

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE
Planning Commission Minutes**

February 17th, 2021

(Draft)

5284 32nd Avenue – Ryan Aukeman – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing

6245 Balsam Drive – Balsam Meadows – Informal Preliminary PUD Amendment

Presentation of Hudsonville High School improvements including a fieldhouse and building connection

Chairman VanDenBerg called the meeting to order at 7:04 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 Bendert, with support by Staal, to approve the minutes of the February 3rd, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

2. 5284 32nd Avenue – Ryan Aukeman – Special Use Permit – Public Hearing

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

The staff report was presented.

This request is for a 30' x 40' accessory building, which is 1,200 s.f. where 459 s.f. is permitted by right. This would result in a total of 1,776 s.f. of accessory space since there is a 576 s.f. attached garage. This is a unique parcel, being a flag lot. A couple homes were constructed on the property behind the homes that front 32nd Avenue. Ryan Aukeman's lot being about 1 ¼ acres. Normally on a lot of this size, a total of 1,536 s.f. of accessory space is permitted by right. This includes attached and detached storage space. On a lot of that size the largest accessory building size permitted by right is 864 s.f. One other limiting factor for what is permitted by right is that there cannot be more accessory space than the ground floor area of the house, which is 1,029 s.f. If it were more of a

sprawling ranch versus a 2-story he could have potentially been permitted by right an 864 s.f. building. The reason for this requirement is the intent of making sure the lot remains looking residential. Where it is a house with garage versus a property with a lot of garage with some house.

Public comment is as follows:

- Peter Martin of 5280 32nd Avenue (neighbor to the south) says he is fine with the accessory building.

Chairman VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Was there adequate notification to the public? Yes, the public was noticed and there were a few comments from neighbors stating they are fine with the building.
- Is this something that could be approved in this meeting including the height? It depends on the size that is approved. Some sizes would look better with a greater height.
- The building elevation presented is a concept. It is not to scale of what is being asked for at this meeting. It is intended to show that the aesthetics would match the house. The camper being stored within the building is smaller but the door will be around 10-12' in height depending on the gable and roof pitch. Applicant would like to have two garage doors on south facing wall then a walk-in door on the east facing wall and anticipates one window per wall. Perhaps a smaller shed door as well for a lawn mower.
- Is the land sloped? Where the garage would be is the flattest portion of the lot.
- Was the setback of 10' from the lot line intended to allow access to the easement to the north for future development? The additional setback depth was done to keep additional spacing from the lot lines for the surrounding neighbors. There are also trees that the applicant wanted to make sure wouldn't grow into the garage.
- Is this going to be a pole built building or a traditional garage? Likely pole built.
- Is there going to be recreation space above the garage based on the window in the building elevation? There isn't an intention for a loft due to needing the height for a camper so at least half the space would need to remain open above.
- There wouldn't be attic trusses there may be cathedral trusses to help with the height.
- Due to the ground floor area of the house, the applicant is only permitted another 459 s.f. If he had a ranch house with all square footage on the ground floor, the applicant would have been able to have 864 sq ft for an accessory building.
- Due to the size of the ground floor, allowing 24' by 36' wouldn't be out of line with the area but 30' by 40' is quite large compared to the surrounding buildings.
- Setting precedence for larger out buildings isn't great. We are considering allowing the applicant to have more square footage than what is allowed on his lot by going against the ordinance. We would set a bad precedence to approve the requested 30' by 40' but the logic of allowing the applicant 864 sq ft would be valid due to the lot size.
- If we were to approve the 864 sq ft building the applicant still might not be able to get the height that he is looking for, if he cannot get an adequate height with our standard of 14' he would have to come back and get a height variance. That should be taken into consideration when approving the square footage today.
- Encourage applicant to go with a scissor truss to get the maximum height needed

without coming back to the Planning Commission next month.

- A size of around 576 s.f. looks in line with the neighborhood and a larger size seems like it would set too large of a precedence for the neighborhood. If the applicant had a larger size home, he would be allowed 864 sq ft but because his homes ground floor area is smaller on his larger lot, he isn't able to get to the 864 sq ft. The surrounding lots have 576 s.f. because that is what their lot size and ground floor area allow.
- The house stands a lot taller than the garage due to the way the lot is laid out. The garage would not look as large as the house does.
- The view from the easement walkway to the south of the property does make the house look large. This lot is unlike any other in the area because of the easement past the home and through property. Wouldn't encourage the sprawl of the ranch style on lots to get larger accessory buildings since that wouldn't have allowed the walkway to be in place. Sees that the house is plenty large enough to justify a larger accessory building.
- The aesthetics of the building elevation are very nice. The size of 30' by 40' building would be too large to be comfortable approving. Comfortable with approving the 864 s.f. due to the size of the house and lot. Encouraged by windows on every wall, it makes it feel more like a residential building than a business.
- Supporting the 576 s.f. is arbitrary because it is a round number and still exceeds the maximum allowed square footage allowed of 459 s.f..

A motion was made by Waterman, with support by Raterink, to approve a Special Use Permit for 5284 32nd Avenue for an 864 s.f. detached accessory building for a total of 1,440 s.f. of accessory space where 1,029 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 with the following conditions:

1. The siding shall be a color consistent with the house.
2. Applicant makes every effort to limit roof height to applicable standards.

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

3. 6245 Balsam Drive – Balsam Meadows – Informal Preliminary PUD Amendment

Todd Stuive from Exxel Engineering presented the request and Mark Pruim from Ledger Builders was present.

The staff report was presented.

This request is for a 31-unit residential site condominium project.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- The sports complex does not have a water or sewer connection. If that is true can we require the utilities be capable of a tap in if the complex would want to do so. It has been mentioned to the applicant to talk to the sport complex about that opportunity. The utility easement would be extended to the property line then it would be up to the sports complex to connect.

- The plan is to loop the water to Balsam Drive, but an easement could not be located so far.
- There will be 186 trips out of the property. Balsam Drive can handle the traffic from this development. It is a collector street. There is a turn lane at the entrance. The commission wants due diligence to make sure questions are answered.
- The main question would be if a left turn lane is needed, but there is already one here. Then would this project push Balsam Drive's level of service to need a widening? Most likely not but we can ask engineers.
- Would like to see a "T" or cul-de-sac at Starling Drive terminus so vehicles can turn around. Providing turnaround would cause issue for the two end units on Starling. The applicant would change the design before adding the turnaround. Fire code doesn't require a turnaround. There is good internal access with the loop. Avoiding people turning around in unit 13 driveway would be nice but understand the applicant's comments.
- Access to the sports complex. Would the applicant consider other points of access? The road in the sports complex is jammed with cars on busy days and putting pedestrian access right there may be dangerous to the pedestrians without widening the sport complex road or adding a sidewalk on. Would they consider moving it to between units 17 and 18? That way it comes out in the fields instead of onto the road. Applicant is open to that and still need to contact the complex anyways so they will look into it.
- Are the extra parking spaces the applicant shows required? The street looks to be wide enough for on street parking and the spaces impact the sidewalk. They aren't required in this development but they are generally preferred. It can be considered for elimination.
- Would like to still see sidewalk remain where proposed as well as added somewhere else.
- What does the lighting look like? The pole locations are shown but other information has not been provided yet.
- The spacing between the buildings, being closer together than usual. The minimum for habitable dwelling is 10' so having them closer at the 15' wouldn't be an issue for fire spreading. Benefit if allows condos to be detached instead of duplexes.
- Is applicant locked on this site plan? The three car garages may be in high demand so wondering if they would come back for edits? If they are in high demand early on the applicant may come back and ask for edits.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Raterink, to approve the Statement of Findings and Recommendations for 6245 Balsam Drive Informal Preliminary PUD in accordance with Section 11-8 E from the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance. This proposed development promotes density done well. All of the units will have an aging-in-place design that includes a zero step, which allows people to age in place for longer than traditional homes. No additional studies are needed. Although, traffic will need to be discussed later. A public hearing will be scheduled to take place on March 17, 2021.

This plan meets the regulations as set forth with proposed deviation as presented along with the following recommended condition:

1. Provide a description of the natural and man-made features. This would describe the intent to protect the existing landscaping on the property, including around the perimeter where possible.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

4. Presentation of Hudsonville High School improvements including a fieldhouse and building connection

The project was presented by Doug VanderJagt the Superintendent of Hudsonville Public Schools, Bryce DeYoung from OAK, Matt Heidloff and Molly Timmer from GMB were present along with Pat Briggs the Assistant Superintendent of finance for Hudsonville Public Schools.

This presentation includes the addition of a fieldhouse and a connection between the freshman building and the rest of Hudsonville High School.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- What happened with the bike path placement? It remains where planned.
- WCET will remain on the property. At this point it does not need to move but they are looking at where it might be if they need to move it.
- South Elementary does not have any changes planned. Park Elementary will get an overhaul but not until after the 5th graders are moved to the grade 5-6 building. A gymnasium will be added along with new classrooms to fit standard classroom sizes.
- Throughout the district there will be additional monument signs installed for buildings that do not have them.
- Year away from designs for Park Elementary, renovations will not start until 2024.
- The greenhouse at the high school now will be moved and put in a good place for angles with the sun and everything needed.
- The curb cut that is being kept near the existing church. Is that across from a driveway? This curb will be slightly different than the current church curb cut. There will be a traffic study done to determine traffic light need.
- There will be a traffic analysis to assess a left-turn lane for Balsam Drive. The City's CIP has a proposal for a left turn lane for 32nd Avenue all the way down to New Holland Street as well. Would be good to have discussion with the school to coordinate projects.
- Façade updates for the existing high school building along 32nd? It will be somewhat minor with the updates for a robotics center and then trying to cover up some of the air conditioning units as well. If there is money left, they want to clean up the area along 32nd Avenue and make it look nice.

5. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Altman, to adjourn at 8:58pm.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted,
Sarah Steffens
Planning / Zoning Assistant