

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE
Planning Commission Minutes**

March 16th, 2022

Approved April 20th, 2022

**5284 32nd Avenue – Ryan Aukeman – Special Use Permit
Draft Zoning Ordinance Review**

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

Present: Altman, Bendert, Brandsen, Kamp, Northrup, Schmuker, Staal, VanDenBerg, Waterman

Absent: None

Staff Present: Steffens, Strikwerda

PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items) – None

1. A motion was made by Brandsen, with support by Altman, to approve the minutes of the February 16th, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

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

Ryan Aukeman of 5284 32nd Avenue presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

This is a follow-up request from Ryan Aukeman to allow 1' of additional height for an accessory building so it can be 15' instead of 14' for the purpose of having 12' walls. He received Special Use Permit approval to construct an 864 s.f. accessory building where he was permitted 459 s.f. based on the ground floor area of his house. The lot is large enough to allow an 864 s.f. accessory building. He also received a variance to allow placement in his front yard 10' from the property lines since his rear yard is floodway, along with the inability to add to the attached garage.

When the Planning Commission approved his Special Use Permit the following conditions were included:

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

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Wall Height/Roof Pitch.

- 4 options were shown to the Planning Commission from Ryan Aukeman's designer. One option allows the building height to match the house but the roof pitch of 4/12 does not match the house.
- The applicant prefers the option that has a 6/12 roof pitch to match his house as long as an overhead garage door system would work. The shingles will also last longer.
- The Commission also prefers the 6/12 roof pitch.
- Visually this building wouldn't really been seen from 32nd and three of the neighbors directly impacted by the building have expressed report.
- Draft Zoning Ordinance.
 - Is this decision based on scale of building vs the use of the building? What is the intent of the ordinance? The scale of the building is what the ordinance is looking to keep in check. In the draft zoning ordinance, the wall height restriction is in place in order to keep the scale in check as a taller wall is more noticeable than a steeper pitch roof.
 - For this specific case the draft zoning ordinance would allow a taller height in the roof pitch and if the building would be 1 s.f. larger than the wall height would meet the draft as well.
- Neighbor Comments.
 - Three neighbors surrounding the applicant gave written comment that they were fine with the request.
 - The neighbor to the north has a larger accessory building as well. They were noticed about this meeting and did not give the city any comments.
- Overhead Door System.
 - An overhead garage door system needs 10-12" above the door to work so keeping that in mind for the applicant's sake.
 - They may make a 10 ½' door to allow for the camper to fit within the garage.

A motion was made by Bendert, with support by Schmuker, to approve a Special Use Permit for Ryan Aukeman of 5284 32nd Ave to allow for an accessory building height of 15 feet where 14 feet is permitted by right in accordance with section 4-3 C. 1 of the City of Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance. This approval is based on the finding that all of the General Standards 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 are met for approval with the following condition:

1. The siding shall be a color consistent with the house.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

3. Draft Zoning Ordinance Review

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Overall Ordinance
 - Shows developers that there is a minimum level that we will accept that is at a good architectural level. This helps those developers to make sure their investment is secure.
 - Looking through this ordinance is a lot more comprehensive for a resident or developer and easier to work through for finding answers themselves versus coming to the department.
- Table 1.03.01
 - Building type and façade line in the table could be split in two to require the façade to be updated and the building type (setbacks, etc) as separate requirements.
 - Changes in landscaping should be brought into compliance when any change is done.
 - The location would matter. Something along 37th Avenue versus the downtown core should have different requirements.
 - 37th Avenue Area Analysis.
 - As long as the gas station on 37th stays a gas station, who sets the architecture standards for that building? Corporate would, the franchise. The city makes the building comply to their standards versus letting corporate keep the chain façade the same.
 - This area is in a form-based district. So, they would be able to do small façade upgrades but if they want to add over 50% to their building then they would have to conform more strictly to our ordinances.
 - Does renovating the entire building fall within the 50% or is it just when one wall is changed up to 50%? It is the front wall. If the building was on a corner both the front wall and the secondary wall would have to come into compliance.
 - If someone built an addition off of the back of the building, would they have to comply to the chart? In order to expand by 50%, they would have to improve the entire façade versus just the back wall. So why wouldn't they move locations versus doing the addition?
 - Building placement and height. If they expand over 50% does the entire building need to come into compliance or just the addition? The way it is written now the building as a whole would have to come into compliance.
- Draft Zoning Map
 - HDR-A parcel off of Balsam Drive
 - Multi-family residential and storage units have been discussed. There was not a favorable reaction to a storage facility.
 - Possible sports complex to alleviate the soccer/baseball fields from Port Sheldon Sports Complex?
 - TRN?
 - The soils are not great so development is tricky.
 - MDR parcel from New Holland to Barry.

- The parcel is possibly looking to be a higher density overall, which would need to meet master plan rezoning.
- MDR also allows single family just like LDR. There is talk that MDR isn't high enough density from interested developers.
- Is there consideration for Highland Drive to just not be built? No one has gotten that far but the plan for a long time has been for Highland Drive to be built.
- If there is a way to address this property with zoning to still allow for housing and Highland Drive to go through that would be a win for the development within the city.
- TRN may be the answer to allowing housing at a denser scale and still have Highland Drive go through.
- The front porch style within TRN fosters a community to where you interact with each other.
- Highland Drive Parcel zoned HC.
 - The lot off of Highland Drive and 32nd behind Tommy's may be a good zone for TRN versus the Highway Commercial Zone that it is already in.
 - The highway commercial would be challenging to change to residential.
 - Changing this land to industrial would be a better option.
- Housing.
 - There is great concern for missing middle housing. There is a large lack of attainable housing. Having a mix of housing all together is an opportunity for the city.
 - There is going to be quite a healthy balance of apartments in the city due to all of the projects recently approved and proposed.

4. Adjournment

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Bendert, to adjourn at 8:52 pm.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted,
Sarah Steffens
Planning / Zoning Assistant