

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**

September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021

Approved October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021

**3700 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef – Interpretation**  
**4450 South Buttermilk Court – Fusion Properties – Informal Final PUD**

Chairman VanDenBerg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

Absent: None

**PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items)** – There is a City Commission vacancy so if any Planning Commissioners have an idea of someone for the position who is from Ward 2 reach out.

1. A motion was made by Bendert, with support by Raterink, to approve the minutes of the August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

**2. 3700 Van Buren Street – West Michigan Beef - Interpretation**

Don Vander Boon of West Michigan Beef and Mark Scobell of Dan Vos Construction presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

The approved West Michigan Beef site plan has been adjusted such that Planning Commission input is being sought as to whether a Site Plan Amendment should be filed. It is their intent to keep the main part of the red barn on their site and relocate it to the northeast corner of the property along Chicago Drive. The approved plan had this building removed. The other changes include a reduced size of the main building from 75,790 s.f. to 70,433 s.f. an adjustment to the parking lot and redistributed the stormwater so there is some detention on the east side of the site.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Approving it administratively makes sense since it is a small change.
- Would fire code have to be enforced if the building was moved? Looking to do the rehabilitation code for the move. Will do what is required code-wise to meet state and local regulations.
- This is a fully approved plan from January 2021. Main reason applicant is here is to keep the barn as it is a change that could either be approved administratively or by a site plan

amendment.

- Preserving the white barn on the site already, now with the red barn being saved it will make the site look more agricultural.
- Want to make sure that the use of the red barn would be for West Michigan Beef versus renting for commercial storage. The current use is for hay, trailer storage and boxes. Applicant does not intend to rent it out for storage or commercial rental.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Raterink, to authorize administrative approval of 3007 Van Buren Street West Michigan Beef moving of the barn with the following conditions:

1. Not for additional commercial use outside of West Michigan Beef.
2. Review fire protection systems as required.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

### **3. 4450 South Buttermilk Court – Fusion Properties – Informal Final PUD**

Doug Gulker, Fusion Properties was present and Todd Stuive from Exxel Engineering presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

The entire property has preliminary PUD approval. This is the informal final PUD review for the second phase for buildings D and E. This review is in preparation for the final PUD public hearing. Construction will be based on market demand. The changes from the preliminary PUD include the number of buildings in phase two changing from one building at 185,500 s.f. to two buildings, buildings totaling 180,00 s.f. There would be two driveways instead of one, 185 parking spaces instead of 234 and 12 adjacent parking spaces to the west lot line instead of 86. The height would also decrease from 42ft 3 inches to 30ft.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- There doesn't seem to be a need currently for large fans but that will be discussed on a case-by-case basis.
- Public notice will take place for the formal final meeting in October.
- Will long term trailer parking take place? No there are no trailer stalls.
- Solid waste stations. CMU would be the enclosure material? The existing are metal. On the plan they are masonry and there is a row of junipers behind that. The masonry doesn't get as beat up as a metal one does.
- AC Cooling Units. Originally on building B they were on the west side of the building now they are on the interior of the parking lot. Is the location of the AC units on the additional buildings going to be specified? Have not yet, would like to figure out space to have the AC units and equipment to be on one side of the buildings but prefer not to have them on the residential side.
- Traffic Noise. The previous plan kept truck traffic away from the residences. The truck dock is a lot closer and so are the dumpsters. It will bring more noise closer to the residents. The

height being less is helpful.

- Fence Heights. The fence by the parking lot is 6ft the fence on the berm is also 6 ft.
- Lighting. The lighting on the west side of the building will be the same style as the lighting on the current buildings and it is directed downward.
- Is there an elevation change between the driveway on the west side and the internal parking lot? The elevations are very similar between the spaces.
- Screening. The berm ranges from 13ft to 4 ft relative to the driveway on the site, the berm at its minimum for the houses is 8 ft. The screening for the residential homes seems substantial.
- Security. The concern of the west driveway being separated from the buildings because of the fence is addressed by lighting. Based on the lighting plan the wall packs will be 20 ft tall and directed downward.
- Lighting toward residential. Where the homes are at the lower elevation compared to the site, will the homes be able to see the lighting? Could the lighting on the back of the buildings on the west side be lowered so the residents wouldn't have a glare in their backyards?
- A site section was recommended in relation to the elevation of the lights to the berm to where the residences are located.
- Utility Boxes. There are no plans to cover up the junction boxes or utility boxes with landscaping. The city does not landscape around these items. With this project it can be recommended to landscape around those.
- Buffering. The applicant is trying to do what he can with landscaping and berms to buffer the residents. But there is an industrial district next to residential. The changes to 2 buildings versus 1 are because the call for rental industrial space is around the 40-50 k s.f. range versus a single 200 k s.f. building.
- Parking. The extra parking lot next to building E lends itself better to come off of the other parking areas versus having its own driveway as it did in the preliminary plan.

A motion was made by Altman, with support by Northup, to approve the Statement of Findings and Recommendations for South Buttermilk Court Final PUD at 4450 South Buttermilk Court. This approval is based on the finding that the informal final PUD standards from Section 11-11 B of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met and include the comments and deviations from this report with the following conditions:

1. Semi-trucks are not permitted west of building "D".
2. Additional parking spaces will be required where a need is evident due to vehicles parking outside of permitted parking spaces.
3. The freestanding signs need to be ground mounted.
4. Easements are required for the detention pond and utilities.
5. The utility design requires city engineer approval.
6. Provide a copy of the required utility easements.
7. The sidewalk needs to be 6" thick through the new driveway.
8. A shared parking agreement to be recorded is required for the shared parking area south of South Buttermilk Court.
9. Provide an additional tree type along the residential buffer.

10. Add an additional section of brick and windows on the east wall of building D.
11. Provide the spacing calculations for the new driveway.
12. Change the exit radius to 20' for the new driveway.
13. Need a site section or diagram showing the visual impact from construction of building E to the nearest neighbor to the west.
14. Provide a site section through building E documenting lighting and berm conditions to nearest home to the west.

There will be a public hearing on October 20, 2021.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

#### **4. Discussion**

- Hotel building from the 4450 South Buttermilk Court site plan was discussed.

#### **5. Adjournment**

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Raterink, to adjourn at 8:11 pm.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted,  
Sarah Steffens  
Planning / Zoning Assistant