CITY OF HUDSONVILLE Planning Commission Minutes

April 20th, 2022

Approved May 18th, 2022

3331 Highland Drive – Discussion 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 Staal, with support by Bendert, to approve the minutes of the March 16th, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

2. 3331 Highland Drive – Discussion

The staff report was presented.

This is a proposal for affordable housing units on the vacant Meijer property near the northwest corner of 32nd Avenue and Highland Drive.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Potential Exterior Concepts.
 - O Some of these looks to have a better feel that matches a more of a urban residential look, while others feel more monotonous and like institutional housing.
- Demographic.
 - The focus is \$13-32 an hour, 27k 66k per year. Few families. Seeing more single individuals 25-34 years old.
- Unit Type.
 - o 1 and 2 bedrooms with a few 3 bedrooms. Will entertain studios, lender doesn't prefer them.
- Financial.
 - O Workforce 2-bedroom rate: \$635 Market Rate: \$1525
 - O Subsidized is getting money from the government every month as a property owner. This is a rental regulation rate with a low-income taxing credit. 50% of the

- property has to qualify for affordable. If income grows too high then renters would have to move out of the buildings if this was subsidized. With market rate allowed to exist in the property then people can stay and have their apartment changed to market rate and open up another unit for the rent regulation.
- MSHDA had issues with this property specifically 3-4 years ago, the reason seems to be that the developer in the past hadn't had experience beforehand. It was noted that there was issue with the location of the site in a more industrial area. Now there seems to just be a greater need to add to housing stock with a large development like this (200 units).

Rezoning.

- The rezoning would be from HC (Highway Commercial) to HDR (High Density Residential). The vote for rezoning is a recommendation to the City Commission from the Planning Commission and the City Commission votes to rezone. There may also be a Master Plan map amendment as this is master planned HC (Highway Commercial).
- O Could see with the proximity to the highway this working well for the Industrial zone district if a rezoning is going to be considered. The industrial development just west (fusion properties on S Buttermilk Ct) is not fully filled out yet (the second phase is in process) but there is already interest from major industry.

• Developer Comments.

- Developer sees this project as a compliment to the downtown. The residents would come and use the downtown. This offers more density for the city in general and allows for more affordable housing.
- Developer would like to bring this forward as a PUD as it holds them to a higher standard.

• Site Specific Comments.

- 200 units in this specific development are proposed. 300 units throughout the city are in development.
- o Is the proposed use residential only? Currently yes. But the developer is open to adding commercial aspects.
- The Tommy's Carwash building on 32nd Ave. Cut off this property to have direct access from 32nd Ave versus only access from Highland Drive.
- The main driveway is planned to be off Highland drive with a smaller access from 32^{nd} Ave. The position of the driveways on 32^{nd} is flexible.

• Other potential locations for proposed project.

The other vacant land in the city that is already zoned residential has soil issues so
the developer isn't interested in that land due to that. MSHDA has problems with
environmental issues and funding.

• Density.

 Would like to see a variety of different types of housing that are not being shown on this plan. This feels more like a park and stay development rather than a pocket

- neighborhood. Step up density as the site gets closer to the industrial parcels on Highland Drive.
- Once all of the remaining vacant land is developed in the city then retrofitting is going to be taking place. The city would be looking for a mixture of housing in the future to better bring better density and variety, so why not look for it now.
- A variety of building types is something the developer is interested in but the cost is potentially an issue.

• Against Rezoning.

- Taking away from the downtown with all the projects that are currently happening.
- o Being one of the last large industrial opportunities in the city, it needs to remain commercial.
- The city is keeping commercial south of New Holland, the same applies, housing needs to be kept to the north.
- There is clearly a need for affordable housing in the area. But this is one of the last industrial sites in the city. If this is truly the last buildable spot in the city according to the developer than this sites use is very important.
- o To service the city manufacturing seems to be the best fit.

• For/Consider Rezoning.

Need the workforce housing to populate our economy that lives in the community, but does it all need to be rentals? If this was to be residential, it would need to be mixed use or else it doesn't work. This lot doesn't have environmental issues so it is valuable to be residential.

Final Comments.

- The city is building close to 300 apartment units currently. There is not an idea of how quickly these approved units will fill up. If the city builds too much of one thing too fast it could be dangerous.
- There is no way to control preference of who would be living in the proposed units or for where they would be working. It cannot be assumed that the residents in the proposed project will work in Hudsonville.
- Oconsider if this property is going to be able to be maintained by the amount of rent that is brought in. Or will there not be enough money to keep the quality of the property high?

3. Draft Zoning Ordinance Review

Based on last month's discussion:

Table 1.03.01 (p 1.9).

• The second last row was split into two rows for Building Type and Building Façade. The 'x' was removed for 50% and above façade remodel for Building Type, otherwise the building would need to meet setbacks when a building is being improved. This will allow focus on the façade requirements versus being forced to relocate a building which would cause property owners not to do building improvements.

- An asterisk comment was added for the heading "Building Footprint Expansion" with the comment: "The requirements only apply to an expansion that impacts the primary front of the building and site. The focus of the building and site expansion improvements include the area directly in front of the expansion." This enables building additions without an entire building or site needing to comply with standards. Only the new part needs to be compliant. It also allows for some flexibility for site specific criteria.
- The 'x' was removed for building height under building footprint expansion since this may be an unreasonable request as it relates to the existing structure.

Zoning Map:

It is recommended to keep the zoning as currently exists on the following properties and to review the land use designation when the Master Plan is updated.

- The vacant property east of Balsam Drive. It was recommended that this should be zoned TRN to promote more flexible design on poor soils.
- The vacant property along the proposed Highland Drive corridor north of New Holland Street. It was recommended that this should be zoned TRN to enable higher density higher quality development that will enable the Highland Drive extension to be constructed.
- The vacant property owned by Meijer northwest of Highland Drive and 32nd Avenue. It was recommended that this should be zoned Ind-G since the 32nd Avenue frontage is gone and there is a lack of industrial property.
- 3648 New Holland Street Vacant 10 acres going south from New Holland between the Creek View neighborhood and the industrial park. It was mentioned that this parcel maybe could be TRN as well.

The following discussion took place with Planning Commissioners:

- Indoor Sports Court Discussion.
 - The traffic for this type of use is a quick turnaround. The use is there for an hour or two and then they move on.
 - o This use was interested in the Highland Drive property from the earlier discussion or the vacant HDR land on Balsam Drive.
 - Could this use be on the rear of the property to keep the primary land available?
 - The scale of the building would be more industrial and be a better fit on Highland Drive.
 - Spot zoning for a use like this would be a concern on the Balsam Drive Property.

• Rezoning.

- If we are rezoning the Highland Drive property to Industrial then the Life EMS property should be changed to Industrial too.
- The library parking lot could be sold off to become two homes. So that should be zoned to be MDR.
- The booster station on 32nd Ave is no longer needed. So, rezoning that would be an option to do infill on the site. Possibly office/service?

- Matrix Tables.
 - Roadside stands.
 - As long as there is language to cover if there would be issues with this use then it doesn't need to be specifically listed.
 - o Animal Services outdoor run.
 - Small run for vet clinics to let dogs go outside but not stay outside.
 Could see an issue with noise. Could there be language where they cannot be unattended.
 - o Adult foster care.
 - This use will be added to the matrix tables as it was seen in neighboring communities and felt like a good fit.
 - Senior Housing.
 - Considering amending our Nursing Home language to be senior housing. This is also for independent living and assisted living.
- Building Type Standards.
 - Add a standard that the secondary wall on a corner would also need to be updated along with the primary wall.
 - Make Harvey Street and the streets around the village green both primary streets.
- Planning on a special meeting for ordinance review on Wednesday May 4th, 2022 at 7pm.

4. Adjournment

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Bendert, to adjourn at 8:44 pm.

Yeas 9, Nays 0

Respectfully Submitted, Sarah Steffens Planning / Zoning Assistant