

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE  
Planning Commission Minutes**

September 16, 2020

Approved November 18, 2020

**3156 Highland Drive – Wenzel Chevrolet – Site Plan Amendment**

**3915 Van Buren Street – Doug & Mary Jo DeWeerd – Special Use Permit**

**5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood Lake – Special Use Permit**

**5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood Lake – Formal Preliminary PUD**

Acting Chairperson Schmuker called the meeting to order at 7:01p.m.

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

Absent: VanDenBerg

**PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items) - none**

1. A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Northrup, to approve the minutes of the August 19th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting changing the motion for 3523 Highland Drive – Altron Automation from Patrick to Waterman.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

**2. 3156 Highland Drive – Todd Wenzel Chevrolet – Site Plan Amendment**

Jim Ziegler was present from Wolverine Building for Todd Wenzel Chevrolet.

The staff report was presented.

This request is for a small addition of 738 s.f. to their existing 29,049 s.f. auto dealership building. The addition is a two-stall vehicle delivery location along the south side of their building. They will also convert the existing delivery area inside the building to an additional service lounge space along with doing other minor improvements.

The following discussion took place:

- Why is this coming to Planning Commission for such a small addition? The requirement for not coming to Planning Commission is 500 sq ft and this is a little over 700 sq ft.
- Fire Chief has looked at the plan and has approved it.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Raterink, to approve the Site Plan Amendment for Todd Wenzel Chevrolet at 3156 Highland Drive. This approval is based on the finding that the site plan standards from Section 15-11 of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

### **3. 3915 Van Buren Street – Doug & Mary Jo DeWeerd – Special Use Permit**

Motion by Waterman, with support by Northrup, to open the public hearing for the 3915 Van Buren Street Special Use Permit.

Nate VanderMale from VanderMale Construction was present.

The staff report was presented.

This Special Use Permit application is to allow for additional accessory space. This request is unique in that this house does not have an attached garage but already has a larger accessory building. They want to add a smaller attached garage. Generally, attached garages are preferred to detached garages. For history, their detached garage is all that was left on this property after Hudsonville's tornado.

The addition is a 1 ½ stall garage of 308 s.f.. It will not be visible from the road, being attached to the rear of the house. Since the detached garage is large at 1,344 s.f. it didn't take much of an attached garage to require a Special Use Permit.

Motion by Waterman, with support by Raterink, to close the public hearing for the 3915 Van Buren Street Special Use Permit.

The following discussion took place:

- Is allowing the total accessory building size to exceed what is permitted by 116 sq ft. setting a precedent for other homes in the area? Other homes in the area have more accessory building space than what is allowed. This would allow the neighbors to possibly add an attached garage. That is a better look in a neighborhood setting.
- The neighbor to the direct east was in favor of the project.
- Will the existing detached garage be changed as well? Yes, they intend to match the cosmetic changes of the house with the detached garage.

A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Staal, to approve the Special Use Permit at 3915 Van Buren Street for a 308 s.f. attached garage for a total of 1,652 s.f. of accessory space where 1,536 s.f. is permitted. 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.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

### **4. 5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood Lake – Special Use Permit**

Motion by Waterman, with support by Staal, to open the public hearing for the Flats at Elmwood Lake Special Use Permit.

Bill Aukeman was present.

The staff report was presented.

A Special Use Permit is required to allow a Planned Unit Development. This request is for a 12-unit duplex complex at 5799 Balsam Drive on 6 acres. It should be noted that this project was expanded in area to meet the minimum criteria for a PUD.

Chris and Krista Cousino of 5802 Elm Avenue were present with a question about a barrier or landscaping buffer? The project hasn't gotten that far yet, that will take place further on in the Final Informal PUD and Final Formal PUD Meeting. They have been using the berm as part of their property. Applicant is aware the residents in those homes have been taking care of that property. They have tried to be careful in designing the new layout in relation to the berms, with landscaping being planted within the area of the berm for privacy.

Motion by Waterman, with support by Bendert, to close the public hearing for the Flats at Elmwood Lake Special Use Permit.

The following discussion took place:

- The property to the west is within the 100-year floodplain so this project blocking it off doesn't seem like it is an issue since the floodplain would make it hard to develop along with poor soil. It would be better for it to be toward light recreational use due to these conditions. The applicant owns this property so if he is fine with blocking it off than we are as well.
- Hay is harvested in a field in that western property; will there still be access once this property is developed? Intention would be to allow the farmer to use the pedestrian pathway for access. That access can be addressed in a later agenda item before final PUD approval.

A motion was made by Staal, with support by Altman, to approve the Special Use Permit in accordance with Section 13-6 of the City of Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance for the Flats at Elmwood Lake at 5799 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 7, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Northrup)

## **5. 5799 Balsam Drive – Flats at Elmwood Lake – Formal Preliminary PUD**

Motion made by Waterman, supported by Bendert, to open the public hearing for the Flats at Elmwood Lake Formal Preliminary PUD.

Bill Aukeman was present.

The staff report was presented.

This is the formal hearing for the Preliminary PUD submitted by Aukeman Development Company for a 12-unit duplex development on 6 acres at 5799 Balsam Drive.

A preliminary PUD reviews the concept with final details such as engineering, building elevations, landscaping being reviewed as part of the final plan.

Motion made by Raterink, supported by Staal, to close the public hearing for the Flats at Elmwood Lake Formal Preliminary PUD.

The following discussion took place:

- Non-motorized pathway easement and maintenance, what is the intent? The sidewalk maintained by the applicant and the pathway maintained by the city.
- With the sidewalk running through and the pathway, could the residents at the condo association block access? There would be an easement to connect to the pathway so there wouldn't be an issue with the pathway connection being lost. The businesses in the commercial property like the connection without having designated parking.
- Can the public drive into the development and park to access the path? No but they can use the Elmwood Commerce Centre parking lot and walk to the pathway via the sidewalk connection. The guest parking spaces in the development could be marked for residents only.
- Applicant's preference would be to go back to the 24' road and not have a separate sidewalk. No issue with the connection to the pathway but the issue are placing the sidewalk 3' off the road then have easements to have a connection to the Commerce Centre that has no legal agreement to give parking spaces to use for the pathway. The City should take the initiative to get easements in the Elmwood Commerce Centre to ensure that the connection to the pathway through the applicant's property is then valid and goes somewhere. The city has discussed this with the Commerce Centre but can take a step further with actual paperwork.
- Is there an amount of pedestrian traffic to justify having a sidewalk? Having the sidewalk is good for the development's residents, including the elderly population who would use it along with the public. Moving forward with the paperwork between the City and the Commerce Centre would be good to start the process.
- Applicant feels that the existing sidewalks around the building would not be the typical pathway for pedestrians.
- Is the plan to extend the concrete sidewalk to the north into the neighboring development? That is being discussed to happen at this time.
- Aukeman met with Waterman and Strikwerda and worked through a few different pathway options and ended up with the sidewalk along the road. Applicant is asking to incorporate the pathway on the road as opposed to separate sidewalk or pathway. The goal is to have the separated sidewalk to reduce the risk of cars parking on it. Keeping the pathway separated helps keep the pedestrian flow intact.
- The Elmwood Condominiums within the 46-unit development to the east has no sidewalk and wants to stress that it was approved without the sidewalk and no resident has had issue with that. This complex is only 12 units and he would like to see a sidewalk placed through the Elmwood Commerce Centre that is more streamlined than what already exists in the Centre with an easement through it.

- The proposed development to the north is not the same as what was approved in 2002 so if a dense rental unit development would go there the applicant would place a gate across the road because the applicant does not want to see traffic from that development go through his.
- If the sidewalk and the road are together or separate in the applicant's project would the city still have an easement? Yes, no matter the design through the applicant's property the City would still secure an easement.
- What do other condos in the City have as far as sidewalks and easements? Generally they are private roads and do not have easements or sidewalks. But the last condominium development that the City approved had sidewalk in place.
- This development is different than other complexes due to the connection to the Elmwood Trail.

Motion to approve the statement of conclusions made by Raterink, seconded by Waterman, for the Flats at Elmwood Lake located at 5799 Balsam Drive. This approval is based on the finding that the standards in Section 11-8 E. of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met as follows:

There is definite benefit and consistency with the city's Master Plan by providing a transitional use between single-family detached residential and a commercial complex. The zero-step design provides a style not currently available in the Hudsonville rental market. This style is sought after by people with mobility limitations, including the elderly population. The Master Plan encourages connectivity which is provided via both a private street and a sidewalk that will connect to future development north of this property. There is also a non-motorized connection to Elmwood Trail that will improve pedestrian connectivity in Hudsonville.

The plan meets the regulations as set forth with the deviations as provided and the following conditions:

1. An access easement is required for the private street.
2. An access easement is required for the non-motorized pathway through Elmwood Commerce Centre and the Flats at Elmwood Lake.

Yeas 7, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Northrup)

### **Discussion**

#### **6. 3101 Elmwood Park Drive – Paramount/Bosgraaf – Informal Discussion of Future Site Plan**

Mike Corby and Scott Fredricks with Integrated Architecture, Mike Bosgraaf with Bosgraaf Homes, and Chad Koster with Paramount were present.

- Building A why would the offices be in this location versus closer to the main entrance? It would be more logical to have it in F or E or D. Building F was suggested again.
- The applicant's access to Elmwood Lake Drive where did that come from? There are easement agreements that the applicant says proves they have access to this road and the

applicant owns the entrance to Elmwood condos. The pier in the lake would be a shared use item as well via the documents.

- When talking about the connection to the property to the west the connection makes less sense because the properties aren't as similar. It would not be to the benefit to connect the road to Bill's development but a sidewalk connection would be a great addition.
- The pool location at building A causes concern being that close to a condo.
- The pathway system should be as public as possible, suggestion for the section parallel to the lake be incorporated into a public easement and continue toward Elmwood Lake Drive. Instead of connecting to the driveway they would extend the wider bike path down to Balsam Drive along the property line versus sidewalk that is more through the complex.
- Traffic is a concern, want to see what the engineer's comments will be on the traffic report. May need to be a turn lane and a deceleration lane into the complex as well.
- Bicycle parking located in the project? Plan is to use room in the stairwells to have bike parking which would make it covered which is a great addition to the project.
- Sidewalk connecting the two properties would be enough as long as emergency vehicles can be handled on Bill's property.
- Role of Planning Commission? Site Plan approvable as long as it meets zoning requirements. Can discuss on impact on surrounding development such as potential nuisance issues. There are details where we can ask for adjustments like relocating trash receptacles from being on the main road. Road connection is a leeway issue, pedestrian access is desired. Moving the pool and possibly buffering the dog park in a better way are discussion items.
- Is there a cap at 12 units per building via the zoning? Does that yield to placing more buildings with less units per building rather than fewer larger buildings that would have more units are they closer to the lot lines because of this? Their buildings don't seem to be any closer due to many of them being located on the foundations previously created for the past development. Zoning states 12 units is maximum per building.
- Does this proposal work well with the future zoning ordinance? The master plan designation matches but the density is slightly higher.
- What is the timing for phase 1 and phase 2? They would like to get going on phase 1 as soon as they can, will not all be done in one year. Estimate would be in the 2 year range.
- Scale of architecture is attempted to be in line with surrounding development just with more height being 3 stories.
- Strong emphasis for walkability with connection with the regional pathway as well as within the complex to connect to amenities.
- The community building was in the same place in the previously approved plan from 2004, but they are willing to look into relocating it.
- The applicant is indifferent on the roadway connection to Aukeman's project. They would be happy to do just pedestrian.
- There are the two curb cuts onto Elmwood Lake Drive they plan to eliminate one of them. The traffic demand from what was previously approved to now has not changed greatly.
- Strong emphasis on no large multi-bay parking areas, more narrow separated parking lots to help alleviate noise and help with design.
- These would be market rate apartments so the market may want garages which are why they are proposed.
- Preservation of landscape buffer along Elmwood Lake Drive is important to applicant.

**7. 5340 Plaza Avenue Suite E – Fit Body Bootcamp – Informal Discussion**

- A tent with walls would be an issue if it was permanently installed based on what was approved previously and it would take up parking spaces.
- Could people park under it if the walls were able to be removed? We need to consider that this parking would mainly be used by Fit Body.
- What would happen if another business in the downtown wanted to have a tent sale would they need approval? Yes, they would be for a shorter period of time and would need approval as well.
- Talk to applicant about if the time the tent is up could be reduced at all, the area could be useable when the walls of the tent aren't in place?
- Would this only be allowed during COVID? Would this be monitored? This is part of the hearing that just took place. It is for during COVID restrictions.
- Fitness Centers are allowed to be open but only at 25% capacity so the classes are most likely better running outside.
- Would the walls of the tent really make it any different than being indoors?
- There has not been any concern about the classes being outside. Want to make sure the City supports the business to keep the downtown vibrant.

**8. Grace Community Church – Update**

- Even though the hydrant is properly located, it seems like a safety issue that the access to the hydrant isn't maintained. Is there enforcement on that? Can speak with the fire chief on that issue.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Altman, with support by Raterink, to adjourn at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sarah Steffens  
Planning / Zoning Assistant