disturbing her asthma. Planner Wells offered some insight into controlled burns, and recommended taking this concern to the Township Board as they are better equipped than the Planning Commission to address the issue at hand.

Chair Rober closed the public hearing at 7:08 PM.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

a. Public Hearings

a. 1470 68th Street – Special Use Permit – Accessory Building

Chad Schaap, the property owner and applicant for this project, explained his request for a special use permit. He stated that he is seeking a special use permit to construct a 3,200 square-foot (SF) accessory building, making a total of 4,744 SF in accessory buildings on the property. Schaap intends to use this building as cold storage for lawnmowers, trailers, and vehicles. He stated that he also owns land adjacent to this parcel with rental units and a machine shop and needs somewhere to store all the equipment used for the maintenance of his property.

Planner Dan Wells gave additional context on this project and said that most general standards for special land uses were found to be met. He stated that accessory buildings in this area of the Township are consistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan, and that staff doesn't anticipate any adverse effects on public welfare or safety. Wells mentioned that there is a utility easement that runs through the middle of the parcel, but that the barn is set to be located outside of the easement and all setbacks will be met. He then went on to say, however, that the precedence for development set by this request is undetermined; accessory buildings are typical in this area of the Township, but accessory buildings of this size are not typical, and the Planning Commission needs to determine if the size of the building is appropriate and would be setting a bad precedent for future requests of this nature. One concern from staff regarding this project would be visibility and screening; the building is set to go as far as possible from 68th Street, however, will be highly visible from the neighborhood to the south and the parking lot to the west of the parcel. Staff recommended additional screening for this building to reduce the visual impact; Schaap added that he spoke with the homeowners to the south and they would prefer

to see trees used as screening measures rather than a fence, and he is willing to implement landscaping all around the proposed pole barn. Wells responded that if additional screening was required, staff would be willing to review the landscaping plan administratively. Wells mentioned that there is a utility easement that runs through the middle of the parcel, but that the barn is set to be located outside of the easement and all setbacks will be met.

Chair Rober opened the public hearing and subsequently closed it after nobody approached the podium to speak.

Commissioner Wiersema began discussion by inquiring about the location of the easement; Planner Wells pointed it out on the map and Schaap added that the building will be between 50 and 75 feet away from the easement. Commissioner Haagsma then inquired about the nature of the easement, and Wells confirmed that it is a sanitary easement.

Secretary Thomas inquired about any proposed lighting on the building, Schaap responded that he intends to install motion sensor security lights and aims to reduce the visual impact of any vehicle headlights on dwellings to the south.

Haagsma and Waayenberg both inquired about the intended use of the pole barn and clarified that it will not be used for commercial purposes despite the applicant owning a small machine shop, to which Schaap agreed.

Waayenberg commented that although it is a big building for the area, it's a small percentage of the overall lot.

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg supported by Thomas to approve the Special Use Permit for 3,200 SF in accessory buildings with the conditions that it will not be used for commercial purposes, and additional landscape screening will be implemented and reviewed by staff.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Wiersema inquired about the material of the proposed driveway, Schaap responded that it will be gravel. Chair Rober inquired about proposed setbacks of the building, Schaap confirmed that the building will be 75 feet off of the south lot line and 50 feet off of the west lot line.

AYES: Billips, Waayenberg, Thomas, Haagsma

NAYS: Wiersema, Rober

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (4-2)

b. 7376 Hanna Lake – Special Use Permit – Accessory Building

Before explaining his request for a special use permit, applicant and property owner Rex Kogler clarified some details from the staff memo regarding his application to construct a pole barn on his property. Originally, Kogler was requesting a special use permit to construct a 2048 SF pole barn, however, during

the public hearing for his agenda item, he stated that he now intends to install a 1280 SF pole barn. Kogler mentioned that the building will be 16 feet tall, and he intends to use it to store a motor home, gardening equipment, and other residential storage items.

Planner Wells stated that upon initial review, staff didn't find any issues with general special land use standards being met, and that the reduction in the size of the building brings this project more into compliance with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan. On the staff memo, standards 19.8 (E), 19.8 (K), and 20.2 (D).4 (C) were originally found to be undetermined based on the size of the building, however, in lieu of the applicants desire to make the building smaller, those three standards have now been found to be met. Wells then noted that upon reducing the size of the building, the applicant is now only 80 SF over what would be allowed by right. All setbacks were also found to be met, and staff would still recommend approval of this request based on these changes.

Chair Rober opened the public hearing, and neighbor Greg Waldmiller of 7400 Hanna Lake approached the podium to voice his support for this request. Chair Rober then closed the public hearing.

Planner Wells added that Kogler received Township Board approval for a parcel combination on the two lots that he owns, and by the time construction on this building begins, the combination should be registered at the county level and his two parcels will be one.

Commissioner Wiersema stated that he drove through the area and is interested in recommending a landscape buffer to reduce the visual impact of the building, and Commissioner Waayenberg added that the berm to the east of Kogler's property is decently sized and should offer sufficient screening in addition to trees and shrubs in the area.

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Billips, to approve the Special Use Permit for 1280 SF in accessory buildings with the understanding that the square footage and standards have changed, with the conditions that the building will not be used for commercial purposes, and the existing structure will be removed within 30 days of the new building receiving a final building inspection.

DISCUSSION: None

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

c. Alexander Trails PUD – Major Amendment Site Plan Review

Kelly Kuiper, the Manager of Land Planning and Entitlement from Eastbrook Homes, explained the Alexander Trails project and the rationale behind some of the changes that were made to the site plan. At the April Planning Commission meeting, Eastbrook gave an overview of their Preliminary PUD request; Planner Wells explained that the PUD zoning is still in effect, however, Eastbrook is now working on getting the site plan up to speed as they seek approval. Kuiper then took some time to address concerns raised at the April meeting, and commentary provided in the staff memo.

The new site plan for Alexander Trails still features the same acreage, but the number of units has increased from 396 to 404. This site plan seeks to offer a variety of housing types within the development while satisfying density requirements and maintaining an adequate level of open space preservation. Eastbrook is aware of the wetlands and floodplain in the area, and Kuiper commented that they intend to complement those natural areas and open up the Plaster Creek corridor with activated green spaces. The development features 5.3 miles of paved sidewalk to provide pedestrian connectivity, and 0.88 miles of natural trail through the Plaster Creek corridor; they aim to encourage safe pedestrian movement throughout the development.

As far as changes to the site plan go, Kuiper explained that the eastern portion of the development has been redesigned to incorporate a more open terminating view when entering the development. In the southern portion of Alexander Trails, 2-story townhomes are still featured as they were before, however, the central space now features terrace homes. Kuiper stated that although only 7 units got added to the overall unit count, two fully different unit types are now featured in the design, alongside an improved entrance view, and improved pedestrian access throughout.

Planner Wells then explained the Townships point of view on this request and stated that the general PUD standards of review were found to be met and expressed that the variety of price points and home types presented through the new site plans will be good to appeal to a variety of customers. Wells added that traffic will always be a concern, and that although there are several access points to the west, they will be required to solidify another road connection before exceeding 30 units. As far as protection of the natural environment goes, Wells said they've done a good job setting aside critical areas and providing adequate access to the Plaster Creek corridor while ensuring the nature trail can be properly maintained. Wells went on to say that the amenities being proposed are good and well thought out and will likely serve as nice meeting spots for neighbors, doubling as a social amenity as well.

As far as site plan review standards go, Planner Wells said that the two proposed entrance signs will be reviewed administratively, and that a streetlight assessment district will be necessary to review the photometric details of the site plan. Additionally, the photometric plan that was submitted was not to scale and staff was unable to determine the actual impact of the planned lighting in the development. Wells then expressed a distaste for the proposed spice-inspired street names, to which Kuiper replied that unfortunately the street names from the old site plan will have to be used still.

Planner Wells went on to say that Eastbrook Homes will need to get all necessary agency approvals, including the Township Engineer, the Fire Chief, EGLE, the Byron-Gaines Utility Authority, and the Kent County Road Commission. Specifically, the Fire Chief must review all roads and cul-de-sacs for safety; Wells mentioned there is an ongoing discussion with the Fire Department regarding islands within cul-de-sacs and if they're up to fire code. Wells stated that overall, staff recommends the Planning Commission make a positive recommendation to the Township Board to approve this PUD/ Site Plan Review with the condition that Eastbrook submits a revised photometric plan, and they obtain all necessary agency approvals.

Chair Rober opened the public hearing for Alexander Trails.

Leon Pratt of 2490 Crystal Meadows expressed his concerns regarding Alexander Trails and the unnecessary risk that he believes this development brings to his neighborhood. He is concerned about the additional traffic that will be brought to the area from the road connection leading into Sienna

Pointe, and he is also concerned about the burning of brush that is currently happening on the site. Pratt expressed concerns regarding construction vehicles entering the site from 76th Street, and also voiced that he is worried about the sewer line passing through Plaster Creek in case of an emergency or spillage happening from the sewer line. To conclude, Pratt also expressed concerns regarding the ability of snowplows to navigate the streets within Alexander Trails, specifically within the cul-de-sacs.

Joel Hugen of 6894 Sienna Drive echoed earlier concerns about the increase in traffic and potential safety risks associated with an increase in vehicle trips in the area. Hugen added that the lack of access points to the north for Alexander Trails is concerning to him, and that he would ideally like to see another connection to the north that doesn't send northbound traffic from Alexander Trails into Sienna Pointe.

Planner Wells took a brief moment to state that all proposed public streets are reviewed by the Kent County Road Commission and that up to 30 homes can be built without requiring a secondary road connection.

Dave Lotterman of 6950 Sienna Drive expressed his worries about the increase in traffic through the neighborhood.

Eric Miller of 6838 Terra Cotta voiced concerns about traffic as well, specifically the lack of speed bumps in the area and the need for them. Additionally, he expressed worry that there are no posted speed limits in the neighborhood currently, and that with all of the additional traffic that would be coming to the area, he feels as though it would be necessary to have a stronger Sheriff presence in the area to manage and mitigate the high speeds he sees and additional trips.

Chair Rober then closed the public hearing.

Planner Wells reiterated that under the current zoning ordinance, there are no stipulations that require a certain number of outlets for a certain number of houses, and that there are four spots for potential road connections throughout the development. One connection is through Terra Cotta, and the rest of the road connections will ultimately depend on future development. Wells also mentioned that Alexander Trails is set to feature a mix of public and private roads.

Commissioner Wiersema inquired about an area on the northern side of the development with condo units and if there will be sidewalks; Kuiper responded that originally, they were only on the north side of the road, but that they instead removed sidewalks from the north side and put them on the south side so that they would cut through less driveways.

Wiersema also inquired about sidewalks depicted on "Road P" from the site plan and if they would be included on the rest of the roadway, to which Kuiper said they determined the road system in that area is too short to justify having sidewalks, however if they are deemed critical by the Planning Commission, they can make it happen. Commissioner Wiersema asked about the dimensions of "Road P", and Kuiper responded that they are set to be 26 feet wide, however there are several details to be ironed out and determined at the site plan level. Wells added that 26 feet is the required minimum road width by the Fire Department.

Wells added that sidewalks in a short stretch of road with so many driveways would likely hinder pedestrian accessibility, and it will likely be easier for pedestrians to move through that area by just

walking in the roadway. The area in question is quite small, and Wells stated that he is doubtful there will be a lot of high speeds in this specific area.

Commissioner Wiersema sought clarification about the undevelopable space within the floodplain area, and Kuiper confirmed the boundaries of the undevelopable area.

Wiersema then commented on the Consumers Energy easement that runs through the development and the stormwater retention area that runs underneath their lines. Kuiper responded that the easement will likely need to be split in two at some point or shifted. Wiersema added that the area in question provides adequate space for a trail of sorts since it's a very natural area, and Kuiper said that if a hard surface pathway is desired by the Planning Commission, Eastbrook would be willing to figure it out and make it work.

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Billips, to approve the site plan and make a recommendation to the Township Board to approve the amendment to the Alexander Trails PUD with the conditions that all township department and agency approvals are secured, and that the photometric plan is revised and reviewed by staff.

DISCUSSION: None

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

b. Site Plan Review

a. 6141 East Paris Avenue – Stone Pro Warehouse

Paul Henderson of Roosien & Associates was the representative for this project and was available at the meeting to answer questions about the Site Plan Review.

Planner Wells gave an overview of the project and said that this Site Plan Review is for a 6,000 SF warehouse/ storefront for StonePro. This application was reviewed by the Planning Commission at the March meeting where some issues were identified, and revisions were recommended; the applicant has taken Planning Commission feedback into consideration and is now back with a revised site plan seeking approval for the project. In their initial application, the landscaping was found to be insufficient and there was conflict amongst the proposed building and an easement in the western part of the parcel; the revised site plan addresses and mitigates both of those problems. Planner Wells stated that all setbacks were found to be met, in addition to point-system landscaping requirements, and photometric requirements. On the topic of lighting, Wells stated that staff is recommending 3,000-4,000 Kelvin for lighting temperatures. Additionally, Wells stated that staff is recommending a condition in which the applicant must secure all agency approvals for this project; Township Engineer Jeff Gritter communicated that prior engineering concerns for this project have been addressed through the new site plan. Planner Wells mentioned that the Planning Commission must determine if pedestrian circulation is adequate, but besides those concerns, staff recommends approval of this project.

Chair Rober inquired about the state of sidewalks and foot traffic in the area, to which Henderson replied that the client doesn't anticipate much foot traffic in the area, and that they don't intend to be a high-volume kind of business.

Commissioner Wiersema stated that upon inspecting the site, he found a pile of miscellaneous junk and debris in the southwest corner of the parcel and would be interested in making the removal of junk a condition of approval. Planner Wells added that the site has come a long way visually over the last two years as a result of code enforcement efforts from the Planning and Zoning Department, and that he anticipates StonePro will take good care of the site and contribute to the improvements seen in the area.

Commissioner Waayenberg expressed that he was pleased to see the landscape revisions in addition to the relocation of the building and given the nature of the area/ business, he is willing to look past the lack of connectivity provided by the proposed sidewalks.

Motion: Motion by Wiersema, supported by Thomas to approve the site plan review with the condition that all necessary agency approvals will be acquired, and debris will be removed from the site.

DISCUSSION: None

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

c. Items Not Requiring a Public Hearing

a. 4598 84th Street – Special Use Permit – Accessory Building

Homeowner Mike Naber's request for a special use permit was addressed and approved at the April Planning Commission meeting, however, due to a staff error on the memo provided to Commissioners, needed to be readdressed at this meeting. The public notice that was sent on behalf of this request listed the correct square footage of the proposed accessory building, therefore a re-notice was not necessary. The correct square footage of the proposed accessory building is 2400 SF, which includes a roofed awning.

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Thomas to rescind the original motion and approval for this special use permit.

DISCUSSION: None

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Thomas to approve a special use permit to allow for 2400 SF in accessory buildings with the condition that the accessory building will be architecturally similar to the existing building, and it will not be used for commercial purposes.

DISCUSSION:	None
AYES:	ALL
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
DECISION:	Motion Carried (6-0)

b. 3495 68th Street – Dutton Marathon – PUD Amendment Preliminary Review

Adam Bryant of Irish Design & Build, the contractor and representative for this project, gave context on the project and explained what the applicant intends to do upon seeking a PUD amendment. The site in question is mildly untidy; there is some miscellaneous junk behind the building, minimal landscaping, and a broken fence towards the front of the property. Bryant stated that there is much room for improvement on the site and many areas in which landscaping could be improved. He went on to say that if the client decided to go with a flat roof for the building, air conditioning units could be placed on top of it and reduce the visual impact from where they're currently located at the rear of the building. Bryant mentioned that a flat roof system and the removal of some pavement would open up even more area for extra landscaping on the east side of the building, and that the entire outside of the building is getting revamped as well, including the removal of some windows, and improvements to signs.

Revisions to the site plan that was originally submitted include directional arrows and striping in the parking lot that will help direct delivery trucks and customer traffic, in addition to some upgrades to exterior lighting fixtures.

Bryant inquired with the Planning Commission about the dumpsters for the business; they are located in the parking lot but on a different parcel, and it is unclear whether the business would still be able to use them, or if it is recommended that the client purchase that small chunk of land to maintain access to the dumpsters.

Overall, Bryant stated that the main objective is to update the entire site and the property, in addition to opening up the inside of the store and increasing the storage space and adding a walk-in beer cooler.

Planner Wells offered additional context on this project and said that this PUD was originally approved in 1981, which made finding documentation of permits for the staff review quite challenging. Wells was unable to find any record of when awnings or parking spaces were added, but he believes they were approved over many years; what was originally approved is far different from what is at the site today. Wells stated that this is a good opportunity for both the Planning Commission and the Township Board to analyze this site and bring it into compliance with the standards of the current Zoning Ordinance.

Wells went on to say that there is an easement that wraps around the north and east side of the building which offers flexibility with setbacks; the applicant would like to extend the building up to the access easement. On the topic of dumpsters, Wells stated that this area is leased by another owner, therefore the applicant does not have control over the property, and that enclosing the dumpsters/ relocating them to the parcel in question are absolutely reasonable improvements.

The building is currently 3200 SF and the applicant is proposing an additional 1400 SF to provide extra storage space and a walk-in beer cooler. Wells stated that if the building gets expanded to the north, the rear setback gets reduced to 15.3 feet, which is a deviation from the 25 feet that is typically allowed in a

commercially zoned district, however, back when this PUD was approved, it is questionable if setbacks were even taken into consideration. The setback issue at hand is the biggest reason for this request being categorized as a Major PUD Amendment and requiring Planning Commission consideration.

Planner Wells clarified that this is the applicant's preliminary PUD Amendment review, and if the Planning Commission grants them preliminary approval, they will come back for a public hearing with a more refined site plan so as to iron out any fine details and address any standards that are currently undetermined.

Staff encouraged the Planning Commission to debate the matter of setbacks if the addition is approved for this site, and the primary use within this project; if the project gets approval, would the primary use remain a gas station, or at that point would it be a liquor store? Wells also clarified that the site differs vastly from what was originally approved, however, this is a modern gas station, and many changes have been made to the site over time. He went on to say that parking spaces have also increased over time, and it is unclear whether the excess parking spaces are exactly necessary at this site.

Wells added that staff is unfamiliar with the environmental history of the site, and this might be a good opportunity to determine whether any gas tanks need to be replaced. Township Engineer Jeff Gritter communicated that although a stormwater easement does run through the south side of the parcel and drains on the opposite side, he is not concerned and does not see this as an issue.

Wells encouraged the Planning Commission to discuss the narrowed setbacks on the north side of the building, and other improvements that could be deemed necessary, such as dumpster screening, lighting changes, and improvements to internal roads. Additionally, Wells mentioned that staff is requiring removal of poster and snipe signs, and landscaping improvements to reduce the weeds and overgrowth on the site currently. Overall, staff recommends preliminary approval of this application.

Commissioner Wiersema agreed that the dumpsters need to be sufficiently screened and questioned the current location of them on a different property. He added that it is unclear where else the dumpsters could go without sacrificing employee parking spaces to the rear of the building. Wiersema then sought clarification on the location of the cooler, and Bryant confirmed where the addition is planned to go. On the matter of a possible flat roof, Wiersema expressed a distaste for the visual appearance of a flat roof in the Dutton area, even if it makes sense in terms of optimizing the site. He suggested that whatever happens architecturally here should be consistent with the village feel being emulated in Dutton.

Chair Rober inquired about the pavement in the parking lot, and Bryant confirmed that they intend to repave the parking lot.

Commissioner Haagsma echoed Wiersema's concerns about the aesthetics of a flat roof not matching the character of the area and added that he would prefer to not see junk on the exterior of the building. Haagsma added that he is not fond of the dumpsters not being on the property, and that he is concerned about what may happen to the north of the property at the west end of the strip mall; in the original plans from 1981, the strip mall is depicted as extending further west. Wells added that a few years ago, the owners of the strip mall were interested in extending the strip mall further west, but it never came into fruition. Haagsma clarified that he isn't opposed to an addition, as long as the visual appearance of the building is improved from its current state, and the applicant provides sufficient site plan materials that accurately depict the changes to come.

Commissioner Waayenberg expressed that he likes the idea of improving landscaping on the site; he added that the setback issue isn't too big of a concern for him because the building itself has been there for so long and people are seemingly used to it. Waayenberg then suggested the possibility of having a flat roof for the sake of relocating air conditioning units but including a fake gable to emulate the village feel in the area. Wiersema added that the strip mall appears to use this approach and seems to have a false gable roof as well; Bryant responded that he inquired about this with the architect for this project and would be interested in entertaining this idea.

Wells inquired with the Planning Commission about their thoughts on awnings and what kind of aesthetics they envision for those if a rebrand happens for the station at any point; Waayenberg voiced that he would prefer to see them remain unbranded, and Rober and Billips agreed that something humble and modest would be preferable instead of something fluorescent and branded.

Motion:	Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Haagsma to schedule this item for a public hearing whenever the applicant submits necessary materials and says they are ready.
DISCUSSION:	None
AYES:	ALL
NAYS:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	None
DECISION:	Motion Carried (6-0)

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

a. Clarification of Data Center Use

Wells introduced this discussion item with some context and said that there is a data center by the name of Switch located in the Township, which is located on industrial property and has previously been treated as a site plan review. A new data center project is seeking clarification on the interpretation of a data center under the current Zoning Ordinance, because the Zoning Ordinance does not outright say that data centers are an allowed use by right in industrial areas. Wells stated that since data centers are basically warehouses, it seems as though a site plan review should be sufficient and that a special use permit would be unnecessary for this kind of use in an industrial area. Individuals involved in this project are seeking clarification from the Planning Commission to help determine whether a site plan review is appropriate for data centers in industrial areas, or if a special use permit should be deemed necessary as well. The only impact Wells anticipates is visual from the footprint of the building itself and any fans that may sit on top of it; data centers generally do not emit any light, scents, or sounds that would be considered a nuisance. Wells added that the individuals working on this project sound as though they are seeking clarification before applying for anything in case they get denied through a by-right application.

Commissioner Haagsma stated that he wouldn't have an issue considering a data center a warehouse, or a light manufacturing operation.

Commissioner Billips raised concerns about the amount of electricity a data center would use, and Haagsma added that the water use would be slight cause for concern as well. Wells confirmed that the

Water and Sewer Administrator and the Township Engineer have both confirmed that the Township has enough water supply to support the needs of a potential data center, depending on the cooling mechanism being used.

Planner Wells reminded the Planning Commission that the Switch data center sets precedence, which allows the Township to process data centers as site plan reviews.

Haagsma and Waayenberg voiced that they would be comfortable processing data centers as site plan reviews, and the remaining commissioners agreed.

b. Special Planning Commission Meeting

Wells stated that the Zoning Ordinance update is in its final stages and once the final draft has been reviewed, it may be a good idea to hold an additional Planning Commission meeting in the next few months to review and address the changes. Wells said this meeting will be run as a public hearing and it will be noticed in the Sun and News but inquired with the Planning Commission about their thoughts on holding a special meeting dedicated to discussing the updates. The Planning Commission was receptive to this idea and is open to holding a special meeting within the next few months.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 PM.

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the minutes from the May 23rd, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting of the Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission held at the time and place mentioned above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lani Thomas".

Lani Thomas,

Secretary

Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission

Date: , 2024