

CITY OF HUDSONVILLE
Planning Commission Minutes

March 17th, 2021

Approved April 21st, 2021

6245 Balsam Drive - Balsam Meadows – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing
6245 Balsam Drive - Balsam Meadows – Formal Preliminary PUD – Public Hearing
3804 Hillside Drive - Tom Verkaik – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing
3790 Hillside Drive - Dan Postmus – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing
5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood – Informal Discussion

Chairman VanDenBerg called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

All commissioners are attending the meeting remotely from the City of Hudsonville, Ottawa County, Michigan except Commissioner Raterink who is present from Palmetto, Manatee County, Florida.

Present: Altman, Bendert, Northrup, Nyitray, Raterink, Schmuker, Staal, Strikwerda, Steffens, VanDenBerg, Waterman

Absent: none

PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items) - none

1. A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Altman, to approve the minutes of the February 17th, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

2. 6245 Balsam Drive - Balsam Meadows – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Todd Stuive Exxel Engineering presented the request. Mark Pruij and Craig Ledger from Ledger Builders were present.

The staff report was presented.

Public comment is described as follows:

- Al Frankfort of 6273 Summer Dr preferred fewer units maintaining the 20' side yard building setback and adding basements to every unit. Traffic is an issue already, suggested shifting the road to where unit 1 is located.

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Connection to the sports center with water. There is a light at the connection to the Port Sheldon Sports Complex. The sewer is very shallow at that point and would not be able to be extended beyond the property line.
- Parking spaces within the neighborhood interfering with the sidewalk. It is quite typical to see these in a condominium development. With it being a private street and narrower roads, it is good to keep the cars off the road and grass as far as additional parking.
- The main entrance, is there delineation of the sidewalk going across that drive? Yes, it will likely need to be thicker.
- The zero thresholds seem to be from the garage not the front door. In the garage there is a taper for drainage so that will be zero step. The front porch is also planned to be zero step.
- Spacing of the drive relative to Springdale St. There are many commercial businesses along this street and the traffic from this project seems that it would be similar. The ordinance has commercial driveway standards as the center of the driveway being 75' from the north edge of the adjacent right of way. This project is 107'. The city engineer felt that because of the traffic volumes this project would be fine. It would be better if the entrance was further from Springdale St but it is fine the way that it is.
- The applicability of the PUD. The qualifying factor for a PUD is to conserve natural features as much as possible. The applicant is planning to keep as much of the perimeter planting on the property as they can. Would like to see that taken more seriously as far as that preservation taking place. Having staff walk the site and flag the areas that need to be preserved. Having that vegetation staked at 10' from the drip line. There are not a lot of unique features to this site so the preservation of the existing landscaping should be a high priority.

A motion was made by Schmuker, with support by Staal, to approve the Special Use Permit in accordance with Section 13-6 of the City of Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance for Balsam Meadows at 6245 Balsam Drive. This approval is based on the finding that the standards in Section 13-6 of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

3. 6245 Balsam Drive - Balsam Meadows – Formal Preliminary PUD – Public Hearing

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Todd Stuive from Exxel Engineering presented the request. Mark Pruijm and Craig Ledger from Ledger Builders were present.

The staff report was presented.

Public comment is as follows:

- None

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Will the lighting in the plan be pointing down properly? It looks like it in the drawing but looking at the particular globe it seems it wouldn't be pointing down. There may be an internal shield on the light but the applicant will check with the company to check if they meet dark sky criteria.
- Could the sidewalk connection to the sports complex be moved? It makes sense to leave the pathway where it is due to resident privacy and the pathway lining up with the fire access gate.
- Would like to see what the fire access gate would look like in a drawing at the next meeting.
- Stormwater collection area. Is there a way to design that to be a fully wet pond? It would be a nice element for the residents and help with the appeal of design as far as having this complex meet requirements for a PUD. The county adopted regulations that make it more challenging to deal with stormwater on the property so that would have to be looked into.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Waterman, to approve the Statement of Conclusions for 6245 Balsam Drive Formal Preliminary PUD in accordance with Section 11-8 E from the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance. This proposed development is consistent with the Imagine Hudsonville 2030 Master Plan and provides a definite benefit being a development that does density well with single-family detached residential condominiums that have an aging-in-place design including a zero-step layout. This design will allow people to age in place for longer than in traditional homes.

This plan meets the regulations as set forth with proposed deviations presented:

1. Provide detail on looping the watermain to Balsam Drive.
2. Sensitivity toward conservation of natural features to require city staff to walk and mark the drip edge of the trees that need to be retained.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

4. 3804 Hill Side Drive - Tom Verkaik – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Tom Verkaik presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

Public comment of support was provided from Dr. Snoeyink of 4236 Creek View Drive.

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- The property that this applicant has is partially in the convenience and restrictions of the Creekview Estate Plat so because the applicant is looking to put this building outside of the

plat, they are allowed to build up to the city requirements versus having to follow the covenants.

- What is the reasoning for keeping the other smaller shed? It is in good shape and the applicant wouldn't want to get rid of it if he didn't have to.
- What would he have to do to keep the existing shed for different uses and meet primary size? He is allowed 64 sq ft to meet the lot's maximum.
- Would like to see the smaller shed removed to make the new building be under the permitted maximum. Keeping the smaller shed is self imposed issue since the applicant just wants to keep it.
- There is a small hill where the two driveways connect is that going to be an issue?
- Will there need to be an easement for the shared driveway? It isn't required but it would be in their best interest to get one.
- Would like to see a window above the garage doors like in the picture given. The applicant plans to have windows like that in both peaks.
- In order to keep the shed the larger building would have to be 24' by to meet permitted size requirements.
- The buildings are far back and down on elevation so they wouldn't be easy to see.
- The two properties on Vista Dr that had applications denied were asking for 1200 sq ft and 1400 sq ft buildings and ended up building what they were allowed via the city ordinance around 850 sq ft.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Schmuker, to approve a Special Use Permit for 3804 Hill Side Drive for an accessory building that is 15' in height were 14' is permitted and to allow for a total of 1,616 s.f. of accessory space where a total of 1,536 s.f. is permitted by right. This approval is based on the finding that all of the General Standards for Approval listed in Section 13-6, and the Standards for Specific Special Land Uses for Accessory Uses at Single Family Dwellings listed in Section 13-7 K of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance are met.

This plan meets the regulations as set forth with proposed deviations presented:

1. Applicant will provide new rendering that shows window above garage door.

Yeas 5, Nays 4 (Altman, Bendert, Staal, VanDenBerg)

5. 3790 Hill Side Drive - Dan Postmus – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Dan Postmus presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

Public comment of support was provided from Dr. Snoeyink of 3818 Hill Side Drive.

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Architecturally the lean-to softened the height of the building. It doesn't also seem to be part of the accessory building because it is a lean-to that will not be for storage.
- If the property is ever sold, what is the city's ability to monitor what gets stored under the lean-to? We have done enforcement on rubbish. If it was neat and tidy it wouldn't be an issue. But if there are complaints then there could be enforcement.
- If this lean-to was used for storage in the future would we be able to enforce it? Requirements could be placed on the permit for the lean-to not to be used for storage.
- Is there a plan for a window in the upper portion above the garage door? That was not part of the plan but that could be added.
- The plan for the lean to is for a patio and social area not for storage.
- Is there going to be an issue with creating the driveway right where the two connect at the accessory buildings? There would be a little bit of a retaining wall to level out the two properties so the driveway is also level going back.
- Is the driveway going to be paved? Yes, the driveway is planned to be concrete all the way back.
- The requested height is 5' over our standard up to 16' has been more the standard.
- The trusses are at a reduced slope so even though the applicant is asking for 5' it will only be 1' taller than the neighboring building.
- Does the overhang need to be 10' out from the building? Could it be 4' or 6' to still have enough room for social gathering. With a larger group 10' made more sense for gathering.
- Do we count lean-to's as square footage even though the area underneath is open? Building area is measured from the wall or support posts so the lean-to is included in what is measured. Even though a building with walls makes a bigger impact than a lean-to.
- If there was not a roof then it wouldn't count. Would a pergola count toward accessory space? The pergola would not count as sq footage.
- The concern with the building height is if it is residential or more commercial looking? If it looks like a barn or agricultural building then it doesn't fit the neighborhood so would prefer to keep the building height to the city standards.
- The applicant is trying to mimic the house and the colors of the house to try to keep the building looking residential.
- The 12 by 12 garage door makes it look more like an agricultural building rather than a residential garage.
- Is there a standard for garage door size? No, we only have standards for building height so any applicant or resident could do whatever garage door size would fit.
- The applicant could store the RV outside the building in the backyard and the applicant thinks that the other residents would rather see the RV parked in a building than outside.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Raterink, to approve a Special Use Permit for 3790 Hill Side Drive for an accessory building that is 19' in height were 14' is permitted. The additional square footage for a carport of 240 sq ft that is not for mechanical or equipment storage. This approval is based on the finding that all of the General Standards for Approval listed in Section 13-6, and the Standards for Specific Special Land Uses for Accessory Uses at Single Family Dwellings listed in Section 13-7 K of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance are met.

This plan meets the regulations as set forth with proposed deviations presented:

1. Applicant will provide rendering with a window above the garage door.
2. The porch social area shall not be enclosed.

Yeas 6, Nays 3 (Altman, Staal, VanDenBerg)

6. 5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood – Informal Discussion

Bill Aukeman presented the request. He asked if it is ok to move forward to final PUD with same concept. The road will be a little different.

The staff report was presented.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Continuing the PUD Process without having to go back and start over seems fine as long as redesign is consistent with original PUD. There could be the potential to table this request before the final stages to work out issues.
- Uncomfortable with the event tent idea that was proposed.
- Utility concerns from staff review. The sanitary sewer seems to be the same as it was in the first plan. The water line layout seemed to be a concern with DPW so that would need to be look at for review.
- The tent idea is an alternative to the condo layout if it was received well by the commission as an idea for during COVID and afterward for community events. This would be something good to have in the meantime or instead of the 12-unit PUD if the community found it desirable.
- The concern with outdoor events is that they could become a nuisance. In past events there were noise issues and control issues of the crowd. There would be concerns with noise, trespassing, alcohol issues, etc. It is too close to the residential neighbors. The baseball diamonds at Port Sheldon get calls for being too loud and this is closer to residential properties.

Discussion

- Timeline on lawsuit for the Bosgraaf development? Nothing has been set. There is one against the city and one against the developer and the property owner.
- The Buttermilk Creek Trail grant was formally approved by the state. Clearing on the high school property has been done, this project will be constructed this year from Allen to New Holland St.
- The underpass delineators on 32nd Ave were pushed back due to COVID but they are expected to be installed soon.

7. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Bendert, with support by Raterink, to adjourn at 9:38 pm.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted,
Sarah Steffens
Planning / Zoning Assistant