

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE  
Planning Commission Minutes**

January 20, 2021

Approved February 3, 2021

**3007 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing**

**3007 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef – Site Plan Review**

**3101 & 3150 Elmwood Park Drive – 3101 Elmwood – Formal Preliminary PUD  
Amendment – Public Hearing & Informal Final PUD Amendment**

**Election of Officers**

**2020 Planning Commission Annual Report**

Chairman VanDenBerg called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

All commissioners are attending the meeting remotely from the City of Hudsonville, Ottawa County, Michigan except Chairman VanDenBerg who is present from Highland Beach, Palm Beach County, Florida and Commissioner Raterink who is present from Palmetto, Manatee County, Florida and Commissioner Nyitray who is present from Holland, Ottawa County, Michigan.

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

Absent: none

A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Bendert, to move the public comments for non-agenda items to the end of the meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

1. A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Altman, to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

**2. 3007 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Joe Geelhoed, Mark Scobell from Dan Vos Construction, Ron Vander Boon Jr and Donald Vander Boon from West Michigan Beef were present.

The staff report was presented.

West Michigan Beef submitted a Special Use Permit application to allow for a meat processing facility in the I-1 Zone District.

Public comments were requested, none were received.

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Concerns about volume of sewage for Wyoming Sewage. Has this been reviewed by Wyoming Sewage? No, by our engineer and they said that West Michigan Beef has the requested expansion capacity.
- This reconstruction will only bring them further into compliance.
- Additional truck traffic? There will be signage on the site to direct truck traffic to Chicago Drive.
- The goal is to produce 50% more product, so 50% more trucks. But will direct all entry and exit onto Chicago Drive. Some may come off of Van Buren Street.
- What time of day is the truck traffic? 10 am – 2pm otherwise it is scattered from 5am-10pm so that will not interfere with commuter traffic times.

A motion was made by Altman , with support by Schmuker, to approve a Special Use Permit for 3007 Van Buren Street in accordance with Section 5-19. E. 2 of the City of Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance to allow for a new meat processing facility/building in the I-1 Zone District.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

### **3. 3007 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef – Site Plan Review**

Joe Geelhoed, Mark Scobell from Dan Vos Construction, Ron Vander Boon Jr and Donald Vander Boon from West Michigan Beef were present.

The staff report was presented.

West Michigan Beef submitted a Site Plan application for a 75,790 s.f. building to replace most of their existing buildings.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Is the northwest wall sign larger than the ordinance allows? The signs on the property are a permitted size; there is an error on the plan. The signs will be sized according to the ordinance.
- With landscaping on the southeast elevation, what about the section without any large doors around it, could that be broken up by adding some landscaping to that area? Some of the

trees within the parking lot will help break up the visual mass of the building. The applicant can do a visual with the landscaping like the northwest elevation to help show what that would look like. Chicago Drive has a 8-9' higher elevation than Van Buren Street which is a concern. The landscaping and distance from Van Buren Street will be helpful.

- The roof elevation change, is that recommended to become shorter by 6'? No, the final building height for part of the building may be reduced by 6' depending on final construction design. The applicant is in compliance even with the tallest height shown.
- The property on the west end of the site, is that still going to become commercial in the future? The applicant left it open and kept the retention pond as far away as possible to keep it open for future development.
- Entrance into the site from Chicago Drive. Can a semi-truck fit to slow down in the deceleration lane next to the driveway? MDOT will specify deceleration lane length. It is wide enough to fit a semi-truck. This requires MDOT approval.
- Could the sidewalk along Van Buren continue to the west? The focus for sidewalk was with this property. Happy to see the access to Wilson Ave that the applicant has provided. Extension of sidewalk to the west could be a future project. The sidewalk will link to the section of sidewalk in front of the businesses to the east.
- Wording in the zoning ordinance for aesthetics of the buildings facing Chicago Drive. That language is general criteria for quality of materials in the industrial zones. There was back and forth on improvement of the façade with windows along the top of the wall, but the buildings height may be reduced in the final design. To break up the northwest wall the applicant added the glass in the center.
- Is the metal siding vertical corrugated metal with exposed gaskets and screws? What is the maintenance plan? It is insulated with concealed fasteners that have some texture to it to help break up the mass of the wall. You also will hardly see the joints.
- Height of building along Van Buren has finished floor 10' above the road so it will appear as 45' instead of 35'. What can be done with screening? The applicant hopes to lower the roof height in the final phases of design to help with this and with cost. The scale of the building won't seem as harsh but the applicant will create an elevation like in the plans for the northwest wall that shows the landscape at maturity and when they are first planted to show that the impact wouldn't be as severe.
- The building will be 400-500' from Van Buren so the scale of building height to distance will help since it won't be near the road.
- Is it possible to put in taller landscaping? If they do a perspective drawing like the northwest elevation that will help show it won't be a severe view.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Waterman, to approve the West Michigan Beef Company Site Plan Amendment for a 75,790 s.f. building to replace most of their existing buildings at 3007 Van Buren Street. This approval is based on the finding that all of the site plan review standards from Section 15-2 A of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance are met with the following conditions:

1. The concrete portion of the wall will have patterning to improve appearance through paint and/or concrete texturing.

2. The landscape island shown as paved in the parking lot on pages C1-1 & 7 will be landscaped.
3. Shift evergreen trees in the northwest corner of the site along Chicago Drive to the northeast.
4. The sidewalk will line up with the existing sidewalk on the east side of the property.
5. Provide an easement to the city for the portion of the sidewalk on private property
6. Final water main details require city engineer approval.
7. The Knox box location requires Fire Chief approval.
8. Directional signage will be provided to direct trucks to Chicago Drive.
9. Property addressing will be provided for phase I.
10. MDOT will review and approve the Chicago Drive entrance.
11. 46 deferred parking spaces are permitted.

Yeas 8, Nays 0,  
(Raterink did not vote due to technical issues)

#### **4. 3101 & 3150 Elmwood Park Drive – 3101 Elmwood – Formal Preliminary PUD Amendment – Public Hearing & Informal Final PUD Amendment**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Mayor Mark Northrup made the following statement:

As the elected Mayor of the City and as a member of the City's Planning Commission, I have determined that I will not participate in discussions related to nor vote on a request of Bosgraaf Homes before the City's Planning Commission to amend the Elmwood PUD in my capacity as a member of the Planning Commission in order to avoid a conflict of interest or even the appearance of a conflict of interest. The Planning Commission will have this matter before it and will be required to take some formal action. The reason for my abstention from participation is the close proximity of my home to the Elmwood PUD. The action taken could have a positive or a negative effect on my home property at 5803 Elm Avenue. To be clear, I have not taken nor will I take a position for or against the proposed amendment. Thank you.

A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Altman, for Mayor Northrup to abstain from discussion on the agenda item for 3101 & 3150 Elmwood Park Drive.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Northrup)

Mike Bosgraaf with Bosgraaf Homes, Chad Koster with Paramount Properties, Michael Corby with Integrated Architecture, Jon Male with Excel Engineering, Aimee Giacherio with Wade Trim, Bill Sikkel with Sikkel and Associates were all present.

Mike Bosgraaf, Michael Corby and Aimee Giacherio presented the request.

The staff report was presented in detail by Mr. Strikwerda to be incorporated by reference into the minutes.

The request is to amend a part of the original Elmwood Farms PUD that was approved in 2004. The original PUD was two separate projects with two separate owners and was viewed as two separate phases but was approved as one PUD. The first phase of the original PUD was Elmwood Condominiums, which was completed. The second phase is what is being amended. The biggest change from the original PUD is eliminating a 155-unit retirement building that is replaced with 11 apartment buildings having a total of 128 units, and eliminating 14 duplex units that are replaced with 28 townhome units. A pathway for public use is also added to provide a link from Balsam Drive to the pathway that goes around Elmwood Lake. The apartment breakdown is 14 studio, 23 1-bedroom, 82 2-bedroom, and 9 3-bedroom units.

Public comment is as follows:

- Tom Forshee Planning Commission Legal Counsel from Dickinson Wright, present at the meeting to provide legal help if needed, but not to tell the Commission whether or not to approve the project. Stated that the Planning Commission's decision shall be incorporated into a statement of conclusions that shall specify the decision, the basis for the decision and conditions imposed based on that decision. They shall evaluate compliance with regulations based in this article within the ordinance with particular emphasis on adequate demonstration of definite benefit and consistency with the City of Hudsonville Master Plan. Stressed to the Planning Commission to state on record what they found persuasive or unpersuasive to make sure to state it. Also spoke on the density calculation specific to including the lake or stormwater detention, he said to rely on the professional staff (Zoning Administrator) to make those determinations accurately. The purpose of a PUD is to promote flexibility and creativity with land use design.
- Brad Fowler from Mika Myers asked if all three letters that were sent were distributed and read from October 15<sup>th</sup>, December 9<sup>th</sup> and January 18<sup>th</sup>. Three main arguments that demonstrate why this PUD Amendment should not be approved as proposed. The development is not consistent with the cities' master plan. It would circumvent underlying zoning requirements primarily the density calculations, and it would violate the private property rights of the condominium association.
- Marsha Plafkin 5290 Southbrook Ct 45, this project would be a great disservice to the residents not only within the condominiums but in the whole city.
- Don and Carol Schaafsma 6005 Elmwood Lake Dr, this type of development would not be found in the surrounding area which is single family and owned condominiums.
- Ryan Kilpatrick with Housing Next, a housing needs assessment was done for Ottawa and Kent Counties, there is a need for over 30,000 housing units across both counties. There are dozens of employers who are looking to attract additional employees at living wages (\$16-25/hour) but there isn't enough housing to support those employees. The housing need is hampering economic growth.
- John Lepard 6360 Apio Circle, President of Apio Lake Condominium Association, the proposed rental units would be unfair to the resident owners of Elmwood Condos and Apio Lake Condos. This project would change the character of the communities. The lakes in the area are intended to be private and used by condominium owners only. It is already challenging to keep the lake from being used by trespassers. The use of the lake causes liability issues as well. The applicant has made changes to make the complex more

compatible with architecture and design, but it does not mean the use and layout are compatible.

- Sally Cain 6063 Elmwood Circle, she was told the use on the vacant property would not allow any rentals. Many other owners were told the same thing, that the adjacent property would be developed as a senior facility or more condos. She is wondering if they will have to move because of this development. Concerned that the lake will have an increase in recreational water craft that does not comply with the condos existing rules. There will be at least 100 boats on the lake. Concerned about traffic volume and safety. Putting rentals priced from around \$600 to \$1200 next to \$350,000 condos doesn't make sense. Maintenance of the property and litter are a concern. Asked Commission to consider road maintenance within the condos due to wear from proposed development. Is the easement valid or not? There is legal disagreement between the two lawyers.
- Stephen and Pat Butryn 5977 Elmwood Court, impact of proposed development on the community is not comparable to the original PUD plan of the senior facility. Concerned with traffic that would come from the proposed apartments and townhomes. People will use the private roads instead of the pathway to get to the pier because the road is a more direct route. Feels there is not enough parking at the proposed development for residents, staff, and visitors. Expressed that the meeting is too late at night due to those who are looking to go on public record about the project having to be up this late in order to be heard. Dan Strikwerda is not part of the development team. Is there anything negative to say about the project?
- Bill Aukeman 6345 Apio Circle, asked how the information presented at the meeting like the traffic study was collected. The information was collected based on the original PUD files the city has and the information for the proposed development. Expressed that he has never attended a meeting where the Planning Administrator made the presentation for the applicant. The original PUD was approved because of its use and to accomplish a goal of the cities that additional housing opportunities for seniors or senior care facilities were desired. The Elmwood condos aren't just units they are people too, 30% of the people in the project are either single or widows. Had concerns about how valid the traffic study presented is. This isn't a project next to the condos, it is within the same PUD and the approvals that Chairman VanDenBerg and Commissioner Raterink proposed for the original PUD were meant to stop developments like this. Feels the Planning Administrator is doing a disservice to the surrounding residents and the applicants themselves due to spending their time and money. Listed off the owners of Elmwood Lake Condos and when they moved in to show that they are not just unit numbers.
- Eildert and Mary Etta Zwart 6145 North Elmwood Lake Dr, adamantly oppose the project being presented based on the opinions presented previously. Wondering about the supply of fish in the lake and how the proposed development would impact it. He was told the lake wasn't going to be developed in this way. Concerned about signage with no fishing or swimming that doesn't do its job already. Traffic concerns related to the train coming through the city and backing up Balsam Drive past the entrance to Elmwood Park Drive.
- Robert Becker, 5850 Balsam Drive, Cedar Crest Dairy Owner. All the concerns he had were addressed expect for that the dairy has 1000 to 1200 semis that pull out of their driveway every week and do a left turn on Balsam Drive. The residents of the proposed apartments would turn out of Elmwood Park Drive right across from his driveway thus being in the way of the semis so he thinks a traffic light should be considered.

- Doug Benner 6058 Elmwood Circle, concerned with traffic related to the northern driveway of the proposed development being a right turn only exit. Feels the lake should not be counted in density as it is existing and not an added amenity by the developer of the proposed site. Rentals do not have the same pride in their property as those who own their property, feels it is wrong to put a rental community in this location.
- Elaine Aukeman 5983 Elmwood Ct, is adamantly against the project and agreed with previous statements. Asked if the Commissioners walked the property and have seen the impact versus just looking at the site plans.
- Norma and Harold Pothoven 5991 Elmwood Court, no interest in any of the amenities that are being proposed. Concerned they will see the parking lots, not the view of the lake they have now. Many made comments and have written letters, having this meeting tonight has shown that they have ignored the views of the Elmwood community. The younger generation would not blend well with the existing community. Feels the Planning Commission disregarded the original PUD and the condos opposing to the project. This is not the place for the project. Commissioners will go back to their homes versus the condo residents having to look at this project if approved. This is a different atmosphere and the lighting of the parking lot would make the condos feel like it was Meijer. The atmosphere today is different than the past, there were no drugs, they did not have permission to carry guns. What would keep someone, a renter perhaps a young person who has a gun and maybe some night he might be suspicious about what goes on in the elderly project over there, think maybe the elderly have a lot of money and the person needs a drug fix. What would keep them from walking over to our dark area and looking in our windows and perhaps getting in? Perhaps robbing us or killing us? That is not out of the question. Look at what is going on in Grand Rapids. Asks Commissioners to realize that just because this proposed development looks nice it doesn't mean it will be a good project.
- Phil and Sharon Symko 6067 Elmwood Lake Drive, stressed that they are not just units they are people, similar to Bill Aukeman's statement. Felt Zoning Administrator did a good job of selling the project for Bosgraaf versus being neutral on the situation. The pickleball court would generate a lot of noise along with a dog park. The lake is a big concern, how many will walk in front of the condos to fish? Talking about right turn only coming out of building A, who would pay attention to the sign stating right turn only? Against this project and hopes the Planning Commission will listen and not go further with this development with all the issues brought up.
- Carol and Robert Wiegand 6173 North Elmwood Lake Dr, when they moved to Elmwood Lake Condos 7 years ago, they saw the community as safe and welcoming and on a lake. Decided to build their own condo and were told no one could build behind them and an assisted living facility would be built next door. Unhappy that this property could be turned into apartments and townhomes. Traffic that would be produced on Balsam Dr and within the community as well as the use of the pathways will interrupt the serenity of the current development. Do not look forward to all the issues that would come with the proposed development as well as their property values decreasing.
- Duke Warsen 5969 Elmwood Court, Dan Strikwerda explained the reasons he felt this should be a good project. Resident asked how many letters were written in opposition of the project? Around 40. The right turn only lane would not be followed if traffic was backed up, future resident of the proposed project would instead use the drives in the private

development.

- Randy and Lynn Roelofs 6036 Elmwood Circle, someone working for Hudsonville Schools told her you would not be able to get buses back into the complex let alone a fire truck. The bike storage is not needed there is nothing to accommodate it. Worried about the use of the pathway in relation to dogs being leashed and being picked up after properly. The beach with cabanas will be an issue with rats that have been around the lake. Concerned with the maintenance of the lake and why there is a need for a beach at the proposed development. Safety in the development? On site safety management should reduce crime, but this resident has spoken to police officers that have said they don't want the complex due to an increase of police calls, domestic disputes, noise, drugs. The condominium complex does not have this issue, check the records to see how many times the police have been called to the condo complex. This would be an issue with the community at large as well. This project was started as a single PUD, half was built, the other got delayed. This is the original PUD so the rules should not change from the original.
- Bill Sikkel Legal Counsel for the applicant with Sikkel and Associates, the proposed development has an easement that is binding and runs with the land that all roads in the development are able to be used not just the one strip of Elmwood Lake Dr. The intent is to use that strip rather than the whole of the private roads. It is horrific to hear about someone who would be a tenant in the proposed complex that these people will do drugs and be vagrants. Describing the tenants as criminals is wrong. Those who choose to rent are not going to destroy this community. The way which the development is proposed will be a fine addition to this community. There should be compassion to the tenants who want to live there.
- Brad Fowler with Mika Meyers, the easement agreement has good case law that says there should not be a greater burden on the existing property. The easement could get thrown out. Even the portion of the road that is being used on Elmwood Lake Dr would not be valid.
- Mike Bosgraaf with Bosgraaf Construction, the developer was willing to get rid of the right turn only lane but decided to keep it for proper traffic flow. Most of the residents will go out the main entrance way due to the flow of the complex.
- Bob DeVries 6037 Elmwood Lake Dr, with traffic it is right to say there are going to be 10-15 cars waiting to go out of the complex and the easement was made with the retirement home not the apartment complex. This is not only a legal issue but a morality issue. Can you now say the game has changed? There are many things that will happen once the project is done that isn't being thought of right now. Expressed not wanting to share the lake with the proposed apartment complex. If the project goes forward the condos will take the proposed project developer to court.
- Jim Holtsclaw 6020 Elmwood Circle, the overriding issue is that there is great opposition in this project. The conduction of the traffic study has only shown numbers, not someone having been immersed in traffic. Shocked at the fact that Bosgraaf did not present the project and the Zoning Administrator did. Resident was told the additional land would be used for a project like the one they live in now. Resident understood that the senior facility would be built but not an apartment complex. Willing to pay more to the HOA to prevent this project from happening.
- Rita Krug 6090 Elmwood Lake Drive, came from living at Ramblewood Apartments in Wyoming. Looked at many sites before settled in Elmwood Condos. Opposed to the plan,

agrees with all the residents at Elmwood Lake. Safety is a concern for her, she chose this condo development for the community of Hudsonville and the complex. Hope that Planning Commission are listening and hearing Elmwood Condos concerns.

- Bernie Grysen 5999 Elmwood Lake Drive, aware that there was an agreement with the developer from the original PUD and that they should cover half the maintenance of the property. Trespassers are a regular issue and there have been physical confrontations. They have set agreements, by-laws on lake usage. No motorized boats unless electric. Concern of people using any type of motor boats.
- Mike Bosgraaf with Bosgraaf Construction, Use of the lake. There is a restriction on the lake, they have the same restrictions as the condos as far as electric motors. If there isn't anything in place, they would happy to put something like that in place. The developers have no desire to allow residents to have motor boats. There would be an onsite manager to make sure abuse of the lake does not happen.
- Carol Hoffman 5936 Elmwood Lake Dr, fairly new residents. When they purchased, they were told the vacant land was proposed as assisted living or more condos. They would not have bought if they knew the proposed types of apartments were going in. Concerned about traffic coming into the complex as well as pedestrian access and visibility.
- Virgil Leatherman 6029 Elmwood Lake Dr, ask that the Planning Commission look at the density issues. Asked if there is a better traffic study.
- Dan Pohler 6101 North Elmwood lake Dr, agrees with the traffic issue and that a study is needed.
- George Marsh 5944 Elmwood Ct, agrees with everything that was talked about. To put a small city in this small piece of land is not right for the community. From the first meeting Dan Strikwerda has given the impression that he has already made the decision and this project is going to happen. If that is true why are residents writing all of these letters to the Commission? Until tonight (it was his understanding) there was no interaction between the residents and the proposed developer.

Hearing no others wishing to speak, Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Is Elmwood Condominiums age restricted? It is not age restricted.
- There is a lot of behind the scenes work that has gone on by Dan Strikwerda to make this development the best possible version it can be. There are not a lot of negative comments from him due to moving the developer toward a better product. His role is to specifically inform Planning Commissioners whether or not this ordinance and our plan. He was more in depth than normal due to his normal role but also respond to many criticisms against whether this development met our ordinance from their attorney. His remarks were intended to help the Commission and give assurance that the proposal on its own merit can be considered under law.
- The traffic with the right turn only on the entrance by building A. Is there an opportunity to make a loop that would then eliminate the concerns from the residents of the condo complex? This plan is already the 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> reiteration of the plan to have the access the way it is. The applicant felt that they still needed this entrance based on fire code and traffic flow. Or a crash gate at that location for the fire department to get through that drive.

- There are dumpsters at that loop as well so if that access is closed that would have to be considered.
- Landscaping along Elmwood Lake Drive. Should a wall be considered to separate the apartments from the condos? Or a hedge that would remain full in the winter?
- Safety concerns for pedestrians. Could there be signs or a pedestrian stop at the entrance of the complex? The applicant has no opposition to that happening.
- Sidewalk across from the townhomes could be an issue with parking in those driveways so it may not be needed and doesn't make sense. Could a sidewalk go across the street from the townhomes? The discussion would be for across the street from the townhomes not right in front of them.
- Patrick Waterman, there seem to be four common areas of opposition: This development does not comply with or local Zoning Ordinance or Master Plan; that this development will cause neighboring property values to decline; this development will cause excessive traffic hazards; and that this development will lead to an increase in crime in this area. When these points were first raised, we all agreed that we should consider them at face value as legitimate opposition. However, to my knowledge and in my professional opinion, I have been a City Manager for 11 years and a Professionally Certified Planner for 22 years. All of these items of opposition have either been contradicted, if not disproven by reputable people, sources and experts. This means that these specific areas of opposition should now be in my opinion, considered as illegitimate opposition. It would be entirely inappropriate, arbitrary, capricious and unlawful for us as a Planning Commission to reject what is considered a valid land use application based on illegitimate opposition. Instead, I believe we need to remain focused on what we determine to be the remaining legitimate areas of opposition, if any. Took offense to an opposition letter wrote that said "This Planning Commission has the duty to please the Hudsonville Community" which I interpreted in this instance to mean the residents of the Elmwood Lake Condominiums. It is clearly not our purpose or our duty to make decisions based on public sentiment or pressure, but rather to make decisions based on law and good planning. Our duty as Planning Commissioners is to uphold our zoning regulations and further our planning goals for the city. This indeed includes having the responsibility of protecting the public good in this community. So, the question becomes for us 'what public good would this project bring to our community?' and 'in what way would this project be detrimental to the public good?'. In my opinion the most significant public good it brings is filling the critical need for more housing opportunities in our city. Which has been stated numerous times and is also stated in our Master Plan and in our cities' Strategic Plan. I think the only detriment to the public good is that there is going to be an increase in traffic volume on Balsam Drive. But from what we understand about Balsam Drive and its current load is that it has the capacity to absorb that traffic.
- All of the resident letters have been read and received and taken into consideration. Many of the Commissioners stated they have been to the site. This included a comment about watching traffic in peak hours.
- Density question, clarification on what the density calculation is. Buildable area has been mentioned but the ordinance doesn't use buildable area. Then to exclude lake or water is an interpretation of a definition in the Zoning Ordinance. Historically only Right-of-Way has been taken out of the calculation. Nothing was found that said the lake had to be removed from the density calculation regarding the proposed development. The proposed

development has 30.2 acres and 156 units so about 5 units an acre. (The density is actually lower than the original PUD.) There is also a requirement of so many sq ft per unit type. An intent of a PUD is to preserve natural features as well. If these features were removed from the density calculation then developers would not want them in their projects.

- Tom Forshee asked each Commissioner to decide whether they found the evidence presented in the Zoning Administrators report supported or if they had parts that were not persuasive, along with why they are going to vote the way they will.
- Rhyse Altman, based on Dan's report he feels that it did a good job of covering the areas of concern, and the evidence presented is supported. Finds the project to be approvable.
- David Bendert, finds the evidence provided in the report inclusive and in favor of approving the project, addressing the concerns that we have heard and doing that in a compelling manner.
- David Nyitray, found it very compelling in the staff report about the reduction of deviations, found agreement that the proposed development meets zoning requirements and the portion that does not meet zoning is consistent with the underlying Imagine Hudsonville 2030 future land use designation. Also found that City Manager Patrick's analysis on which arguments are invalid versus valid in terms of crime and property value loss as attested to by the Sheriff as well as the City Assessor through the partnership with the county. Finds it approvable as well.
- Gary Raterink, likewise. He listened to all the comments, the letters, listened to and read the reasons why we think about this, and is at the point of being confident that we have been looking at this thoroughly. The phone calls I have received, the letters we've read we know that everybody is very emotionally involved in it all and we really do care about that. But this is to the point where the evidence for the Planning Commissioners that we have been presented with is in favor of approval.
- Jules Schmuker, with what Dan has prepared for us and the concerns that have been brought up by the community as well as the Planning Commission she believes that the studies that have been done for those arguing against it have satisfied her need for concern. She feels this an approvable project.
- Scott Staal, took a lot of time looking at Mika Meyers arguments, talking with Dan a little further for further explanations. Also spending a lot of time in our zoning ordinance and our master plan just going back and forth looking at all the arguments and from my point of view the purposes of the PUD which Dan spelled out from the ordinances, he explained it well that we are meeting those purposes. The zoning ordinance section 11-3 which includes the permitted uses also spells out the reasons why this project meets those requirements. Then the density calculations which with speaking with Dan and they seem consistent with what has been done in the past, I see no reason to doubt that those density calculations are acceptable the way he is doing them. I know there is obviously a lot of emotions in these decisions but from these facts what I am looking at this is something that we can accept.
- Skip VanDenBerg, he concurs with the statements made by Commissioner Nyitray and finds this a supportable project.
- Patrick Waterman, he reiterates his previous comments on the four main areas of opposition. We are not in a position where we are trying to push or ask for this development. We are trying to consider a development that is being asked by the owner

of the property. We all as property owners have inherent rights and those rights include to develop and do things with your land. We are being asked as a commission to consider that. Would we consider voting on the retirement center if it was in front of us, absolutely. But we are being asked to consider another development and in conjunction with our own rules and regulations and that is our decision tonight. Again, my main question is traffic as it relates to the interaction with Balsam Dr. We were the ones who asked for a left turn lane analysis knowing that there may become an issue in backing up Balsam Drive, the city is also looking at reconfiguring the lanes on Balsam Drive to provide a center turn lane as is found to the north by the bridge. All of that will be taken into consideration with traffic as far as we know based on the volumes that are going to be absorbed on Balsam Drive and I see no reason to hold up or reject this development as it is currently proposed.

- Sidewalk by the townhomes? Do we want to add that into the motion to add sidewalk across the road from the townhomes?
- The right turn only lane. There is the ability of the developer to maintain that drive if it went to gravel or gated. The access for the garbage would be nice but something else could be figured out. Having the gate would be sufficient.
- Is there a concern having that many units with only a single entrance? Secondary access isn't totally necessary, but the looping is always nice.
- Decorative landscaping to divide off the two properties along Elmwood Lake Dr with a hedge or wall? Coniferous trees would be an option to keep more blockage but doesn't fully block the view.
- Some of the evergreen style trees could be shifted into that area along with a berm to make that edge of the complex have more of a buffer.
- Consider a gate for the emergency vehicles at the driveway by building A.

A motion was made by Schmuker, with support by Altman, to approve the Statement of Conclusions for the 3101 Elmwood Formal Preliminary PUD in accordance with Section 11.08 E. and the Statement of Findings and Recommendations for the Informal Final PUD in accordance with Section 11-11 B both from the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance and incorporating the findings and discussion of this Planning Commission Report. This approval is based on finding that the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance standards have been affirmatively met with the frontage deviation listed and the following conditions:

1. The second parcel where the townhomes are located will need to be combined so there is one parcel in Hudsonville for this development. The master deed for the original retirement building will need to be dissolved to combine the two lots that make up the development property.
2. Utility easements will be required to enable access to the water infrastructure.
3. Staff have the opportunity to work with the developer on reevaluating the north driveway design to determine if it addresses the concerns that were addressed tonight.
4. Incorporate the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program.
5. One of the accessible parking spaces needs to be van accessible.
6. Provide the mailbox locations.
7. Add an improvement to the dog park fence such as vinyl wrap.

8. Provide dog park access from the private sidewalk.
9. Add more sidewalk across the roadway from the townhomes where it is lacking including pedestrian crosswalks where they are lacking.
10. Add traffic control signage where Elmwood Lake Drive terminates into Elmwood Park Drive.
11. Provide an easement for the portion of the pathway that will allow public use.
12. Provide a performance bond for a possible sidewalk extension to south property line that will remain in effect for 5-years from Final PUD approval.
13. Provide a performance bond with city engineer approval for a left turn lane as part of phase II. The funds will either be used to expand Balsam Drive to allow for a turn lane or to implement a road diet that includes the turn lane.
14. Provide a keybox on the back of the entry sign along with a master key.
15. Provide detail where it is missing from the landscape plan.
16. Remove the driveway that accesses the adjacent commercial lot.
17. Staff have the opportunity to work with the developer on reevaluating the traffic study to determine if it addresses the concerns that were addressed tonight.
18. Applicant will work with city staff to provide adequate landscaping buffering and screening along Elmwood Lake Dr.

Along with the following statement “The Planning Commission finds that the project is in compliance with the regulations contained in article 11 of the ordinance, with particular emphasis on adequate demonstration of definite benefit and consistency with the City of Hudsonville Master Plan.”

A public hearing for the Final PUD Amendment is scheduled for **February 3, 2021**.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Northrup)

A motion was made by Waterman, with support by Altman to allow Mayor Northrup back in the diet.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

## **5. Election of Officers**

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Altman, to appoint Charles VanDenBerg as Chair  
Yeas 8, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (VanDenBerg)

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Bendert, to appoint Jules Schmuker as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Schmuker)

## **6. 2020 Planning Commission Annual Report**

The report was available for the commissioners and can be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting.

## **7. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items) - none**

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Altman, to adjourn at 12:27 a.m.  
Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sarah Steffens  
Planning / Zoning Assistant