

**SOUTH HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 6, 2023

Draft

**1) Call to Order: 7:00 PM**

**2) Role Call:**

Tippman – present

Kiry – present

Odland - present

Meyer – present

Poole – absent

Dibble – present

Nicol – absent

Motion by Tippman to excuse absence of Poole and Nicol, second by Kiry, 5-0 yes.  
Motion passed.

Audience: applicants and many citizens

**3) Approval of the Agenda**

Odland requested Unfinished Business letter “a” be moved before the public hearing. Motion by Dibble to approve the agenda with correction, second by Tippman, 5-0 yes, motion passed.

**4) Approval of the Minutes**

Motion by Kiry to approve the minutes as presented, second by Meyer, 5-0, yes motion passed.

**5) Public Comment non-agenda items - none**

**6) Communications / Correspondence** - Letter from Barbara Kelly, Seawall Ct, several concerns with the proposed U-haul development. 1. Generate heavy traffic 2. 3 story building will open floodgates to other buildings that high 3. Property values will be impacted 4. Road is for no thru trucks

**7) Unfinished Business**

a. Continue Discussion amendment to approved PUD site plan, CR 388. Peter Jobson presented amended plan to reflect removal of an apartment building and parking lot that surrounded the apartment. The proposal will still be 100 units. The two buildings on the west will now be 3 floors. Adequate parking will be provided around and by the buildings. Motion by Dibble to approve the amended site plan as presented, second by Meyer. Poole-n/a; Dibble-Yes; Tippman-Yes; Odland-Yes; Nicol-n/a; Kiry-Yes; Meyer-Yes. 5-0, yes motion passed.

**8) Public Hearing –**

Applicant, Amerco Real Estate Co of Phoenix AZ, owners Life Styles of Paw Paw and Verdis Burrows of Inverness FL have petitioned for Preliminary site plan review and amend PUD to develop the property to a U-Haul Moving and Storage facility (including storage buildings, retail store, uhaul rental) at V/L 73<sup>rd</sup> St 80-17-011-037-01 80-17-011-32-71.

Smalley went over the application: The proposed project, U-Haul company – known for truck/trailer

rental and also storage units, amend the PUD-divide 5.8 acres. 3-story retail/storage building approx. 100x300, 15,600sq ft storage for their use, and 6 mini-storage buildings. Outside display of trucks/trailers for rent. Project will also include 1.2 acre parcel to the north, this parcel will be vacant and be used for storm water retention/detention.

Applicant went over plan: The 3-story building will be climate controlled. There will be a pull-in bay to load/unload out of the elements. The bay will not pull through, cars will back out. No fencing is proposed around the facility. The property will be landscaped. To start might employ 8-13.

Motion by Kiry to open the Public Hearing at 7:37PM, second by Tippman, 5-0, yes motion passed.

Public comments:

Kiry stated he would like to sidewalk(s) installed on the south side to 73<sup>rd</sup> for the kids bus stop. Help keep kids off the road. Was discussed the stop may be on the north, was discussed possible sidewalk on both sides. Kiry would like just one side, either one.

Jim, Seawall Ct- Allen Edwin stated that a use more like medical office would be constructed; do we have any say in the use.

Mark, 6<sup>th</sup> Ave-questions regarding the height. Smalley stated the ordinance was amended allow 50ft. Concerns for 73<sup>rd</sup>, not a Class A road, no trucks allowed. The applicant stated semi-trucks would only come on occasion to deliver things, but main vehicles are not semis.

Mark, Parkview Ln-Asked who will finish the road and removal of center boulevard before county takes over. Mr. Klett the developer stated he would (the developer will finish the road, not u-haul).

Michael, Beacon Ct- suggested U-haul take care of the center island. Add directional signs pointing to 73<sup>rd</sup> to exit and not go into housing development. And all lighting to be down facing.

No name(could not hear)- concern for water table, already high. Will this make the water worse, how will their water be taken care of? Per the applicant, their will be swales and the 1.2 acres will be the retention area. Will there be fence around retention pond? Per applicant, there will not be a pond; there will be several smaller swale areas.

John, Seawall Ct- has there been an impact study done? Storm water concerns. Additional traffic concerns. Concern property values will go down. Upset with Allen Edwin for not saying this type of development was coming. Would not had purchased if knew this was possible.

Margurite, Parkview Ln – asked developer if this has been developed in from of other housing communities. He stated yes, in Traverse City.

Rudy, Parkview Ln- were there permits to remove the wetland in the from of the property. Per the developer (Mr. Klett) yes, proper permits with EGLE were obtained.

Michael, Beacon Ct – concern with pond not being protected with a fence. Requests good landscaping to make property look good and maintain it.

No name (could not hear)- asked what the hours will be. Applicant stated, 7a-7p. The facility or storage units are not accessible 24/7. Per applicant, there may some exceptions if a customer needs after hours access.

No name (could not hear)- questioned why this property? And how long has this been in the works. Per

applicant, u-haul has a checklist of desirable locations and this property checked all the boxes. Per applicant, been in the works only a few months.

No name, Seawall Ct- agree with the concerns, concern with this affecting the water table.

No name, 6<sup>th</sup> Ave – how will the trailers and trucks be screened/hidden? Suggested fence, high tree landscape, not desirable to look at.

No name, Seawall Ct – wish knew about this, would not had bought property.

Motion by Kiry to close the Public Hearing at 8:41PM, second by Meyer 5-0, yes

## **9) New Business**

### **a. Discuss/decide Preliminary site plan U-haul**

Smalley went over concern: the triangle parcel is not part of the PUD, and this amendment does not add to it. From discussions with developer, I was told wasn't being added, but the plan C-101 says "addition". The plan shows the building on the "property line". PUD flexibility allows 7feet side setback. The parking lot area on line, 20.02G, side setback for parking may be waived. If the parcel is not added to the PUD then the setback of 7ft should be maintained. Applicant was not aware but would like to discuss to work it out.

Also, how will open space/lot coverage be calculated? 2 parcels together or separate? The street bisects the parcels. PC members discussed; parcels separate for lot coverage/open space.

Meyer asked who did the traffic study and stated should be validated.

Odland went over the comments from public hearing for conditions: 1. directional signs when leaving the driveways, directing to 73<sup>rd</sup> St.; other signs to try to defer cars from driving through housing development. 2. Sidewalk being installed on one side or the other for kids bus stop, safe travel. 3. Landscaping plan being submitted with final, to review swales, retention/detention areas if need fence. And review for screening of outside stored items; the plan does not show any fences and concern was looking at outside items 4. Down face lighting, maybe low watt lighting, ordinance requires already, but concerns from neighbors that lights may shine in their houses. 5. There was discussion about the road being taken over by the county, and removal of the boulevard islands; who will maintain the road and remaining island.

Motion by Tippman to approve the preliminary site plan and PUD amendment with items to be added to final plan: 1. directional signs to be added when leaving the driveways, directing to 73<sup>rd</sup> St.; other sign ideas to defer cars from driving through housing development. 2. Sidewalk being installed on one side starting from Anchor Dr to approx. 73rd. 3. Full landscaping plan submitted 4. Add lighting placement and type to plan. 4. Figure out the issue of the building over the property line of parcel not in the PUD; either adjust the building size/location or add the parcel to the PUD. 5. Final site plan shall be submitted per PUD ordinance and/or final site plan requirements. Second by Meyer. Roll Call vote: Poole-n/a; Dibble-Yes; Tippman-Yes; Odland-Yes; Nicol-n/a; Kiry-Yes; Meyer-Yes. 5-0, yes motion passed.

## **10) Unfinished Business –**

a. Refer to #7

b. Master Plan – draft – discussion, more chapters were sent to review. The PC did not discuss. A

workshop meeting was set up for Monday September 18, 6pm.

**11) Staff & Subcommittee report**

ZBA report- none

Board report – refer to Board minutes

Zoning report – Smalley – 2 or 3 site plan review for Oct meeting

**12) Commissioner Comments and Public Comment – none**

**13) Adjournment at 9:15pm**

*Respectfully Submitted by:*

*Tasha Smalley*

*Zoning Administrator/Recording Secretary*