

## **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GEORGETOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP BOARD HELD DECEMBER 8, 2025.**

The meeting was called to order by Supervisor Jim Wierenga at 7:00 p.m.

Prayer for guidance by Gary Veldink

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Roll Call

Members present: Jim Wierenga, Kelly Kuiper, Gene DeWitt, Gary Veldink, Amy Grasman, Kevin Kelly, John Schwalm

Also present: Justin Stadt, Superintendent; Andy Rienstra, Assistant Superintendent

Absent: None

### **#251208-01 – Approval of Agenda as presented for December 08, 2025 and Board Member Recusal**

Moved by John Schwalm, seconded by Amy Grasman, to approve the agenda as presented.

Moved by Kelly Kuiper, seconded by Gary Veldink, to amend the agenda to remove item 10.3, Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15 from the consent agenda.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Kelly Kuiper stated that she had a conflict of interest with the item 10.3, Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15, and with item 8.2, (PUD2502) (Ordinance No. 2025-09) Nevada Creek Development, Ottawa Land Investments LLC.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Gene DeWitt, to approve the recusal of Kelly Kuiper from discussion and voting on the Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15 and (PUD2502) (Ordinance No. 2025-09) Nevada Creek Development, Ottawa Land Investments due to a conflict of interest related to employment.

Yeas: Jim Wierenga, Gene DeWitt, Gary Veldink, Amy Grasman, Kevin Kelly, John Schwalm

Nays: None

Absent: None

Abstained: Kelly Kuiper

**MOTION FOR RECUSAL CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **#251208-02 – Fire Department Monthly Update**

### **#251208-03 – Communications, Letters and Reports Received for Information to be Filed**

- [Utilities Committee Meeting Minutes of November 10, 2025](#)
- [Finance Committee Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2025](#)
- [Finance Committee Meeting Minutes of December 01, 2025](#)
- [Georgetown Fire Department Reports November 2025](#)
- Building and Zoning Department Reports
  - o [Building and Zoning Department Report](#)

- [Georgetown Engagement Report](#)
- ST2510
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
- ST2511
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
- ST2512
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
- ST2513
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
- ST2514
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
- ST2515
  - [Staff Report](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)

**#251208-04 – (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.**

Moved by Gary Veldink, second by Amy Grasman, to open the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Members of the public were present. Comments were made by the following:

- Pam Westen, 640 44<sup>th</sup> St.
- Laura Johnson, 668 44<sup>th</sup> St.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Kelly Kuiper, to close the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**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 December 8, 2025, beginning at 7:00 p.m. and after the first public hearing was held by the Planning Commission and the second public hearing was held by the Township Board, Township Board Member Gary Veldink 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 Amy Grasman:

**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 44<sup>th</sup> St. & 8<sup>th</sup> Ave. PUD, a mixed use PUD with residential, commercial and office uses, on 12.11 acres, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 7 0-14-25- 100-051 and #70-14-25-100-052, located at 6124 and 6110 8<sup>th</sup> 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.**

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.

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.

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.

There was discussion among the Board members about screening concerns raised by the members of the public during the public hearing. The consensus of the Township Board was that it was understood that the language in the motion states that a greenbelt must be maintained along the entire adjacent residential property on all sides.

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

Yeas: Jim Wierenga, Kelly Kuiper, Gene DeWitt, Gary Veldink, Amy Grasman, Kevin Kelly, John Schwalm

Nays: None

Absent: None

Abstained: None

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 December 16, 2025.

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

Yeas: Jim Wierenga, Kelly Kuiper, Gene DeWitt, Gary Veldink, Amy Grasman, Kevin Kelly, John Schwalm

Nays: None

Absent: None

Abstained: None

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Wierenga, Georgetown Charter Township Supervisor

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly Kuiper, Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

## Attachments:

- [PC Minutes 251119](#)
- [PUD2501 Resolution](#)
- [\(PUD2501\) 44<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> Ave Preliminary PUD Final](#)
- [Site Plan PUD2501](#)
- [Application – Agenda](#)
- [Fire Department Layout Approval](#)
- [Cover Letter](#)
- [Narrative](#)
- [Photometric Plans](#)
- [Traffic Impact Study](#)
- [Commercial Architectural Drawings](#)
- [Multi-Family Architectural Drawings](#)
- [Townhouse Architectural Drawings](#)
- [Property Notice](#)

**#251208-05 – (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.**

As per the motion at the beginning of the meeting, Kelly Kuiper recused herself due to a conflict of interest related to employment. She stepped down from the Board members' desk and sat in the audience.

Jim Weirenga stated the following. He appreciated all the background information that was provided regarding both PUDs. This PUD was initially approved around 2004 and has been revised throughout the years. This application is requesting to go from an already approved PUD to a modified PUD. There already has been an approval for this preliminary PUD and there will be something developed there. It is just a question of what and whether or not the Board members determine that this revised PUD meets ordinance requirements.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Amy Grasman, to open the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Members of the public were present. Public comments were made by the following:

- Pete Plowman 6877 Creek Ridge Ct

Moved by Gene DeWitt, seconded by Amy Grasman, to close the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Jim Wierenga stated the following. Just like with the previous PUD, there are various standards that were brought to their attention. The Planning Commission has reviewed this plan and recommended approval of the PUD ordinance. He asked the applicant to give an overview.

Michael McGraw, Eastbrook Homes, Nevada Creek Development Company, 1188 East Paris Ave. SE, Ste. 100, represented the applicant and presented the request, including detailing the highlight of the plan and answering questions. He noted that there were a variety of different home types with around 1,500 to 2,000 square feet, some ranches and some two-stories, but no basements.

Gene DeWitt asked if any kind of shelter would be provided for a tornado shelter, or other such necessary things, for people to go to if needed.

The applicant stated no and they have been building slab on grade as a substantial part of their offering for about 10 years.

Amy Grasman asked where the six-foot privacy fences would be located and the applicant pointed it out, explaining the situation.

Gene DeWitt asked if there could be a connection to 36<sup>th</sup> Ave. for emergency vehicles and buses.

The applicant said there were more connections than other developments had and there were many different ways to get out and many internal connections.

Gene DeWitt stated that it would be easier if there was a connection to 36<sup>th</sup> Ave. even for construction.

The applicant stated that they already had connections here and it was planned out very well.

Jim Wierenga asked if he was talking about sequencing.

The applicant explained the two existing accesses.

Jim Wierenga asked how wide the other streets in the development were and the applicant stated that the public streets were the standard 66-foot rights-of-way with 30 feet of pavement, the same as all standard streets. Jim Weirenga asked what the width of the private street pavement was. He also stated he had his biggest concerns were with the width of the streets and alleys. He asked how many units there were and was told 121.

It was noted that the pavement of the alleys was only 20 feet wide and the perimeter private road was 26 feet wide.

Michael McGraw stated that 26 feet is consistent with the other private roads, the 20-foot roads were not at all uncommon, and there were developments with narrower roads. He said that the Fire Department reviewed and approved the roads.

Jim Weirenga stated that even if the minimum standards of the Fire Code were met, that does not necessarily mean the health, safety and welfare standard is met from the standpoint of the Board to protect the residents. He understood that it was passed by the Fire Department but he was still concerned with the width of the alleyways and asked if that was previously brought up.

The applicant said no concerns were raised by the Planning Commission in respect to the width of the alleyways.

Jim Weirenga asked if concerns were raised about traffic safety and pedestrian safety in general.

The applicant stated that no concerns were raised about safety with the alleys or the interior design, but only primarily concerns about Fillmore were raised at the Planning Commission, mostly concerning traffic and pollution, not related to the interior design.

Amy Grasman asked what the Fillmore people complained about and was told they were concerned with traffic and pollution.

Jim Weirenga stated that the single-family homes around the outside were more semi-traditional even though they were close together and they had access to the 26-foot private road, but his concerns were more about the alleyways because that is the street that they face. He asked if that was the front of the site.

The applicant stated the following. If you were asking him, no; however, the way the ordinance is written the front is on the road. He has never heard that before. But they do have the road in front and the alleys provided the only vehicular access to these sites that were not on the perimeter road.

Jim Weirenga asked where additional people park, other than in the garage or the two spaces on the driveway, when it is the holidays or a graduation party. He noted where additional parking was provided. However, he said he knows what they will do realistically, even though additional parking spaces are provided.

Michael McGraw stated that each site had two parking spaces in the garage and an additional two spaces on the driveway, which is similar to traditional single-family houses, and additionally extra parking spaces are provided at the ends of the alley.

Amy Grasman said that she agrees with Jim Weirgenga's concerns.

Jim Weirenga noted that if he was carrying food to one of these units in January, he would not carry it from one of additionally provided parking spaces that were a distance away, but rather would find a way to "jimmy" his car in one of the spaces in the driveway, or else he would find a way to park on the side of the alley. He said that there is little distance to the narrow alleyway. He also noted that if a child was playing, it would be dangerous if a ball went out in the alley.

Michael McGraw said that couldn't happen and they should go downtown to see how there are similar layouts. He can't say no one is going to do that, but they provided additional parking spaces.

Jim Weirenga asked if he had directed them to visit Macatawa Legends.

Michael McGraw stated that portions of Macatawa Legends were similar in some respects but not as good as Cooks Crossings.

Jim Weirenga stated the following. Macatawa Legends had more roadways and wider pavements. He lived in Grandville where there were alleys with small garages. But even those units had frontage on a public road where you could park, along with the alleys, which gave more space. There were more options. He doesn't see the proposed traffic and parking setup as safe.

Michael McGraw stated the following. Every time they had an opportunity to create a community with options to face greenspace, Macatawa Legends wasn't a great example, they designed the layout of the units to face greenspace. They are similar to those on the ends. The ones on the green space are more desirable and what customers wanted. They created those types of units every time they had the opportunity because those are most desirable. This meets all the requirements of the Fire Department, who is the most important agency to look at it. When roadways are developed, they must talk to the Road Commission. When drains are constructed, they must talk to the Water Resources Commission as to how to design it. The Fire Department is the one who has the say in the roadways and alleys.

Jim Weirenga stated that when talking about a potential fire truck or other larger emergency vehicles driving in the alleys, it is different than the general day-to-day safety of vehicles driving on the alleys. It is part of the Board's responsibility to make sure all of it is safe.

Gary Veldink said that these are not Road Commission roads because they are private roads.

Michael McGraw said that he understands that but was just making a point that the Fire Department has purview over this aspect, including radius and width. They did look at the width, eyebrows, geometry and specifically the design. That is how and why they designed it and he did not expect a lengthy discussion because they thought they had discussed this with the agency that has the purview over that. It was approved by the agency he thought had to approve it.

Gary Veldink stated the following. His concern is that it looks great right now, but it is so dense, what about when there is snow. He sees a huge issue when trying to remove snow from this area. Snowbanks do create issues for fire trucks and other vehicles because if the corners are not cleared out there are problems.

Jim Weirenga stated that he wouldn't limit that comment to fire trucks because it is a general issue for the health, safety and welfare of residents for additional vehicles.

Gary Veldink stated that it is pretty dense when they had to start taking snow away from those areas. Those areas are not going to be plowed by the Road Commission, but rather private companies.

Michael McGraw said that he didn't want to argue with the Board, but rather he just came to present what they designed. He doesn't have concerns about this. He visited a site today and there was not a problem. They hire professionals to plow snow.

It was clarified that there were at a minimum two stall garages and some units had three stall garages.

Jim Weirenga stated the following. They are not arguing but rather giving the applicant an opportunity to address some of the Board's concerns. Regarding the applicant's point about the roads being the purview of the Fire Department, the Board has to evaluate this entire plan based on

the standards in the ordinances. He understands that they are reviewing the Planning Commission's recommendation as well and they do a great job. He appreciates what they bring to the Board. However, the Board must independently as a body review these applications for their determination of compliance with ordinance standards.

Michael McGraw stated the following. The conversation at the Planning Commission related to the alley width was basically that there were some things that still had to be resolved about how fire and safety are handled for the center six-unit buildings in each run. Outside of that they placed faith that the Fire Department had done their review and approved it from that standpoint.

Jim Weirenga asked the applicant to address sidewalks and the fact that there might be some requests for waivers from the sidewalk ordinance. He asked if the plan depicts all the sidewalks that will be in the plan or are some required sidewalks just not shown on the plan in anticipation of them being waived.

Michael McGraw stated the following. This is a depiction of how they would like to build the project, not showing some of the required sidewalks that they would be requesting waivers for, and this was how it was presented to the Planning Commission. (*He pointed out the areas where sidewalks are required but not shown.*) Sidewalks were shown on the inside throughout the project and waivers would be needed because they would be required on both sides of the road on the outside ring. The sidewalks were put on the inside with the thought being that pedestrians would not cross the driveways like they would if they were installed as required. They have never provided sidewalks for a rear loaded development but technically they would be needed in the alley. It makes more sense to place sidewalks on the greenspace and not on the alley. They consider the front to be on the greenspace and the side adjacent to the street as the rear, even though that does not meet the definitions in the ordinance for front and rear yards. They have never put sidewalks in any alleys in any projects ever because it made more sense this way to not have them in the alley.

Gary Veldink asked if the entire project would be condominiums.

Michael McGraw said yes, there will be multiple condominium associations and snowplowing, fertilization, trash, mowing and weed removal will be taken care of by the association other than what he pointed out.

Gary Veldink asked about mail and was told there would be a central area, dictated by the postal carrier, with no individual mailboxes.

Jim Weirenga asked about garbage and trash pickup and was told it would be individually picked up at each site.

John Schwalm stated the following. He is on the Utilities Committee and is concerned about the following: lack of required sidewalks shown, the 20-foot width of the alleys which are considered the private streets providing the only access to some of the units, snow removal, garbage trucks using the narrow 20-foot alleys, visitors having to drive to one of the other parking areas and walk to the home. If a person goes to visit a homeowner and there is no spot available in the driveway, they will just park on the alley. Then if a snowplow truck or a garbage truck tries to get down the ally, it won't work. Plus, he is concerned with snowplowing. He said that this is unique but is worried about traffic and about safety.

Michael McGraw stated the following. This layout may be unique to here, but it is not unique to many places. It is not uncommon in other residential communities to have alley-loaded homes that front on park space. He wished they would have spent more looking at the photography because he thinks the Board members are missing the benefit of something that is not the same as everything else around here. With some of the dimensional challenges aside, he asked if it would make a difference if the alley was 26 feet. They still would not want people to park there, and people would be directed to not park there. He has never once driven through a community like this where people have parked in the alley and that is the reason that there are other transient spaces available for visitors. The longest distance to walk is about 200 feet.

Gene DeWitt asked if signage would be installed about no parking in the alley.

Michael McGraw said that the Zoning Administrator would know more about the requirements for signage than he knows, but they would fulfill the requirements.

John Schwalm said that children have to cross the street to get to the sidewalk.

Michael McGraw said the following. Yes, but there are multiple condominium projects within the Township that have no sidewalks, two of which exist inside Lowing Woods. These were built and approved by the Township with no sidewalks. So, it is not without precedent. Yes, they have to cross a street once, but they do not have to cross 46 driveways as they are going around the perimeter when people are backing out. This is just a different way, and they are not totally opposed to adding more sidewalks but just showed how they want to develop this land.

John Schwalm asked if the Township Board approved a variance for those developments to not have sidewalks or was that before there was a requirement.

Michael McGraw said that he didn't know and he has been a part of the company since 2005 but was out of state for ten years. He didn't know, but if the previous applications were contentious, he would have been here and not the engineer. There are two streets that do not have sidewalks.

Gene DeWitt said the following. He was in favor of this plan. He went to the Planning Commission meeting and they will be able to meet the deviations. He understands the concerns, but he likes the sidewalks on the interior and through rather than the outside. If a child has to cross a street that is only 24 feet. It is not like crossing a four-lane street like Baldwin. He would not be interested in this type of development because he doesn't want to go through a snowstorm to get to the house. But if the interest is there, we could try this concept to see how it goes. It is the perfect setting for this. It is not the way the entire Township should go, but we can try a different concept for a housing development. Plus, a concern of the Planning Commission was traffic, and this cuts it down by 47 units. That equals probably 100 plus cars that will not be there. It will be less vehicles using the Fillmore and 36<sup>th</sup> Ave. intersection and that was a concern of a lot of people. He is in favor of this, especially with the Planning Commission saying yes.

Jim Weirenga asked if he had attended the Planning Commission meeting or meetings and asked about his comments about traffic and safety concerns.

Gene DeWitt said the following. Yes, he had attended the meeting, and a concern was noted for school buses, but kids would come to the end of the road anyway. It would not be any harder to do that than go through Georgetown Forest. A concern was raised about fire, but going through the

Fire Inspector, it was met. Height was an issue, but they also guaranteed that the structures would not be over 30 feet high. If they went over 30 feet in height, they would definitely have to widen the road a little. They are working on being able to access a hundred-foot line.

Jim Weirenga asked if the Planning Commission discussed some of the concerns that Board members were raising.

Gene DeWitt said that sidewalk was talked about, but they thought that with it being provided in the interior, the other could be waived. He didn't really hear much about snow and garbage and that type of thing. If you read the minutes, they accurately describe what was said at the meeting. He did drive out to other sites at Byron Center, but he thinks this is a better layout because the other was on a hill and was more confusing.

Amy Grasman asked about the people on Fillmore and what their concerns were.

Gene DeWill said that their concerns were about water retention, but the Water Resources Commission required more storm water detention to address this. There was also a concern about streetlights, but now without leaves on the trees they could see more of the lights. Another thing was all the traffic on Fillmore. Grand Valley is getting so big they contribute to the traffic.

Jim Weirgega stated the following. The currently approved PUD is for more units than this proposal. Many times the Zoning Administrator sets up pre-application meetings for PUDs. However, this was already an approved PUD. So it was not unusual that the pre-application meeting was not held. But sometimes that flushes out some concerns. There is a dual process of approval where this application is reviewed by the Planning Commission and then comes before the Board. So sometimes it is unknown what one body thinks until it is reviewed by the other. Looking at this independently and looking at the requirements in the ordinance, Sec. 22.10 in particular, he is going to be particular and precise and not just generally come up with opinions. Looking at sections A and C of Sec. 22.10, they are standards of PUD approval, the ordinance reads that the proposed PUD must comply with all the qualifying conditions of Sec. 22.2 and also that 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. So A and C are relevant here. Looking at the qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2, the ones that are relevant would include pedestrian requirement in letter E and traffic requirement in letter G. Moreso traffic, but also pedestrian requirements. Letters E and G of Sec. 22.2 fall under A in Sec. 22.10, standards for approval. Letter C in Sec. 22.10 which includes the health, safety, and welfare of the community. The answers provided tonight do not provide satisfaction that these standards are met. He heard that this layout works great in other places, but it works great until it doesn't, when an issue occurs. The risk is heightened, especially with the width of the alleys. It is not sufficient for the uses are intended, for parking or for pedestrians or for traffic at cross purposes, for example a garbage truck or other uses that are foreseeable. Practically speaking, people are not going to necessarily park and walk. It is a creative idea. Eastbrook does a great work. We have seen their work in this community and other communities. We are dealing with an experienced, capable, creative successful builder. The Township has a very good Planning Commission and they do a good job. They are careful. This is a judgement call and the Board is charged with exercising their judgement on behalf of the residents. The configuration of the alleyway are especially injurious to the public health, safety and welfare of the community. It can be done better, safer. He isn't going to prescribe how to do it better. What he sees with what is being proposed, he does not determine that it is in the best interest of the residents, including those who would be buying in there with eye wide open, and those that

would come after them and the guest that would come to visit them, and the third parties that would come to fix things and pick things up like garbage and the like. The pedestrian and traffic qualifying conditions are not met under Sec. 22.2 and letter A under Sec. 22.10 is met. Letter C under Sec. 22.10 is not met either.

Michael McGraw stated the following. They had the Zoning Administrator and the Fire Department review these things. This was how this was designed based on that. He thought they were the ones that had the say on the road design. They are willing to listen and to have some flexibility. This is how they got to this point. No one tonight or the other night showed up specifically for this project. Public comments were not related to this, but rather their comments were related to the people on Fillmore being able to see the houses behind them in Lowing Woods No. 15. But this is not surprising because the leaves are off the trees. Their comments were more general in nature and not specific to this. This is a 47-house reduction and that is not going to make it worse.

Gary Veldink stated that this is too close, too narrow roads, and there is no room for movement. He hasn't seen such a dense development.

Kevin Kelly said the following. He agrees. The first time he looked at this, he thought you are right on top of your neighbors. He lived in his house for 20 years and has a shared driveway and he wouldn't do it again. It is so dense that if one caught fire, it would go from unit to unit.

John Schwalm stated that he appreciates the work of this developer; however, the alley is only 20 feet wide and there is a concern, especially for garbage trucks, snow removal, and lack of sidewalks. There are very narrow alleys.

Jim Weirenga said that he had an alley too, but they had a public street out front.

Gene DeWitt stated the following. The proposal before this looks like the road might connect to 36<sup>th</sup> Ave. and that is a lot in a small space as well. An additional 47 units was crammed into that space. The Planning Commission approved this.

Jim Weirenga stated that the current PUD was approved by the Board in office at that time and this Board may have looked at it differently. The concerns raised are materially different and with the current way it is configured it presents a unique threat. Or using health, safety and welfare, he could use the work injurious. Reasonable minds are different; however, the Board is charged with considering our own residents.

Moved by Gene DeWitt to approve the proposal as presented, as recommended by the Planning Commission and with the deviations as proposed. The motion failed for lack of support.

**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 December 8, 2025, beginning at 7:00 p.m. and after the second public hearing was held (the first held at the Planning Commission), Township Board Member Jim Weirenga made a motion to **deny**

the application for this Ordinance which is to revise the existing PUD, which motion was seconded by Township Board Member Gary Veldink, based on the following findings:

Pursuant to Section 22.10, subsections A and C, as well as A pointing to Sec. 22.2 subsections E for pedestrian and G for traffic for the reasons as previously stated because the finding is that those standards are not met.

**Sec. 22.10 STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL (both preliminary and final).**

A PUD shall be approved only if it complies with each of the following standards:

(A)The proposed PUD complies with all qualifying conditions of Section 22.2.

(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.

**Sec. 22.2 QUALIFYING CONDITIONS.**

Any development that fails to meet the following qualifying conditions, at a minimum, shall not be considered for the PUD District:

**(E)Pedestrian:** The PUD must provide for integrated, safe and abundant pedestrian access and movement within the PUD and to adjacent properties. (In addition, the township has a stand alone ordinance covering certain sidewalk requirements)

**(G)Traffic:** The PUD must provide for safe and efficient vehicular movements within, into and off of the PUD site. In addition, the PUD should integrate traffic calming techniques, along with suitable parking lot landscape islands and other similar techniques to improve parking lot aesthetics, storm water management, traffic flow and vehicular/pedestrian safety.

Jim Weirenga stated that this is not to say this can't be revised or that they have to remain with what was previously approved, but rather states that what is before them does not meet the standards in the ordinance.

The vote in favor of denying this application for the Ordinance and PUD revisions was as follows:

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink and Kevin Kelly

Nays: Gene DeWitt

Absent: None

Abstained: Kelly Kuiper

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND ORDINANCE DECLARED DENIED.**

**CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE DENIAL**

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 **denied** 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.

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

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink and Kevin Kelly  
 Nays: Gene DeWitt  
 Absent: None  
 Abstained: Kelly Kuiper

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jim Wierenga, Georgetown Charter Township Supervisor

By: \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Kelly Kuiper, Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

#### Attachments

- [PC Minutes 251119](#)
- [PUD2502 Resolution](#)
- [\(PUD2502\) Lowing Woods Revised Preliminary PUD](#)
- [Site Plan](#)
- [Application – Agenda](#)
- [Fee Paid – Agenda](#)
- [Fire Department Lowing Woods Response 1](#)
- [Fire Department Lowing Woods Response 2](#)
- [Response to Fire Department Memo](#)
- [Architectural Pattern Book](#)
- [Nevada Creek Letter](#)
- [Narrative](#)
- [Deviation Table](#)
- [Survey of PUD2502](#)
- [Property Notice](#)

#### **#251208-06 – Public Comments for Items Remaining on the Agenda.**

Members of the public were present; comments were made by the following:

- Michael McGraw, Eastbrook Homes

**#251208-07 – Supervisor Comments regarding Public Comments**

Jim Weirenga stated the following. They were not prepared to answer questions about specifically where this should go from here. He brought up some of his concerns to the Zoning Administrator and they get more specific when a decision needs to be made, like they just did. He used the work “opinion” but subsequently changed it to “judgment” because they are exercising their sound discretion and judgement in their positions as Board members charged with the duty and empowered by the ordinance to make the judgements that they did. He doesn’t want it to be seen as merely one’s opinion. He asked each Board member, for the purposes of this meeting, did each of the Township Board members vote on his very specific motion that sited very specific provisions of the ordinance or did they vote based on their personal preference, whether it be about density or otherwise. He asked if they voted on personal preferences.

Kevin Kelly said no.

Gary Veldink said no.

Amy Grasman said no.

John Schwalm said no.

**#251208-08 – Public Comments for Items Remaining on the Agenda Resumed.**

Members of the public were present; comments were made by the following:

- Pam Westen, 640 44<sup>th</sup> St
- Jerry Johnson, 668 44<sup>th</sup> St.
- Pete Plowman, 6877 Creekridge Ct.
- Michael Bosch, 3245 Golden Oak Ct.

**#251208-09 – Consent Agenda**

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Amy Grasman, to grant the following:

- [Approval of the Bills for November 24, 2025](#)
- [Approval of the Bills for December 08, 2025](#)
- [Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting on November 10, 2025](#)

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**#251208-10 – Preliminary Plat of Lowing Woods No. 15**

As per the motion at the beginning of the meeting, Kelly Kuiper recused herself due to a conflict of interest related to employment.

Moved by Jim Weirenga, seconded by Amy Grasman, to grant 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, as recommended by the Planning Commission, based on the findings that Township Ordinances have been met, as shown on the following documents:

- Sheet C-101 dated 10.22.25,
- Sheet C-102 dated 10.22.25,
- Sheet C-103 dated 10.22.25,
- Sheet C-104 dated 10.22.25
- And with the following conditions:
  - 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).
  - 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.
  - Sidewalks will be constructed per applicable Township Ordinances.
  - Attached garages with a minimum of 400 square feet shall be provided.
  - The open space shall be maintained by the developer and/or an association.
- Attachments:
  - [PC Minutes 251119](#)
  - [Staff Report Lowing Woods No. 15](#)
  - [Site Plan](#)
  - [Application](#)
  - [Fee Paid](#)
  - [Nevada Creek Letter](#)
  - [Narrative](#)
  - [Sidewalk compliance Letter](#)
  - [Street Light Petition](#)
  - [Survey of LW 15](#)
  - [LW 15 Association Documents](#)
  - [Property Notice](#)

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt and Kevin Kelly  
 Nays: None  
 Absent: None  
 Abstained: Kelly Kuiper

MOTION CARRIED.

**#251208-11 – Love Your Neighbor Resolution**

Two members from Love Your Neighbor gave a presentation about what they are and what they do.

**GEORGETOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
 OTTAWA COUNTY, Michigan  
 (Resolution No. 251208-11)**

At a regular meeting of the Township Board for the Charter Township of Georgetown (the “Township”) held at the Georgetown Township office on Monday, December 08, 2025 at 7:00 p.m., this Resolution was offered for adoption by Township Board Member Amy Grasman and was seconded by Township Board Member Gary Veldink, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR

WHEREAS, Georgetown Township recognizes the importance of fostering community rooted in compassion, faith, and dignity; and

WHEREAS, Love Your Neighbor is a 501c3 organization that serves the greater Georgetown Township area with a mission of “Following Jesus Christ, who transforms lives, we equip the community to love, serve and connect with dignity”; and

WHEREAS, Georgetown Township promotes local solutions where possible and that the mission of Love Your Neighbor aligns with the Township’s commitment to civic responsibility, neighborly care, the well-being of all residents, and community building; and

ACKNOWLEDGING, the positive impact that such efforts have on public health, safety, and community cohesion, especially in challenging times; and

ACKNOWLEDGING, the successful role Love Your Neighbor played in mobilizing the community and churches to support families affected by the Federal Government shut down;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Georgetown Township Board hereby expresses its support for Love Your Neighbor and encourages residents, businesses, churches, schools, and civic organizations to participate actively in its mission; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Township will explore opportunities to collaborate with Love Your Neighbor to provide greater value to all residents of Georgetown and support those who are most vulnerable.

The vote to adopt this Resolution was as follows:

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt, Kevin Kelly, and Kelly Kuiper

Nays: None

Absent: None

Abstained: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND RESOLUTION IS HEREBY DECLARED ADOPTED.

Adopted this 8<sup>th</sup> day of December 2025, by the Georgetown Township Board.

CERTIFICATION

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

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Kelly Kuiper, Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

Attachments:

- [Resolution](#)

### **#251208-12 – Veterans Banners**

Moved by John Schwalm, seconded by Gene DeWitt, to approve an application process to order and put up military banners with Praise Sign Company for \$8,446.09, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

Amy Grasman asked if they could partner with Meijer. There was discussion about how to proceed and the decision was made to proceed with the project for the following year.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Attachments:

- [Quote](#)
- [Example](#)
- [Vet Banners Forms](#)

### **#251208-13 – Water and Sewer Connection Rate Resolution**

Gary Veldink explained that they were raising connection fees for residential and commercial connection rates because the Township needs to take in more money to repair more pipes.

Jim Weirenga stated that the Township was on the lower end of fees and this moves the Township more into the middle of the mix, and development on the Blendon side of 48<sup>th</sup> Ave. will be contributing.

Gary Veldink said that there are not as many homes being built.

Jim Weirenga clarified that this has nothing to do with water rates for the residents.

**GEORGETOWN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
OTTAWA COUNTY, Michigan  
(Resolution No. 251208-10)**

At a regular meeting of the Township Board for the Charter Township of Georgetown held at the Township offices on December 08, 2025 at 7:00 p.m., this Resolution was offered for adoption by Township Board Member Amy Grasman and was seconded by Township Board Member Gary Veldink, as recommended by the Utilities Committee.

**A RESOLUTION TO UPDATE THE CHARGES FOR CONNECTION TO THE  
TOWNSHIP'S PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS.**

**RECITALS**

WHEREAS, the Code of Ordinances for Georgetown Charter Township (the “Township”) permits the Township Board, by resolution, to set the rates for property owners to connect to the Township’s public water and sewer systems;

WHEREAS, the Township Board must occasionally review and update the charges assessed to property owners for making such connections, to reflect the increases in the cost of parts, equipment, and labor to complete such connections;

WHEREAS, the Township Board now wishes to update the charges assessed for connections to the Township’s public water and sewer systems.

**RESOLUTION**

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Recitals above are hereby incorporated into this Resolution as if restated verbatim.
2. The Township Board hereby adopts the new schedule for water and sewer connection charges, as set forth in the attached “Exhibit A.”
3. This Resolution is effective immediately, and it shall supersede any prior inconsistent resolutions of the Township Board.

Yeas:           John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt,  
                     Kevin Kelly, and Kelly Kuiper

Nays:           None

Absent:         None

Abstained:     None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY AND RESOLUTION IS HEREBY DECLARED ADOPTED.

**CERTIFICATION**

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

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Kelly Kuiper  
 Georgetown Charter Township Clerk

Attachments:

- [Resolution](#)
- [Water and Sewer Connection Rates](#)
- [2026 Commercial Sewer Connection Charges – Until July](#)
- [July 1, 2026 Commercial Sewer Connection Charges](#)

**#251208-14 – Resolution to Authorize Issuance of Refunding Bonds**

Justin Stadt gave a brief summary and stated the following. Ottawa County Public Utilities issued bonds on behalf of the Township. Interest rates have gone down since the bonds were issued and the Township was able to save money for water utility rate user. This is in the best interest of the Township.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GEORGETOWN  
RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE  
OF REFUNDING BONDS

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Act No. 342, Public Acts of Michigan, 1939, as amended, the Charter Township of Georgetown (the “Township”), the Charter Township of Holland, the Charter Township of Jamestown, the Township of Olive, the Township of Park, the Charter Township of Zeeland, and the City of Hudsonville (hereinafter referred to, with the Township, collectively as the “Municipalities”) and the County of Ottawa (the “County”), acting by and through its Board of County Road Commissioners as county agency, have entered into the 2007 Water Supply System Improvements Contract, dated as of January 1, 2007 (the “Contract”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Contract the County issued its Ottawa County Water Supply System Bonds, Series 2007 dated May 24, 2007 in the original principal amount of \$38,145,000 (the “2007 Bonds”); and

WHEREAS, the 2007 Bonds were issued in anticipation of payments to be made to the County by the Municipalities, pursuant to the Contract; and

WHEREAS, the County issued its Water Supply System Refunding Bonds, Series 2015 (the “2015 Refunding Bonds”) dated April 8, 2015 in the original principal amount of \$30,845,000, to refund the 2007 Bonds outstanding as of the date of issue of the 2015 Refunding Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Refunding Bonds are payable from payments made and to be made to the County by the Municipalities, pursuant to the Contract; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Bonds remain outstanding in the aggregate principal amount of \$18,480,000, mature in various principal amounts in the years 2026 through 2032 and bear interest at rates per annum which vary from 3.00% to 5.00%; and

WHEREAS, the Municipalities have been advised that conditions in the bond market have now improved from the conditions which prevailed at the time the 2015 Bonds were sold and that part of the outstanding 2015 Bonds could be refunded at a considerable savings to the Municipalities; and

WHEREAS, it is the determination and judgment of this Township Board that all or part of the outstanding 2015 Bonds should be refunded to secure for the Municipalities the anticipated savings.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The County is requested and authorized to issue its refunding bonds in the aggregate principal amount of not to exceed \$18,960,000 (the “Refunding Bonds”) pursuant to the provisions of Act

No. 34, Public Acts of Michigan, 2001, as amended, for the purpose of refunding all or part of the outstanding 2015 Bonds and paying the costs of issuing the Refunding Bonds.

2. The proceeds of the Refunding Bonds shall be sufficient, together with other funds available to the Municipalities, if any, to pay the costs of issuing the Refunding Bonds and to establish an escrow Fund in an amount that will be sufficient to pay the principal of, redemption premiums, if any, and the interest on the 2015 Bonds that are refunded.
3. The Township covenants and agrees to continue to make payments to the County in accordance with the requirements of the Contract, said payments to be in amounts sufficient to pay its percentage share of the principal of and interest on the Refunding Bonds and any of the 2015 Bonds that are not refunded as the same shall become due and all paying agency fees and other expenses and charges (including the county agency's administrative expenses) that are payable on account of the Refunding Bonds and those 2015 Bonds that are not refunded. The Township acknowledges and agrees that its obligations as set forth in the Contract shall continue for the Refunding Bonds and the County shall have all rights and remedies set forth in the Contract to enforce the obligations of the Township with respect to the Refunding Bonds in the same manner and to the same extent that such rights and remedies are available with respect to the 2015 Bonds.
4. The Township specifically (but not by way of limitation) reaffirms its pledge of its full faith and credit for the payment of its obligations with respect to the Refunding Bonds and its obligation to levy taxes for the payment of its percentage share of the principal of and interest on the Refunding Bonds in accordance with the provisions of the Contract.
5. The Supervisor is authorized, if necessary, to file an application for State Treasurer's approval to issue the Refunding Bonds.
6. The Supervisor or the Clerk is authorized, if necessary, to approve the circulation of a preliminary and final official statement for the Refunding Bonds, to cause the preparation of those portions of the preliminary and final official statement that pertain to the Township, and to do all other things necessary for compliance with Rule 15c2-12 issued under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Rule"). The Supervisor or the Clerk is authorized to execute and deliver such certificates and to do all other things necessary to effectuate the sale and delivery of the Refunding Bonds.
7. The Supervisor or the Clerk is authorized, if necessary, to execute a certificate of the Township, constituting an undertaking to provide ongoing disclosure about the Township for the benefit of the holders of the Refunding Bonds as required under paragraph (b)(5) of the Rule, and amendments to such certificate from time to time in accordance with the terms of the certificate (the certificate and any amendments thereto are collectively referred to herein as the "Continuing Disclosure Certificate"). The Township hereby covenants and agrees that it will comply with and carry out all of the provisions of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate.

The foregoing resolution was offered by Amy Grasman and supported by Gary Veldink, as recommended by the Utilities Committee.



Amy Grasman said that the budget amendment is not a mandate to spend the money but it is there just in case needed.

Kelly Kuiper said that she wanted to be sure they had a higher-level employee.

Jim Weirenga stated that it was not necessary for the Board to make a motion, but they could just give direction to the Superintendent.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attachments:

- [Budget Amendments 2026](#)

### **#251208-17 – Banking Solution**

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Amy Grasman, to contract with West Michigan Community Bank, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

Matt Hoeksma, president and CEO of West Michigan Community Bank introduced himself and gave a presentation.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attachments:

- [Proposal](#)
- [Presentation](#)

### **#251208-18 – Committee Appointments**

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Amy Grasman, to approve the Committee Appointments as presented, as recommended by the Finance Committee, and to replace John Schwalm with Gene DeWitt as the Jenison Historical Society representative.

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt,  
Kevin Kelly  
Nays: Kelly Kuiper  
Absent: None  
Abstained: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Attachments:

- [2026 Committee Appointments – Approved by Finance Committee](#)

**#251208-19 – Globe Life Insurance**

Representatives of the company presented the proposal.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Amy Grasman, to contract with Globe Life Insurance for \$0.00 to allow employees to optionally enroll in life insurance, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

Gene DeWitt stated that although he was opposed at the Finance Committee, he found his answers. He asked if it would be a payroll deduction. Justin Stadt said that the individual employee, like a paid on-call employee, would have the responsible.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attachments:

- [Worksite Employer Booklet](#)
- [Coverages Snapshot](#)

**#251208-20 – Sick Time Policy**

Moved by Amy Grasman, seconded by John Schwalm, to approve the updated language to the sick time policy, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attachments:

- [Updated Policy](#)
- [Original Policy with Edits](#)

**#251208-21 – Overtime and Compensatory Time**

Moved by Amy Grasman, seconded by John Schwalm, to approve the Policy Manual additions regarding Overtime and Compensatory Time as presented, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by John Schwalm, to amend the Policy manual additions regarding Overtime and Compensatory Time as revised to include language regarding emergency and weather-related activities.

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt,  
Kevin Kelly  
Nays: Kelly Kuiper  
Absent: None  
Abstained: None

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION CARRIED.

Vote for the motion as amended:

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Gene DeWitt,  
Kevin Kelly  
Nays: Kelly Kuiper  
Absent: None  
Abstained: None

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

Attachments:

- [Policy Manual Addition – Presented to Finance Committee](#)
- [Policy Manual Addition – Amended](#)

### **#251208-22 – Employee Gym Membership for the Fire Department Employees**

Moved by Gene DeWitt, seconded by John Schwalm, to add to the Township Benefits Manual gym membership benefits available to all fire department employees, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

Jim Weirenga clarified that this is the current practice and that they would not use this during work hours and there would be accountability of its use.

Matt DeWitt, Fire Chief, gave a presentation on the benefits.

There was discussion.

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by John Schwalm, to table the motion and refer it back to the Finance Committee.

Yeas: John Schwalm, Jim Weirenga, Amy Grasman, Gary Veldink, Kelly Kuiper,  
Kevin Kelly  
Nays: Gene DeWitt  
Absent: None  
Abstained: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Attachments:

- [Benefit Manual Addition](#)

### **#251208-23 – Public Comment**

Members of the public were present; public comments were made by the following:

- Pete Plowman, 6877 Creek Ridge Ct.
- Michael Bosch, 1345 Golden Oak Ct.
- Joe Bush, Ottawa County Water Resources

**#251208-24 – Discussion and General information**

Discussion took place.

**#251208-25 – Meeting Adjourned**

Moved by Gary Veldink, seconded by Gene DeWitt, to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 PM

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

---

Jim Wierenga, Supervisor

---

Kelly Kuiper, Clerk