

CITY OF HUDSONVILLE
Planning Commission Minutes

July 20th, 2022

Approved August 17th, 2022

3232 Central Blvd – Hudsonville Vision – Formal PUD Amendment
3510 Chicago Drive – Jelsema Veterinarian – Building Expansion Discussion
Draft Zoning Ordinance Review

Vice Chair Schmuker called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

Absent: VanDenBerg

Staff Present: Steffens, Strikwerda

PUBLIC COMMENTS (Non agenda items) – None

1. A motion was made by Waterman, with support by Bendert, to approve the minutes of the June 22nd, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Absent 1 (VanDenBerg)

2. 3232 Central Blvd – Hudsonville Vision – Formal PUD Amendment

Vice Chair Schmuker opened the public hearing.

Doug Stalsonburg with Exxel Engineering presented the request.

The staff report was presented.

Hudsonville Vision, 3232 Central Blvd, has submitted a PUD Amendment for a 756 s.f. building addition to the rear of their existing building.

Steve Fifer 3235 Kelly Street was present with resident comments.

- Fence. Question about the maintenance of the fence to the south of the vision center on his northern property line. He has had to take care of it in the past when the support posts would be damaged from people running into the fence. That is taken care of through city code and ordinances. The Planning and Zoning Director will reach out to the property owner to discuss. A potential solution would be to install bumpers to keep cars from hitting the fence.
- Lease Agreement. What would the lease would look like if the home to the east sold or it was broken? The lease agreement will stay in place with the land, the vision center will have first right of refusal to purchase it but otherwise it would stay with the land. The vision

center could release the easement if other parking was found, but not if the business needed the parking.

Vice Chair Schmuker closed the public hearing.

The following discussion took place with Commissioners:

- Is the agreement for parking an easement or a lease agreement? The document will be reviewed to determine which type it is. It was reviewed by the attorney.
- Street trees.
 - The powerlines that are in the way are for telecommunications versus the electrical power. Planting trees underneath the telecom would be ok if they were shorter trees. Would like to see the city's objective of street tree met versus avoiding the lines. If a tree that would max out height wise at the telecom lines, then that would help to avoid issues in the future and would meet the requirements of consumers energy for future growth and trimming. Would be good as well to find a type that then would be used in the future along the streets as well. The concern of the proposed shrub like tree could be visibility as they are lower to the ground than a tree. Shrubs in place of canopy trees wouldn't match what the city require in the ordinance. Do we have a recommended spacing for the trees? There is a recommended spacing.
- Headlights.
 - Is there concern from the homeowner to the east that is providing the easement about headlights shining into the backyard.
 - The vegetation that is existing, only two trees are being removed. There is vegetation that would remain to the east.
 - Potentially require evergreen vegetation for screening from the headlights or an opaque fence. The planning department will look at the sight to determine what would look best.

A motion was made by Northrup, with support by Altman, to approve the Statement of Conclusions for Hudsonville Vision PUD Amendment at 3232 Central Boulevard. This approval is based on the finding that the PUD standards from Section 15.11 D of the Hudsonville Downtown Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met with the following conditions:

1. Locate trees along the property frontage. This does not allow for a deviation using witch hazel instead of deciduous trees.
2. The proposed trees must be from the list of understory street trees in the Downtown Zoning Ordinance.
3. Install a handrail to the existing accessible ramp to bring it into compliance.
4. Confirm the easement language.
5. Research eastern property line buffering regarding headlights potentially shining into the

residential home.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Absent 1 (VanDenBerg)

3. 3510 Chicago Drive – Jelsema Veterinarian – Building Expansion Discussion

The staff report was presented.

Jelsema Veterinarian Clinic has been looking into a possible expansion for quite some time. They will keep the existing 2,400 s.f. Jelsema Veterinarian Clinic building and build a 2-story addition with an approximate 6,600 g.f.a. to the east that will replace a smaller existing 2-story building. The second story will be offices and other vet clinic uses.

The following discussion took place with Commissioners:

- Dog Area.
 - There is a dog area at the southeast corner of the building for them to go out but there could be a condition for there to be person with any dogs outside to help with noise.
- Building Elevations.
 - There isn't any window on the rear of the existing building which doesn't offer anything visually appealing to Harvey Street.
 - The full masonry on the building is nice to see. Some commissioners would like to see this look less industrial.
 - Would like to see a cornice line at the top rather than a bulbous cornice.
 - Would like the bottom floor to be fully rusticated. With the split face block or what their more rusticated material would be. Then there would be a base, middle, top downtown look.
 - Rather than running the belt courses at the sill and head you could make it just at the head and do a brick sill. Or a jack arch, something more playful would be encouraged. Less contemporary.
 - When we had the downtown consultant, Bob Gibbs, he asked us to land on a building style for the entire downtown. We choose a midcentury clean but modern looking type with horizontal lines. The bump in the parapet like the existing building would help tie into the existing building, which is similar to what the city landed on as an overall feel.
 - The paneling in the 3510-address area of the original building, the brick is header coursed and picture framed, that might have been the intent with the detail on the addition. If that is their intent that is great. But replicating the picture frame header course that goes around the current building for these paneled areas on top of the rusticated base with a projecting cornice would be better.
 - The rusticated base is true to most downtowns. The base is delineated from the

upper 2/3rds of the building. For example, in a storefront setting the bottom 1/3rd would be mostly glass with a darker material behind it. But for this use it is broaching a more institutional feeling due to its use. The base of those types is often fully expressed as a more robust weighted material that can support what's above it. Right now, they have 2-3 courses of the split faced material at the base. If that was brought all the way up or pulling or alternating the courses to give the feel of a thick heavy base. That would read better than the 3 large bands of the same material.

- The material on the sides of the windows also would be better if it stayed consistent with the brick around it instead of the lighter color. Full brick versus brick molding all the way around the windows.
- It is great to see the investment into that much masonry. Definitely continue down the road of this type of material.
- Double frontage on the Service Drive and Harvey Street.
 - What about frontage being along Harvey Street instead? The goal for the downtown is to get buildings to front Harvey Street. Commissioners would have liked to see a door onto Harvey Street as an entrance, potentially an entrance on both the Service Drive and Harvey Street.
 - There is a lot of opportunity that could be explored about having frontage on Harvey versus the frontage on the Service Drive.
 - Would like to see a concept of the business having frontage on Harvey Street.
 - The streetscape improvement along the Service Drive is to help the established buildings have frontage that is improved and visually appealing. Then once you move closer to the future village green there would be more buildings along the frontage of Harvey Street versus the Service Drive.
 - Would like to see the parking lot behind the addition along the Service Drive and the addition fronting Harvey. If they move the addition closer to Harvey, how would they make the parking work? It is worth asking them for a visual of what a frontage on Harvey Street would look like.
- Streetscape.
 - The improvements on the Service Drive that were done for businesses to the east a few years ago would happen then when this project was constructed.
 - Would like to see the landscaping area on Service Drive to the same level of what the city has done to the east.
 - Would also like to know if they plan on maintaining ownership or if they are doing an easement and giving ownership to the city for maintenance like the businesses did to the east.
 - Sidewalk is important to see on the Service Drive regardless of which road the frontage is on.
 - The landscape buffer at the south should be curbless into Harvey Street as all of Harvey Street is curbless.

- It would be nice to see curb lawn infiltration systems to help with stormwater. The water from the parking lot would run off into the curb lawn area and then flow into the stormwater system or into the groundwater.
- Parking.
 - Make sure the parking is taken into consideration with any redesign of frontage.
 - Check the specific use of the new addition (additional storage on second level vs more exam rooms?) which would then help determine how much parking they would need.
 - The angled spots on the northern side of the Service Drive would be able to be used for this property as well as the parking on their own lot.

4. Draft Zoning Ordinance Review

The following discussion took place with Commissioners:

- Residential Recreational Vehicles and Equipment.
 - Recreational vehicles on corner lots should be screened and set back 10 ft from the lot line.
 - The permitted surfaces should include asphalt millings.
 - Fix wording to be more consistent throughout the section.
 - The fact that only one piece of equipment can be over ten feet tall out of the three helps.
- Planned Unit Developments.
 - Section 6.03.06 with having deviations permitted only when an additional feature is provided from the developer helps to make the process more of a give and take versus the applicant not providing an added benefit but get deviations from the code.
 - The pre-application review allows for the Planning Commission to only have to have 2 meetings if they choose to have more they can. This is instead of the 4 meetings that the applicant has to attend now. The more informal discussion will now take place with the city.
- ZBA vs Planning Commission responsibilities.
 - People go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for wanting to deviate from the code. So, for accessory building deviations that would be to the ZBA instead of the Planning Commission.

5. Discussion

- Buttermilk Creek Trail Map
- No truck traffic sign on Highland Drive
- DJs Pizza
- Hudson Center II

6. Adjournment

A motion was made by Waterman, with support by Bendert, to adjourn at 9:11pm.

Yeas 8, Nays 0, Absent 1 (VanDenBerg)

Respectfully Submitted,
Sarah Steffens
Planning / Zoning Assistant