



PORT SHELDON TOWNSHIP

16201 Port Sheldon Street, West Olive, MI 49460

Telephone 616-399-6121 Fax 616-399-7173

www.portsheldontwp.org | info@portsheldontwp.org

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes June 25, 2025

Call to Order: 5:00 by Steve Grilley

Roll Call: Present: Steve Grilley, Lori Stump, Del Petroelje, Nicole Timmer, Bill Monhollon, Patrick Kelderhouse, Duke DeLeeuw.
Absent: None
Staff present: Ryan Capson, Andrew Moore, Cate Wiler

Approve Minutes from May 28, 2025:
Move: Patrick Kelderhouse
Support: Bill Monhollon
Motion carried 7-0 via voice vote

Approve Agenda:
Move: Patrick Kelderhouse
Support: Nicole Timmer
Motion carried 7-0 via voice vote

Communications: A letter from Resident Kathleen Ponitz was shared. The property owner thanked the commissioners for hearing her request for a property split at the May meeting.

Zoning Administrator Updates: Ryan Capson shared the contractor working with Consumers plant reached out to ask what they need to do to get the process started for making changes to the site. They were told that changes to site plans must go through an industrial review with the planning commission. Any changes to the site plan will have to go through the planning commission first. This will be a new activity for the township to tear down an existing commercial building.

Public Comments:
1. Kathleen Ponitz stated she was here to listen in on the discussion of the request for a property split with a shared driveway and did not have any additional comments.

Public Comment was closed by Steve Grilley

Old Business: None

New Business:

1. Food Truck Ordinance Discussion –

- a. Andrew Moore read through the draft of ordinance to amend Sec 2.15 of the zoning ordinance to add a definition pertaining to Mobile Food Vending; to Amend Article IV to add a new section pertaining to Food Truck Permits and Approval Standards; to amend the C-Commercial District to allow Food Trucks as a permitted use when operated at the same location for less than 90 days; and to allow food trucks as a use after special approval when operated at the same location for 90 days or more.
- b. Grilley posted the question, “Is this the look you want and what you want to open a door to consider?” Petroelje suggested an annual review could be performed as part of a special use permit and you could revoke the permit based on non-compliance. DeLeeuw asked “If it will be a permanent truck, who applies for the special land use permit, the landowner or the owner of the truck?”
- c. Moore suggested it could be revised to be a different type of permit that does not fall under the special land use permitting. Planning commission approval would still be required for permitting. Issue a special use to the property owner with the stipulation that this use applies only to the approved vendor who has obtained necessary permits per section 4.
- d. Capson mentioned that there are 2 trucks currently that are applying for sales permits, and they have been given temporary status at this time.

Direction or next steps – The topic was tabled for additional research and will be discussed at the next planning commission meeting.

2. Energy Storage Facilities Ordinance Discussion –

- a. Andrew presented a draft of an ordinance to Amend section 2.07 to include definition for “Energy Storage Facility”; to amend section 3.05 to include energy storage facility as a special land use in the industrial district; to amend section 9.03 to include energy storage facilities as a special land use; and to amend article XVIII to include a new subsection related to “Energy storage facilities”
- a. Petroelje asked about how long this technology has been in existence and what is the overall health impact to the community to have that number of batteries in one place?
- b. Capson asked, “Does the township want to add a section that allows for landscaping screening or improvements in section 2?” Consumers is proposing to place it near a waterway and there are not currently any

setbacks to address. But is there a risk of chemicals getting into the water in the event of a fire?

- c. The commission is going to take time to think about it and research for shielding, landscape and environmental impact.
- d. Grilley stated that the township should get something in place regarding the ordinance so that Consumers doesn't just go to the state and bypass/override the township.
- e. Deleeuw asked how the screening that was installed by the gas company looks. Capson said it looks okay but there have been issues with the fence blowing down and residents complaining about the broken fencing. (This was a separate commentary about a previous township issue.)

Direction or next steps – The topic was tabled for additional research and will be discussed at the next planning commission meeting.

3. Shared Driveway Ordinance Discussion –

- a. The question was presented at the last meeting asking if the Ponitz property could be split so they can sell the home that exists on the property and build a new smaller home on the new split with a shared driveway.
- b. Moore presented that the current ordinance states every parcel must have road frontage on either a public or private street.
- c. Within the township, properties zoned as LSR, there are 161 properties of which 133 could be split. Which could potentially add an additional 130 houses just in LSR. However, the ordinance would have to be changed to address set-back and if they are from the property line or from the driveway.
- d. Kelderhouse added that there will be additional limitations for whether a house could still be built upon the splits due to setbacks, easements and the creation of land locked parcels.
- e. Deleeuw suggested that we look at allowing Mother-in-law suites. The property would be owned by the original owner but allow a 2nd residence.
- f. Monhollon asked about the potential issues with shared driveways are safety issues for access with a blocked driveway.
- g. Moore said that some townships are getting away from shared driveways because of the issues created administratively for emergency vehicle access and for the county with frontage requirements.
- h. Capson mentioned that there are properties within the township that have already been split pre-dating current ordinance requirements. We could investigate these as examples if we decide to move forward with this. The

potential issues that arise are maintenance and updates to the shared driveway and who pays.

- i. Kelderhouse was concerned about what adding another 100 properties to LSR would add to the roadways and Lakeshore infrastructure.
- j. Monhollon stated that there is a 40 ft rear setback and a 35 ft front setback and 10 ft on the sides. Add the 15 ft of the driveway and this would already limit the number of lots that could be split due to the lack of space available. With the land locked piece what would the front and rear of the lot be?
- k. ADU with 200 ft of frontage? Look into how many properties fit this requirement and will this be an option?
- l. A question was posed by Planning Commission member, Del Petroelje. "Does the township make these changes for the request of 1 person?" Also, the area that is being requested is the most sensitive area for building. If it is allowed in this area how many other properties within the township will request the same?
- m. Deleeuw raised the idea that the change in ordinance be applied only for lots zoned LSR?
- n. Flag lot splits require 100 feet wide for each split for road commission so this will prohibit splits for any lot under 200 ft in width. Andrew stated that most townships are getting away from Flag lots because of the above issues.
- o. A request was made that Andrew brings in verbiage from other townships that allow ADU.

Direction or next steps – The topic was tabled for additional research and will be discussed at the next planning commission meeting.

Adjourn:

Grilley adjourned the meeting at 6:20 pm.

X



Lori Stump
Secretary