

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held Wednesday, November 19, 2025.

Meeting called to order by Chairman Josiah Samy at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Josiah Samy (Chairman Samy), Jeannine Bolhouse, Jessica Ulberg, Tom Healy, Geoff Brown
Absent: Gary Veldink, Brian Reed
Also present: Ryan Schab, Zoning Administrator (ZA)

#251119-01 – Agenda for the [November 19, 2025](#) Planning Commission Meeting

Moved by Geoff Brown, seconded by Jessica Ulberg to approve the agenda of the [November 19, 2025](#) meeting as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#251119-02 – Minutes of the [September 17, 2025](#) Planning Commission Meeting

Moved by Chairman Samy, seconded by Jessica Ulberg, to approve the minutes of the [September 17, 2025](#) meeting as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#251119-03 – (PUD2501) (Ordinance No. 2025-08) Rubicon, LLC, is requesting (rezoning from LDR to PUD) approval for preliminary planned unit development for 44th St. & 8th Ave. PUD, a mixed use PUD with residential, commercial and office uses, on 12.11 acres, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-25- 100-051 and #70-14-25-100-052, located at 6124 and 6110 8th Ave. Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Chuck Hoyt, Nederveld engineer and representative of the Applicant, presented the request. He noted that the applicant is now seeking to allow Community Service Commercial [CS] zoning uses in the commercial buildings and would like to keep the existing 600 SF accessory building in the southeast corner of the property.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#).

Tom Healy asked if there was a reason the ZA excluded hospitals from the list of prohibited uses for the PUD. While the ZA looked up information on that, Tom asked if the applicant had any proposed tenants at this point.

Chuck Hoyt responded they had a couple businesses looking at the site.

Tom Healy asked why the applicant was looking at going for CS zoning as opposed to NS or OS if they didn't have a particular tenant in mind.

Chuck Hoyt responded that they wanted to leave their options for tenants as open as possible.

The ZA stated there wasn't a particular reason hospitals were excluded from the lists of prohibited uses. He stated that they could make an argument to include hospitals on the list of prohibited uses. He

stated hospitals are defined in the ordinance differently than a clinic [more of a standard doctor's office]. A clinic would likely be allowed in that location as opposed to a hospital.

Tom Healy stated the Planning Commission has been discussing low intensity use and wondered how to define low intensity. He asked if it was determined by vehicles per day or per hour frequenting a business. He stated he felt a hospital should be included on the list of prohibited uses. He stated further that the Planning Commission has been discussing the master plan and mixed-use developments, stating that mixed-use developments take better advantage of existing infrastructure and saves the township from having to expand infrastructure, which is what this development is proposing.

Jeannine Bolhouse wanted confirmation that the existing garage will be the only building that will remain and other existing buildings will be demolished.

Chuck Hoyt confirmed yes, it would be the only existing building to remain.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked what the garage's square footage was.

Chuck Hoyt stated he didn't know precisely, but it appeared to be a 20' x 30'.

The property owner, Rick Geenen, stated the existing garage would be re-sided to match the new construction. He stated he owns the apartment development across the street and the garage is used to keep extra appliances like dishwashers, stoves, and air conditioners. He stated it is also for storing landscaping equipment.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked what road work would be involved in having to bring the sewer across 8th Avenue from the west.

The property owner stated their excavator was checking into that now with the Township, but did not have an immediate answer.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated she believes the site is a great location for a PUD. She stated she appreciated the traffic study that was submitted because the intersection of 8th Avenue and 44th Street can be dangerous and sees a lot of traffic. She stated she is also concerned, as Tom Healy was, about the uses available in CS zoning.

Chairman Samy requested the ZA bring up the list of uses available to CS zoning. While the ZA was bringing up the list, Chairman Samy asked after the layouts of the garages in the residential buildings.

Chuck Hoyt and the property owner stated that there would be enough garages for each unit and there are also two living units on the main floor of the building.

The ZA presented the list of uses permitted by right to a CS zoned property as well as the uses permitted by special land use.

Chairman Samy asked which zoning district restaurants fall under.

The ZA stated they are in NS [and the permitted uses under NS would all be available under a CS zoning].

Chairman Samy wanted to confirm that the restaurant use under CS zoning's special land uses was strictly for restaurants that also have distilleries, breweries, or wineries.

The ZA confirmed yes, it's for restaurants having a distillery, brewery, or winery on the same site. The ZA stated that if the PC allowed CS zoning for the site, they could still exclude certain uses as a condition of approval.

Jessica Ulberg stated she had the same sentiments about traffic at that location and her concern with allowing a CS zoning as it relates to traffic.

Geoff Brown stated that no one drives the speed limit [45 mph] on 44th Street. He stated everyone has seen drivers accelerate to beat traffic lights. He stated he was concerned that there is no deceleration lane on the 8th Avenue side. He stated the proposal in the traffic study was to re-time the traffic light and his concern there was that 8th Avenue would experience a traffic backup worse than it currently does.

Chairman Samy asked if allowing the existing garage to stay would change the layout of the driveway.

Chuck Hoyt stated that it would not change the layout. The intent is to just have a dirt two-track leading off the paved road to the garage.

Tom Healy stated it may be a good idea to look at each special land use in CS zoning to determine if they are okay with that use going into that location.

Chairman Samy asked the ZA if the PC can restrict special uses in a location, so that even if they are allowed by special land use in the ordinance, the PC can prohibit certain uses with the PUD approval despite the ordinance allowing them.

The ZA stated yes, the PC can do that. He stated that some of the prohibited uses listed in the staff report were uses allowed by right or by special land use under CS zoning, such as an open-air business. He stated he did not bother putting the amusement park use on the list of prohibited uses due to the physical constraints of the property, but the PC could include that on the list if they wanted.

Tom Healy stated he believed restaurants which include breweries, distilleries, and wineries on the site would not be appropriate for that location due to the amount of space they would take up. There was a general consensus of agreement on that point.

Chairman Samy opened the public hearing.

Pam Weston, 640 44th St., stated she had concerns about displacement of wildlife from the wooded and pond area, and light and sound barriers to protect existing homes from activity on the PUD property. She stated she was also concerned about traffic.

Joy Church, 620 44th St., stated she was of the opinion the development would need to be on a larger piece of property and that by putting it here, it would lower surrounding home values.

Stan Church, 620 44th St., stated he would like to see substantial landscaping to prevent sound pollution.

Brad Bruinsma, 6026 8th Ave., stated he is also concerned about the increased traffic. He also agreed landscaping barriers to protect against sound and light pollution would be appreciated.

Don Weston, 640 44th St., stated he was concerned about the traffic and the type of retail/commercial uses that would be permitted there. He stated he assumed the commercial building would be a professional space (offices, financial planners, engineers, etc...), rather than a retail space like a restaurant. He stated he would also like to see a way to disincentivize people from cutting through the professional area parking lot because drivers will want to use that parking lot to bypass the 44th Street and 8th Avenue intersection to head eastbound on 44th Street from northbound 8th Avenue.

Terri White, 741 44th St., stated she was also concerned about traffic as it is already difficult to get in and out of their driveways.

There were no further public comments.

Chairman Samy closed the public hearing.

Chairman Samy invited the applicant to speak to the concerns made by residents, chiefly traffic and greenbelt issues.

Chuck Hoyt stated that he is sensitive to concerns about traffic in any development project. He stated that's why they conducted a traffic study and the studies are based on data, formulas, and statistics, but traffic studies do not factor in drivers breaking the law [such as using the commercial space parking lot to avoid the traffic light]. He stated that as someone who lives near a busy middle school with no buses, he must leave his home five minutes earlier than he would otherwise have to. He stated that the developers are also constrained by the Ottawa County Road Commission (OCRC) on where the entrances to the site can be. He stated the exit on the 44th Street side is a right-turn-only exit per the OCRC. He stated he understands that a change to the traffic environment like this may seem more uncomfortable than it will end up being. Before moving on to the discussion for greenbelt, he wanted to clarify where the greenbelt concern was on the property.

Chairman Samy stated he believed it was coming from how trees are shown on the site plan, but they are not shown to be evergreens and the concern may be coming from a place of when the leaves fall in autumn, the light and noise will filter off site more easily.

Chuck Hoyt stated they would be open to changing species of trees to allow for more evergreen trees to be planted.

Chairman Samy stated it appeared based on the site plan that the applicant would be using much of the greenery that is already there.

Chuck Hoyt confirmed yes, they are. He stated 70-75% of the site will be maintained exactly how it is today. He stated that they needed to go through the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) during the development process and EGLE's process included consideration for the wildlife in that location. He stated yes, anytime there is development some of the wildlife will be disturbed, but as they are leaving 70-75% of the site as is, most species will be undisturbed.

Chairman Samy asked if the applicant shared their traffic study with the OCRC.

Chuck Hoyt stated he believed they did. He stated they also had to present their full development plan to the OCRC.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked regarding the CS zoning, if there was a specific use they were looking to have there.

Chuck Hoyt replied no, there wasn't a specific tenant at this time, however he did not understand why the PC would rule out special land uses in CS zoning completely without looking at the context and site plan presented by a specific applicant in the future. For special land uses, the applicant must come back to the PC anyway and some of those uses may make sense in context. He stated for CS in general, the zoning is limited in what it can allow on its own and already includes all permitted uses in the Neighborhood Service and Office Service zonings. He stated that the desire to have CS zoning was due to the applicants being business-minded people who want to keep their options open.

John Geenen was also representing Rubicon and reiterated that it was mostly to keep their options open in order to market the property.

Geoff Brown stated that the applicant also owns the property across the street (Brick's gas station) and that they have done a good job with that development. He stated that the owners might not be keen on putting in businesses that would directly compete with Brick's, giving the example of a restaurant. He stated he did not have an issue with allowing for CS because the PUD will already be controlling uses by limiting parking spaces and any special land uses need to be approved by the PC.

Tom Healy argued that if a special land use comes to the PC and they meet all the requirements in the ordinance the PC must approve it; they cannot pick and choose in the future if they do not limit uses here at the PUD approval. He also stated while the applicant is currently operating Brick's gas station, they may not be in the future [and the two properties could be in competition someday].

Jeannine Bolhouse commented that the PC has to balance every party's interest; the township at large, the applicant, and the surrounding community.

Chairman Samy moved the meeting toward making a motion on the item.

Tom Healy stated regarding the concerns about traffic and drivers using the PUD to cut through, that during the heavy traffic times, traffic is largely traveling west at night and using the PUD to avoid the traffic light wouldn't make sense [and in the morning most people heading toward the city are already using 44th Street to travel east; fewer are going north on 8th Avenue to access 44th Street eastbound]. He stated based on the layout and on the staff report, he was willing to make a motion to approve the zoning switch to PUD, but limit the uses to OS and NS. He stated that given the size of the buildings and access considerations, OS and NS are most appropriate as opposed to CS. He agreed with the use restrictions listed in the staff report. He stated he believes the existing garage should be allowed in the space it's proposed, granted it is updated to match architecturally to the new buildings. He stated the developer should make efforts to establish a more permanent landscaping buffer with evergreens when deciduous trees have lost their leaves.

Jeannine Bolhouse agreed to support the motion.

Chairman Samy agreed with the motion. He stated NS zoning gives the developer plenty of options for tenants.

Geoff Brown also agreed with the motion as laid out by Tom Healy, stating he was especially supportive of the greenbelt buffer between the development and the homes to the south and east of it.

Moved by Tom Healy, seconded by Jeannine Bolhouse to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to recommend the Township Board to approve the following resolution:

**Georgetown Charter Township
Ottawa County, Michigan
(Ordinance No. 2025-08)**

At a regular meeting of the Georgetown Charter Township Board held at the Township offices on _____, 2025, beginning at 7:00 p.m. and after the second public hearing was held, Township Board Member _____ made a motion to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to adopt this Ordinance, as recommended by the Planning Commission, which motion was seconded by Township Board Member _____:

**AN AMENDMENT TO THE GEORGETOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP
ZONING ORDINANCE, AS AMENDED, AND MAP**

THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GEORGETOWN (the "Township") ORDAINS:

ARTICLE 1. The map of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

(PUD2501) (Ordinance No. 2025-08) Rubicon, LLC, to approve (rezoning from LDR to PUD) a preliminary planned unit development for 44th St. & 8th Ave. PUD, a mixed use PUD with residential, commercial and office uses, on 12.11 acres, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-25- 100-051 and #70-14-25-100-052, located at 6124 and 6110 8th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

As shown on the following documents:

1. Application dated 9-25-2025 and narrative dated rev 9-30-25;
2. Nederveld Site Plan Proj. No. 24201810 dated 9-30-25;
3. Elevations and floor plans provided for the townhomes, multi-family building, and commercial buildings.
4. Separate sheet to be provided to Zoning Administrator with additional greenbelt/existing garage information as stipulated.

Based on the determinations that:

1. **The proposal is consistent with the Master Plan.**
2. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for pedestrian walkways.**
3. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for architecture.**
4. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for traffic.**
5. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for open space.**
6. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for uses that are allowed.**
7. **The proposal meets the standards of approval.**

Based on the findings that:

1. The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided.
2. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:
 - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;
 - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;
 - c. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;
 - d. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;
 - e. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.
3. The deviations, regulatory modification from traditional district requirements, are approved through a finding by the Planning Commission that the deviations shall result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards. Deviations are as follows:
 - The site is 12.11 acres, and the application is for a mixed use PUD which is required to have a minimum of 20 acres per the qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 (A).
 - Keep the existing 546 SF garage located in the southeast corner of the lot, provided it will be updated to match the architectural theme of the PUD.

And with the following conditions:

1. **As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site shall be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works. Approval of the utility plans shall be obtained by the DPW and the \$15,000 escrow fee shall be provided to the township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
2. **A Storm Water Drain Permit (written approval by the Water Resource's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
3. **As per Sec. 22.11, a recorded PUD agreement shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
4. **Approved permits are required for all signs and all signs shall meet ordinance standards if one is applied for in the future.**

5. **Approval from the Ottawa County Road Commission, along with any necessary permits, shall be obtained and submitted prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
6. **The parcels 70-14-25-100-051 and 70-14-25-100-052 must be combined prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
7. **The residential and commercial buildings shall provide for coordinated and innovative visually appealing architectural styles, building forms, and building relationships.**
8. **No deviation is requested for the elimination of the garage requirement because garages have been provided. There is a minimum of 200 SF attached garages on the residential units.**
9. **The PUD shall hold the zoning of NS, Neighborhood Service Commercial and uses in the NS district are allowed excluding: assembly buildings, vehicle service stations, mortuaries and funeral homes, outdoor storage, and drive-through facilities.**
10. **The existing garage in the southeast corner of the property may remain where it is built, so long as it is updated to become architecturally similar to the new development.**
11. **A greenbelt buffer shall be planted and maintained with the idea that its purpose is to block light and sound pollution from neighboring lots year-round with evergreen trees along the south property line.**

ARTICLE 1. Severability. In the event that any one or more sections, provisions, phrases, or words of this Ordinance shall be found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect the validity or the enforceability of the remaining sections, provisions, phrases, or other words of this Ordinance.

ARTICLE 2. Except as specified above, the balance of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and map shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

ARTICLE 3. Effective Date. The provisions of this Ordinance shall take effect upon the expiration of seven (7) days from the date of publication of this Ordinance or a summary of its provisions in accordance with the law.

The vote in favor of adopting this Ordinance was as follows:

Yeas:

Nays:

Absent:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND ORDINANCE DECLARED ADOPTED.

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE ADOPTION

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by Georgetown Charter Township Board at the time, date, and place specified above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by Georgetown Charter Township Board at the time, date, and place specified above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

I hereby certify that notice of this ordinance was published in the Grand Rapids Press on November 4, 2025 and on _____ . *(Fill in the 2 dates of publication)*

I further certify that the votes for adoption of the foregoing resolution were as follows:

Yeas:
Nays:
Absent:
Abstained:

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Jim Wierenga, Georgetown Charter Township Supervisor

Dated: _____

By: _____
Kelly Kuiper, Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

Dated: _____

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#251119-04 – (PUD2501-01) Final Development Plan for the 44th St. and 8th Ave. PUD, Rubicon, LLC, a mixed use PUD with residential, commercial and office uses, on 12.11 acres, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-25- 100-051 and #70-14-25-100-052, located at 6124 and 6110 8th Ave. Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Moved by Jeannie Bolhouse, seconded by Geoff Brown, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve the final development plan for **(PUD2501-01) Rubicon, LLC for the 8th Ave. and 44th St. PUD**, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-25- 100-051 and #70-14-25-100-052, located at 6124 and 6110 8th Ave., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan, **contingent upon Township Board approval of the preliminary development plan and effective after the effective date of the rezoning.**

As shown on the following documents:

1. Application dated 9-25-2025 and narrative dated rev 9-30-25;
2. Nederveld Site Plan Proj. No. 24201810 dated 9-30-25;
3. Elevations and floor plans provided for the townhomes, multi-family building, and commercial buildings.

4. Separate sheet to be provided to Zoning Administrator with additional greenbelt/existing garage information as stipulated.

Based on the determinations that:

1. **The proposal is consistent with the Master Plan.**
2. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for pedestrian walkways.**
3. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for architecture.**
4. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for traffic.**
5. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for open space.**
6. **The proposal meets the ordinance requirement for uses that are allowed.**
7. **The proposal meets the standards of approval.**

Based on the findings that:

1. The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided.
2. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:
 - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;
 - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;
 - c. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;
 - d. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;
 - e. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.
3. The deviations, regulatory modification from traditional district requirements, are approved through a finding by the Planning Commission that the deviations shall result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards. Deviations are as follows:
 - The site is 12.11 acres, and the application is for a mixed use PUD which is required to have a minimum of 20 acres per the qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 (A).
 - Keep the existing 546 SF garage located in the southeast corner of the lot, provided it will be updated to match the architectural theme of the PUD.

And with the following conditions:

12. **As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site shall be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works. Approval of the utility plans shall be obtained by the DPW and the \$15,000 escrow fee shall be provided to the township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**
13. **A Storm Water Drain Permit (written approval by the Water Resource's office) shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.**

14. As per Sec. 22.11, a recorded PUD agreement shall be submitted to the Township prior to the submission of any building permit applications.
15. Approved permits are required for all signs and all signs shall meet ordinance standards if one is applied for in the future.
16. Approval from the Ottawa County Road Commission, along with any necessary permits, shall be obtained and submitted prior to the submission of any building permit applications.
17. The parcels 70-14-25-100-051 and 70-14-25-100-052 must be combined prior to the submission of any building permit applications.
18. The residential and commercial buildings shall provide for coordinated and innovative visually appealing architectural styles, building forms, and building relationships.
19. No deviation is requested for the elimination of the garage requirement because garages have been provided. There is a minimum of 200 SF attached garages on the residential units.
20. The PUD shall hold the zoning of NS, Neighborhood Service Commercial and uses in the NS district are allowed excluding: assembly buildings, vehicle service stations, mortuaries and funeral homes, outdoor storage, and drive-through facilities.
21. The existing garage in the southeast corner of the property may remain where it is built, so long as it is updated to become architecturally similar to the new development.
22. A greenbelt buffer shall be planted and maintained with the idea that its purpose is to block light and sound pollution from neighboring lots year-round with evergreen trees along the south property line.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#251119-05 – Requesting approval of the layout of the **Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15**, on the following parcels of land that are zoned PUD: P.P. # 70-14-05-400-050, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-052, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-053 and part of P.P. # 70-14-05-400-022 located north of Taylor St., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Michael McGraw, applicant and president of Eastbrook Homes, presented the application to the Township and made himself available to any questions from the Planning Commission.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#).

Tom Healy asked the ZA what the maximum lot coverage allowed in LDR is.

The ZA responded that it is 30%.

Tom Healy commented on the 7 ft side yard setbacks and how egress windows can encroach into the side yard. He is concerned about density issues with this development and is opposed to the 7 ft side yard setback.

Jeannine Bolhouse had no comments.

Chairman Sammy stated he disagreed on the smaller setback being an issue. He stated some people prefer the larger yards allowed in standard LDR zoning, but the smaller lots aren't an issue in his opinion.

Jessica Ulberg had no comments.

Geoff Brown had no comments.

Chairman Samy opened the public hearing.

Kip Haverdink, 3382 Fillmore St., stated he was concerned with the development changing the ravines in that area. He cited one of the goals of the Master Plan as preserving some of the natural ecosystem. He stated taking down thousands of trees and interfering with the ravines is counterintuitive to the Master Plan. He was also concerned about light pollution screening.

Susan McKinney, 3250 Fillmore St., stated she was concerned about increased traffic in that area as Fillmore Street has dangerous S-curves that drivers get into accidents on frequently. She also was concerned about light pollution.

John Dykstra, 3210 Fillmore St., wanted to reiterate the traffic issue on Fillmore Street. He stated he felt that residents' health and safety were being sacrificed for commercial progress. He also agreed that he would like to see some of the natural area preserved.

Pam Haverdink, 3382 Fillmore St., stated the ravines are always changing and getting wider naturally, and having construction in that area will expedite the issue. She was also concerned about having so much high-density housing in that location. She stated there is already Grand Valley State University contributing to traffic on Fillmore Street and in the next phase of development, Lowing Woods is hoping to add higher density areas like condos and townhomes.

Gary Haan, 2980 Fillmore St., stated a 30-foot high reservoir was built at about 3000 Fillmore Street and he is concerned that the anticipation for building such a large reservoir is that a lot of water will be draining into it. He stated he's concerned about the water runoff being caused by the development. He also agreed the traffic issue was a concern.

Amy Jurewicz, 3249 Fillmore St., stated a traffic study needs to be done before any further development occurs. She stated she has witnessed too many accidents in that area.

There were no further public comments.

Chairman Samy closed the public hearing.

Michael McGraw spoke to the concerns. Regarding the density of the development, he stated 20 years ago the development was originally approved for 852 units and they are actually reducing the density of that number. Regarding traffic he stated that the development doesn't have any direct control over what happens on Fillmore Street, and stated the development does not have a direct connection to Fillmore Street. He stated that Ottawa County Water Resources Commission (OCWRC) must approve everything the development does regarding stormwater. He spoke to the reservoir mentioned by Gary Haan, stating they built that reservoir per OCWRC's requirements which are determined by current stormwater data. He stated that, yes, trees get removed and portions of a ravine can get filled in, however none of that is done without OCWRC's approval. As far as the lighting issue, he stated that the developer adds coach lights on the garages, but any additional lighting is customer preference. Streetlights are installed by Consumers Energy and are done at regular intervals as on any public street.

Jeannine Bolhouse asked if EGLE was involved at all regarding the ravines.

Michael McGraw stated they would be if there was any wetland impact.

Tom Healy asked if Michael McGraw could give an estimate as to how much of the ravines have been filled in.

Michael McGraw responded no, he could not. He stated there are several areas that will not be developed, especially ravines, and OCWRC's preference is that ravines remain unaltered as much as possible.

Moved by Chairman Samy, seconded by Jeannine Bolhouse, to adopt the staff report as finding of facts and to recommend to the Township Board to grant tentative preliminary plat approval of Lowing Woods No. 15, based on the findings that Township Ordinances have been met, as shown on the following documents;

- a. Sheet C-101 dated 10.22.25,
- b. Sheet C-102 dated 10.22.25,
- c. Sheet C-103 dated 10.22.25,
- d. Sheet C-104 dated 10.22.25

and with the following conditions:

- a. All previous approvals for signs remain in effect. Signage must meet previous approvals and sign permits must be obtained for all new signs (other than signs approved by the Road Commission for use in the road right-of-way).
- b. The individual building envelopes appear to meet the minimum standards of the PUD setbacks with 25 foot front, 25 foot rear and 7 foot side setbacks. However, each building permit application will be reviewed at the time it is submitted for conformance for each individual site.
- c. Sidewalks will be constructed per applicable Township Ordinances.
- d. Attached garages with a minimum of 400 square feet shall be provided.
- e. The open space shall be maintained by the developer and/or an association.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Jeannine Bolhouse spoke to the residents who made comments, particularly those comments about the traffic. She stated that she too drives on Fillmore Street daily and understands that traffic can be difficult on that street, however traffic concerns do not preclude a developer from moving forward with their plans for a property. If they meet the standards of the ordinance they are allowed to move forward.

Chairman Samy agreed with Jeannine's sentiments and suggested that residents also speak their concerns to the Ottawa County Road Commission (OCRC). The township has little control over what changes can be made to roads and speed limits, but the OCRC does have that control along with the Michigan State Police.

Geoff Brown stated he believed a light at 36th Avenue and Fillmore Street would help things. The OCRC is the only entity that can make that happen.

Tom Healy stated that another option would be to contact your local congressman and express safety concerns to them. Regarding development in general, the Master Plan that is currently in progress is turning toward preserving more green space and farmland. He emphasized how critical it is that residents participate in the Master Plan process.

Chairman Samy reiterated that the Planning Commission doesn't have any more authority or sway with the Road Commission than residents do. He stated that strength in numbers would be a more effective plan to affect any change to the roadways.

#251119-06 – (PUD2101-04) Final Development Plan for the Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15 Nevada Creek Development Company and Ottawa Land Investments LLC, on the following parcels of land that are zoned PUD: P.P. # 70-14-05-400-050, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-052, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-053 and part of P.P. # 70-14-05-400-022 located north of Taylor St., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#).

Moved by Chairman Samy, seconded by Geoff Brown, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to approve the final development plan for (PUD2101-04) Final Development Plan for the Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15, Nevada Creek Development Company and Ottawa Land Investments LLC, on the following parcels of land that are zoned PUD: P.P. # 70-14-05-400-050, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-052, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-053 and part of P.P. # 70-14-05-400-022 located north of Taylor St., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

As shown on the following documents:

- a. Sheet C-101 dated 10.22.25,
- b. Sheet C-102 dated 10.22.25,
- c. Sheet C-103 dated 10.22.25,
- d. Sheet C-104 dated 10.22.25

On the basis that the following are met:

- a. **The proposed PUD complies with all qualifying conditions of Section 22.2.**
- b. **The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development.**
- c. **The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.**
- d. **The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.**
- e. **The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.**
- f. **The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10.**

And with the following conditions:

- a. **A recorded PUD agreement (according to Sec. 22.11) is submitted prior to the submission of building permit applications for this phase.**

- b. **As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site shall be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works. Approval of the utility plans shall be obtained by the DPW and the \$23,000 escrow fee shall be provided to the township prior to the submission of any building permit applications for this phase.**
- c. **Sign permits must be obtained for ALL signs. Any signs not expressly approved with the PUD MUST meet ordinance requirements. No sign shall be located within the road right-of-way (other than signs approved by the Road Commission for use in the road right-of-way). Any sign not approved with the PUD and not allowed by the ordinance must be removed immediately or changed to a conforming sign. All previous approvals for signs remain in effect.**
- d. **The location, type and size of all proposed landscaping and site amenities (art work, fences, gateway features, etc.) were approved with previous approvals and remain in effect.**
- e. **Approval from the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission is required.**
- f. **The individual building envelopes appear to meet the minimum standards of the PUD setbacks with 25-foot front, 25-foot rear, and 7-foot side setbacks. However, each building permit application will be reviewed at the time it is submitted for conformance for each individual site. All the lots in this phase meet the PUD's required minimum lot width of 65 feet.**
- g. **Open space shall be maintained by the developer and/or homeowner's association.**
- h. **All outstanding fees shall be paid prior to any building permits being issued.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#251119-07 – (PUD2502) (Ordinance No. 2025-09) Nevada Creek Development, Ottawa Land Investments LLC, 1188 East Paris Ave., is requesting to change from PUD to REVISED (PUD) Planned Unit Development zoning for the Lowing Woods PUD for single-family detached home sites, townhomes, ranch condominiums, villa units, terrace units, clubhouse, open spaces and other amenities on the following parcels of land: P.P.# 70-14-05-400-050, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-051, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-052, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-053 P.P. # 70-14-05-400-055, P.P. # 70-14-05-445-013, P.P. # 70-14-05-445-014, P.P. # 70-14-04-300-043, P.P. # 70-14-04-300-041 and P.P. # 70-14-05-400-022, located north of Taylor St., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

Michael McGraw, applicant and president of Eastbrook Homes, presented the application to the Township and made himself available to any questions from the Planning Commission.

The ZA presented the [Staff Report](#).

Tom Healy asked if there would be street parking anywhere along the private roads for the detached condos/terrace/courtyard homes [not the alleys, but the roads].

Michael McGraw stated he believed you could park on those roads, so long as driveways aren't blocked.

Tom Healy asked about parking along Deer Haven Drive and Hollace Drive.

Michael McGraw stated that those are public roads that are subject to restrictions [by the Ottawa County Sheriff's Office], but, yes, they could park there. He noted that on the private streets they have guest parking available.

Tom Healy asked the ZA if approval for the deviations could be limited only to the terrace and townhome units.

The ZA stated yes, they could only apply to certain home types in the proposal.

Tom Healy commented in the proposed plan, there is no direct access to 36th Avenue in the high-density area, whereas there was in the initial plan. He was concerned that not having access to 36th Avenue will cost valuable minutes for first responders trying to get to the densest part of the development.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated she liked the changes and was comfortable with the deviations. She stated she could see a concern regarding safety and she would rely on the fire department's expertise in that matter.

Chairman Sammy stated he visited the Eastbrook development in Byron Center and he really liked the variety of home options. He stated that street parking is an issue in Georgetown, not just in Lowing Woods and said that he would defer to the Fire Chief's recommendation about the streets and street parking as they relate to emergency service vehicles.

Jessica Ulberg stated she liked the housing options the proposed plan is suggesting. She liked the additional park, pool, and dog park.

Geoff Brown stated he also liked the new proposal as opposed to the old. He liked that there were less units and more green space.

Chairman Sammy opened the public hearing.

Matt Kortman, 3217 Fillmore St., stated he felt Eastbrook could be an ally with Georgetown residents in solving the traffic issues because Lowing Woods residents will also be facing the traffic congestion too. He stated he liked the housing options. He stated some solutions to consider would be lower speed limits and different ways to accommodate the extra population.

Stacey Deweerd, 3351 Fillmore St., stated the issue she and her children are facing is lack of bussing to and from school. She stated there are so many kids in Lowing Woods and the surrounding area, that her children have had to wait at school for busses to come back after dropping off an initial wave of children. She stated during the school year she will be notified multiple times there is no bussing available for her children and she is responsible for getting them to and from school. She stated that problem will not get better as more big developments go in. She stated if there is concern about fire engines getting through the development safely, the same issue would face school buses. She asked if any consideration has been given to the schools themselves to see if they can support the size of a development like Lowing Woods. She stated the Hudsonville Fifth/Sixth Building is already at capacity. She stated there is no sidewalk on 36th Avenue or any alternative transportation for those students to get to the schools there. She stated

even if parents are doing the transportation, the lines of cars in the drop-off/pick-up area at the schools are excessive.

Kip Haverdink, 3382 Fillmore St., wanted clarification on since they were reducing the number of units, were they also reducing the expected population of Lowing Woods.

Chairman Sammy stated yes, it will be less residences available; it's not becoming a multi-family housing development.

Kip Haverdink stated he felt one of the goals of the Master Plan was to preserve land for agricultural use, but the Lowing Woods development is an antithesis to that. He stated it was the Planning Commission's responsibility to plan for growth in a controlled way and the way 36th Avenue is structured, the street and the schools on it are not ready to handle the increased volume of people. He also commented that it was not just 36th Avenue, but Cottonwood Dr. too that could not handle the growing population.

There were no further public comments.

Chairman Sammy closed the public hearing.

Michael McGraw stated in response to Tom Healy's comment about the high-density part of the development not being connected to 36th Avenue that, yes, while the new layout does not directly connect to 36th Avenue, it actually provides more ways for emergency vehicles to get to an address because it has the grid-like layout. In response to the comments about traffic, Eastbrook can only do so much because the roads are under the Ottawa County Road Commission's jurisdiction. In response to the school bussing issue, again he stated that Eastbrook can only do so much to solve the bussing issue. He stated he was of the opinion that most school districts are in a declining enrollment situation right now since people will not move out of their homes due to mortgage interest rates. In response to the comment about preserving agricultural space, he stated the solution is to actually build more dense in a smaller area, not less dense in a larger area. He stated single family units on large lots take up more acreage than the proposed condos and courtyard style homes in the more dense pocket.

Chairman Sammy stated the Planning Commission has no control over the bussing issue either.

Stacey Deweerd stated that she had not been sure if the bussing issue was something that the Planning Commission could help with and understood they could not. She commented that while the decreasing student population might be true of some school districts, it is not the case with Hudsonville Public Schools.

Chairman Sammy stated he understood her concern because he is seeing growth over by 40th Avenue too on the north end of the township. He asked the ZA to tell the Township Superintendent the concerns about bussing because the Superintendent may be able to communicate that to the schools.

Jessica Ulberg asked if there was one single bus stop in Lowing Woods or multiple stops for Hudsonville Public Schools.

Stacey Deweerd clarified that she did not live in Lowing Woods, but that she knew there were multiple stops. She stated that the busses drop off the Lowing Woods kids first because there are so many of them and then they come back to the school to pick up the rest of the kids.

Jessica Ulberg stated she asked because she knew Jenison Public Schools only has one bus stop in the whole development.

Tom Healy asked if the issue was a lack of buses or bus drivers.

Stacey Deweerd responded that it is both.

Geoff Brown stated he spent eight years serving on the Jenison Public Schools school board. He stated that Jenison was having issues mostly with getting drivers. He stated the school districts have the money for more buses, but it's getting drivers that is the issue. He stated the issue needs to be brought before both Jenison and Hudsonville Public Schools school boards and work on solving the lack of bus drivers issue. He stated both school districts have the money to support more drivers and more buses.

Chairman Samy opened the meeting to discussion about making a motion.

Tom Healy stated that item 3(h)(1) [regarding detached garages] should apply specifically to the high-density area in the development.

Jessica Ulberg stated they could rephrase the item to say "rear-loaded townhomes."

The ZA stated he would work on phrasing for that item.

Tom Healy also asked about revising items F and I under the conditional items.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated regarding item F [requirement for fire sprinklers] that it should be rephrased to say the townhomes need to meet the 2015 International Fire Code (IFC).

Tom Healy suggested rephrasing to state that all units in the development have to meet the IFC.

The ZA agreed to rephrase that item.

Chairman Samy stated regarding item I [requirement for sidewalks unless waived], they could rephrase to say: although the Planning Commission has determined the proposed sidewalks as drawn on the plan are sufficient, they are required to meet the Township Ordinance requirements unless waived by the Township Board.

The ZA agreed to rephrase that item to add context.

Moved by Chairman Samy, seconded by Geoff Brown, to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to recommend to the Township Board to approve the following resolution:

**Georgetown Charter Township
Ottawa County, Michigan
(Ordinance No. 2025-09)**

At a regular meeting of the Georgetown Charter Township Board held at the Township offices on _____, 2025, beginning at 7:00 p.m. and after the second public hearing was held, Township Board Member _____ made a motion to adopt the staff report as finding of fact and to adopt this Ordinance, as recommended by the Planning Commission, which motion was seconded by Township Board Member _____:

**AN AMENDMENT TO THE GEORGETOWN CHARTER
TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE, AS AMENDED, AND MAP**

THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GEORGETOWN (the “Township”) ORDAINS:

ARTICLE 1. The map of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

(PUD2502) (Ordinance No. 2025-09) Nevada Creek Development, Ottawa Land Investments LLC, 1188 East Paris Ave., is approved to change from PUD to REVISED (PUD) Planned Unit Development zoning for the Lowing Woods PUD for single-family detached home sites, townhomes, ranch condominiums, villa units, terrace units, clubhouse, open spaces and other amenities on the following parcels of land: P.P.# 70-14-05-400-050, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-051, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-052, P.P. # 70-14-05-400-053 P.P. # 70-14-05-400-055, P.P. # 70-14-05-445-013, P.P. # 70-14-05-445-014, P.P. # 70-14-04-300-043, P.P. # 70-14-04-300-041 and P.P. # 70-14-05-400-022, located north of Taylor St., Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan.

As shown on the following documents:

1. Application and narrative dated 9-8-2025.
2. Nederveld Site Plan Proj. No. 25201449 dated rev 10-23-25;
3. The Architectural Pattern Book provided by Eastbrook Homes.
4. Separate sheet to be provided to Zoning Administrator with clarification on the front yard vs. rear yard determination.

On the basis that the following are met:

- a. **The proposed PUD complies with all qualifying conditions of Section 22.2.**
- b. **The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development.**
- c. **The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.**

- d. **The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning.**
- e. **The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22.**
- f. **The information as per Sec. 22.5 is provided.**
- g. **The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10.**
- h. **The deviations, regulatory modification from traditional district requirements, are approved through a finding by the Planning Commission that the deviation shall result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards, with deviations as follows:**
 1. **Detached garages.** To allow for detached garages for the 43 future “Terrace Units” and the 32 future “Rear-Loaded Townhome Units” located in the future northwest corner of the PUD. The applicant states that the proposed layout would provide a further variety of housing styles and price points, and would provide private, rear courtyard space. This is unique to the rear loaded detached garages as it allows for a 6’ privacy fence to be installed between the garage and the townhome creating a private backyard that is not typically enjoyed by traditional front-loaded garage townhome or condo owners. The proposed revision reduces the number of units in the PUD from 829 to 782; the PUD allows for up to 852 units. However, 75 of the proposed 782 units would have detached garages.
 2. **Setback revisions to detached single family condo units.**
 - a. Front yard setback to allow for 25’ to edge of pavement from the currently approved 26’.
 - b. Side yard setback to allow for 12’ of building separation from the currently approved 14’.
 3. **Setback revisions to Townhome units.**
 - a. Front yard setback to allow for 22’ to edge of private street from the currently approved 26’.
 - b. Side yard setback to allow for 10’ of building separation from the currently approved 14’ for the garages.
 4. **Setback revisions to Terrace units.**
 - a. Front yard setback to allow for 22’ to edge of private street from the currently approved 26’.
 - b. Side yard setback to allow for 10’ of building separation from the currently approved 14’ for the garages and units.
 5. **Locate Accessory Buildings and six-foot high fence in the “Front yard.”**
 - a. For all Terrace and Townhome Units with detached garages, the garages are located in what the Zoning Administrator has determined to be the front yard. Note that the applicant’s plan has switched front and rear yard due to the orientation of the homes. For zoning purposes, the front yard is the side adjacent to the street.

And with the following conditions:

- a. **A recorded PUD agreement (according to Sec. 22.11) is submitted prior to the submission of building permit applications.**
- b. **Sign permits must be obtained for ALL signs. Any signs not expressly approved with the PUD MUST meet ordinance requirements. No sign shall be located within the road right-of-way. Any sign not approved with the PUD and not allowed by the ordinance must be removed immediately or changed to a conforming sign. All previous approvals for signs remain in effect.**
- c. **The location, type and size of all proposed landscaping and site amenities (art work, fences, gateway features, etc.) were approved with the previous approvals and remain in effect.**
- d. **Approval from the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission is required.**
- e. **All other previous approvals not explicitly changed with this new approval remain in effect including the maintenance of open space by the developer and/or homeowner's association to include the 59' of open space that fronts along Bauer Road.**
- f. **All units within the development are required to meet the International Fire Code (IFC) as approved by the Township's Fire Inspector.**
- g. **The Terrance Units and Townhouse Units building height cannot exceed 30' to the eaves from the mean grade.**
- h. **A revised plan is submitted listing the front yard and rear setbacks as per the Zoning Ordinance definitions.**
- i. **Although sidewalks are not shown on the plan for these areas, sidewalks are required to be provided adjacent to all private alleys and private roads A, B and C, unless waived by the Township Board, even though the Planning Commission agreed the sidewalks as shown on the plan dated 10-23-2025 are sufficient.**
- j. **Streetlights adjacent to the private roads and alleys are the responsibility of the property owners and not the Township.**

ARTICLE 4. Severability. In the event that any one or more sections, provisions, phrases, or words of this Ordinance shall be found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect the validity or the enforceability of the remaining sections, provisions, phrases, or other words of this Ordinance.

ARTICLE 5. Except as specified above, the balance of the Georgetown Charter Township Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and map shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

ARTICLE 6. Effective Date. The provisions of this Ordinance shall take effect upon the expiration of seven (7) days from the date of publication of this Ordinance or a summary of its provisions in accordance with the law.

The vote in favor of adopting this Ordinance was as follows:

Yeas:
Nays:
Absent:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND ORDINANCE DECLARED ADOPTED.

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE ADOPTION

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by Georgetown Charter Township Board at the time, date, and place specified above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by Georgetown Charter Township Board at the time, date, and place specified above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

I hereby certify that notice of this ordinance was published in the Grand Rapids Press on November 4, 2025 and on _____ . *(Fill in the 2 dates of publication)*

I further certify that the votes for adoption of the foregoing resolution were as follows:

Yeas:
Nays:
Absent:
Abstained:

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Jim Wierenga, Georgetown Charter Township Supervisor

Dated: _____

By: _____
Kelly Kuiper, Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

Dated: _____

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#251119-08 – Communications, Letters and Reports

#251119-09 – Public Comments

Members of the public were present. No public comments were made.

#251119-10 – Other Business

#251119-11 – Adjournment

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Jessica Ulberg to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.