

HOLLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
January 7, 2020

**Present:** Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen, Members Dennis Gebben, Randy Kortering, Norm Nykamp, Ed Zylstra, and Miska Rynsburger. Also present were Community Development Director John Said, Assistant Community Development Director Corey Broersma, and Recording Secretary Tricia Kiekintveld.

**Absent:** Chairman Marion Hoeve.

Vice-Chairman/Secretary Jack VanderMeulen took a moment to welcome the Planning Commission's newest member, Ms. Miska Rynsburger, and thanked her for her willingness to serve.

**Public Comment:** Ms. Christine Gara, 2922 Riley Ridge Rd., Holland, MI 49424 was present to talk to the Commission regarding an easement located between the Riley Ridge development and the Pointe Lake Condominium Development. Ms. Gara stated that back in 2002, and also 2014, Holland Township's Planning Commission approved additional units to be built in the Pointe Lake Development contingent upon Mr. Winters, owner, obtaining a maintenance contract for the easement. In her research he never obtained a maintenance contract for that easement. Mr. Winters has gone by many different company names throughout the years and now is stating that he no longer owns any property there and is not involved with the development in any way so has no ties to the easement. Ms. Gara is questioning how 70 more condominiums were allowed to be built without the maintenance contract coming to fruition. She stated that the Pointe Lake Association doesn't want to maintain it because their owners do not use the easement. The Riley Ridge owners are upset about the easement because over the past 4 years it has been used for the heavy equipment that was used to build the additional units in Pointe Lake. They have had construction equipment driving in front of their homes on Ridge Way Drive for the past 4 years. She is asking what Holland Charter Township is able to do about this situation. Mr. VanderMeulen told her that she should get in contact with Corey Broersma and John Said in the Community Development Office and they can assist her further with this situation.

\*\* Motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of December 3, 2019, was made by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben. 5 members in favor. 1 member abstaining. Motion carried.

**Vice-Chairman VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a Special Use** submitted by Jimmy Asmar/Holland Elite Hospitality LLC for land addressed as James Street, west of 120th, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-21-226-001. The applicant seeks permission for a 100-room, four-story, TownePlace Suites hotel. The property is zoned C-2 Community Commercial.

The subject site contains approximately 8.9 acres, with an existing Staybridge Suites on the property, along with approximately 193 parking spaces. Approximately 18 additional parking spaces are proposed for the new TownePlace Suites hotel (total 211 on-site for both hotels), with a fire lane around the entire new building. The existing and proposed hotels, parking, and related improvements occupy the western approximate 2/3 of the site, while the eastern portion of the site will retain the existing No. 28 County drain, floodplain, and wooded area. The existing house on the property is in the process of being demolished in conjunction with the completion of the Staybridge Suites.

Staff noted that the applicant asked for the motion to be tabled at tonight's meeting. The applicant then stated that they were unclear on how the process worked. Now they understand a bit better and would still like to present their application at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Andy Andre of Stellar Development, LLC, was present to speak to this request. Mr. Andre stated that this hotel would be an extended stay hotel under the national brand of Marriott. He also pointed out that the original plan did not have full circulation around the building for emergency vehicles; the new plans now have a driveway going all the way around the building that is supported by a new retaining wall due to the elevation changes. This new drive and retaining wall system has a slight impact on the flood plain. The area affected is 27-cubic yards (325 sq. ft.); however, Mr. Andre pointed out that they are providing 5,000 sq. ft. of restoration area. They feel this more than makes up for the small area that would be affected with the driveway.

Mr. Andre stated that they are aware that they are approximately 4' above the 50' maximum height restriction. They have the flexibility to change design features to lower that height to the 50' restriction. He also stated that they are able to easily adjust their landscaping plans to meet any recommendations that staff or the Commission has. Mr. Andre stated that they can easily adjust their lighting plans to meet any necessary requirements of the township as well.

Mr. Andre addressed each of the Special Use standards stating that they feel they meet all of the standards. In regards to if the project shows a need in the community, Mr. Andre pointed out an extensive feasibility study that they had done that does show that this type of extended stay hotel is feasible in the Holland area. He pointed out that they did take into account current planned development of hotels as well as the existing hotels. He is aware that there is currently a lot of growth at a 4% rate and that is expected to taper off as the number of hotels come on-line but is still expected to maintain a positive rate.

There was some added discussion regarding what the applicant is looking for from Commission tonight. Are they withdrawing the request for tabling? The applicant is requesting if the Commission is able to move forward tonight, they would like to do that.

The Commission and Staff discussed the number of hotels that have come before them for approval and the potential for saturation of the market in the township. If hotels are not refreshed and renewed it can be a negative spiral and they can become code enforcement challenges. It was stated that individual property issues will be dealt with by code enforcement and is not the role of the Planning Commission to control. Placing additional limits on hotel uses would ultimately be a Township Board issue. And at this point the Township Board is allowing the market to determine what should be built and what should not and are not planning to put a moratorium on hotels.

Public Comment: None.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Gebben to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

The Commission went through the Special Use Standards and determined that they meet the standards.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Zylstra and supported by Mr. Kortering to approve the request with the stipulations that the project meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements regarding building height, and compliance with all lighting, landscaping, and parking requirements. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Vice-Chairman VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD)** submitted by Scott Geerlings/Geerlings Development for land addressed as 275, 245, 305, and 317 E. Lakewood Blvd. The applicant seeks Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for a mixed-use project containing residential and commercial uses. The project is proposed to be called "275 E. Lakewood" (Note: applicant should confirm whether this address will be available). The subject property is located along the north side of Lakewood, between North Park Drive and Beeline Road-and contains approximately 20.7 acres total. The applicant previously appeared before the Planning Commission for a Pre-Application PUD review at the June 4, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Mike Corby of Integrated Architecture was present to speak to this request. He stated that they are looking to provide creative, quality housing options into this community.

Their plan is designed to support walkability, with natural pathways and to provide active areas. They are looking to provide a high-quality project that has diverse offerings for the residents.

The proposed development will include multi-family and attached single-family dwelling units on the principal (west) portion of the site, with two proposed commercial buildings in the east portion of the site. The site also contains an area of floodplain and wetlands that lies along the county drain between the proposed residential area and the proposed commercial area. Mr. Corby stated that due to the wetlands they have removed some of the residential buildings they originally planned to reduce floodplain and wetland impacts.

Mr. Corby stated that they are looking to have a lot of trees in the development and along the private roads. They also are planning to provide pickle ball courts for the residents.

Mr. Corby added that they are proposing 183 units consisting of studio, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom apartments as well as townhouses. Phase 1 of the project would include 3 residential buildings along Lakewood Blvd. as well as the 2 commercial buildings. During this phase they would also be constructing the community center and common green space.

They are proposing 2 entrances along Lakewood Blvd. along with a temporary construction entrance that would later be removed.

At this time, they are requesting preliminary PUD approval. Because of this they do not have specific building and landscaping plans drawn up yet. However, Mr. Corby did point out that they do plan to meet all of the township standards. They are proposing an efficient design to help minimize the foot print on the land. Mr. Corby stated that they are asking for leniency on the storage requirement. They are currently proposing studio apartments with 70 sq. ft. of storage rather than the 120 sq. ft. of storage currently required. Mr. Corby pointed out that they will offer additional storage on site for residents that would like that option. The design of the units is open concept with no hallways to allow for as much natural light into the unit as possible. Their focus is on attractive livable units.

Staff requested a connection to the west. Mr. Corby stated that they do not own the property there so cannot physically have access to connect to the stub located in the Oak Valley Estates subdivision to the west and they do not feel the need to do so at this time.

They are open to creating an easement on their parcel for the trails along the county drain and wetlands.

Mr. Corby stated that the final PUD would address more specifics.

Mr. Gebben questioned the internal roads and if they could eventually connect to the west. Mr. Corby answered that the internal roads would be private. He stated that nothing would be in the way of connecting to the west but they do not own the land necessary to make the connection. Staff stated that they would like the developers to provide an easement for future connection. Staff also pointed out that this is the one chance that we have to get a public easement on this private property. Mr. Corby stated that they are on board with that.

Mr. Kortering asked about the mechanical closet being outside of each unit. Mr. Corby stated that this helps with maintenance as the renters will not need to allow maintenance personnel into their residence to do any repairs and it keeps the renters from potentially doing anything to the equipment.

Mr. Kortering also asked about the supplemental storage that was mentioned earlier. Mr. Corby answered that they would offer on-site indoor storage cages that the residents could use on each floor of each building. They see that about 30% of renters typically desire additional storage.

Mr. VanderMeulen asked about the path around the perimeter of the property if that would be open to the public or mainly for resident's use. Mr. Corby stated that they are not planning to restrict access to neighboring walkers using the paths. Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if they would be having the rental management company maintain the pathway. Mr. Corby answered, yes that is the plan. Mr. VanderMeulen inquired if there will there be a bridge across the creek. Mr. Corby said the plan is for some way to cross the county drain and wetlands.

Mr. Gebben asked about the commercial properties. What are you proposing to have occupy those buildings? Mr. Scott Geerlings answered this question by stating that one of the buildings would be a restaurant; however, they do not have any commitments on either building yet. Mr. Gebben then asked if the commercial being proposed will really be there to support the residents as stated by the PUD standards. Mr. Corby answered that the commercial would not be there just for the residents but would also be there for the broader community to utilize as well. Mr. Gebben pointed out that he feels like Phase 1 looks like two very separate developments and would like to see a good connection between the two. Mr. Corby stated that they intend to physically connect the two areas through walkways and bridges.

Public Comment:

Mr. Matthew Topping, 307 Hillview Drive, Holland MI 49424, had concerns with how close one of the proposed buildings is to his house. He is also concerned about the height of a 3-story building so close to the residential development next door. He asked if it would be possible to turn the building so it would be facing the other direction so that not all of the windows and decks/patios would be looking directly into the neighboring houses. Another suggestion would be to install a fence all the way around as he is concerned with tenants coming into his yard. He also suggested possibly a berm and additional foliage to help create a barrier between the properties.

Mr. Brian Mitchell, 198 Surry Oak Dr., Holland, MI 49424, stated his concerns over traffic that this many units will generate and the added congestion it will cause.

Mr. Ken Kruis, 198 Surry Oak Dr., Holland, MI 49424, is concerned about light pollution with the number of street lights they are proposing along the walkways. Staff commented that the township does have very strict lighting restrictions so this should not be a problem.

Mr. Gary Bouwman, 335 Hillview Dr., Holland, MI 49424, stated that he too is concerned about traffic. He also does not want to see an easement to their neighborhood. He is concerned also with the height of the 3-story buildings they are proposing. He believes that this is too much for the neighborhood. Mr. Bouwman pointed out that 103 units would create approximately 250 vehicles and asked the Commission to consider the neighbors with bringing in so many people to this development.

Mr. Chris Hillman was present representing his son Cody Hillman, 355 Hillview Dr., Holland, MI 49424, he is concerned about the flood plain. He would like to see the FEMA Flood Zone Plan to see the impact on the flood plain. Staff answered that the developers are required to follow FEMA laws and regulations when it comes to flood zones. Staff also pointed out that the flood plain does limit the housing but the developers are allowed to alter the flood plain.

Staff read a letter into the record signed by a number of residents in opposition to the development.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Zylstra to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

Staff made some comments in response to the discussion. 1) They like the idea of possibly swapping the townhomes with the apartments along the west side of the property to allow for a more gradual transition from lower density to higher density buildings. 2) Staff would recommend that the Commission think about setting specific limits on what C-2 uses they will allow in this development. 3) Due to the limitations with the wetlands being protected areas and therefore not able to be developed without some mitigation staff would like to know the density projections of the land taking that non-developable land into account. 4) Mitigation Area: Will there be an opportunity for a path above the flood zone so it is usable after a heavy rain or will it begin to deteriorate and have the potential for individuals to slip and fall as algae grows on the path from moisture. 5) An easement to Hillview would allow for an access to Lakewood Blvd. in the future. This could also be a good way to control traffic flow because of the 90° angles within the development that will naturally slow traffic down and deter people from taking the road. On the other hand, if Hillview was to extend straight to Lakewood Blvd. that would encourage more traffic and at higher speeds. Mr. Nykamp clarified that the easement would not actually be a road constructed during this project but would just allow for a future road if access was gained through the adjoining parcels at some point in the future.

Mr. Kortering asked about the distance between the lot line and the proposed buildings. Staff stated that the closest building is 20' from the lot line. However, if they swapped the apartment building for a townhouse that would allow for more green space between the lot line and the building. Mr. Geerlings stated that is something they are willing to look at. Mr. VanderMeulen also stated that he would like to see as many owner-occupied units as possible. The less that is rental the better for the neighborhood. Mr. Zylstra also pointed out that the townhomes would be 2-story buildings similar to a 2-story home so that would flow much better next to the residential homes neighboring the property.

Staff reminded Commission that now is the time for them to provide directions for the developer to make revisions to the final plans.

Mr. Nykamp stated that he would like to see two bridges over the wetlands to allow for even greater access to the commercial part of the development. One closer to the commercial and one further north.

Mr. Geerlings stated that would be determined by EGLE (State of Michigan) but they are open to the idea of changing the locations of the buildings on the property. Mr. Corby stated that with the concern of people walking too close to the neighboring houses they could remove the perimeter pathways to deter people from walking too close to those homes. Mr. Corby also stated that they are in agreement with making Building F on the diagram to townhouses and eliminating the pathway along the west edge of the property.

Staff brought up the fact that the unit sizes of the studio and 1-bedroom apartments are below requirements and that the Commission is advised to require developers to adhere to the ordinances. Mr. Kortering inquired if the size of the unit is affected at all by the fact that the mechanical room is outside of the unit rather than included in the square footage of the unit like normal. Staff replied that that is not taken into account because that can happen in many apartment complexes.

Mr. Kortering brought up that we keep hearing our size requirements are quite high for studio and 1-bedroom apartments. But 400' sq. ft. for the studio apartment is less than even MSHDA requirements. Staff commented that there is a current need for affordable rental but is not sure this a long-term need. Mr. Kortering commented that he feels even with all the new housing we will still be short.

Mr. Nykamp inquired about the walking path along the north west side of the parcel. He questioned that removing the walking path from the plans may go against the master plan discussion about wanting more walkability in the township. Staff would like to see the walking paths, and other amenities because it adds to the quality of life for the community. Commissioners want to keep the path but maybe it would be possible to move it to another location on the property.

Mr. VanderMeulen questioned if they are ready to vote or not. Staff stated there are several issues that should be addressed. Mr. Kortering stated he is not comfortable approving at this point with all of the concerns stated tonight. Mr. Nykamp and Mr. Gebben agreed that they would like to see a plan with the items discussed tonight. Mr. Gebben is comfortable leaving some items for staff to work out with the applicant but it seems like the size of the units is a real issue that needs to be addressed by Commission. He also stated that if this is an adequate defense, that today's renters are looking for smaller rental units, then maybe the Commission needs to consider some changes.

Mr. Gebben suggested that the applicant work with staff on the unit sizes.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Nykamp to table the request to give the applicant time to work out the issues presented including but not limited to unit sizes. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Vice-Chairman VanderMeulen opened the Public Hearing for consideration of a Special Use request** submitted by Nate VanderZwaag, Macatawa Plumbing for land addressed as 840 Black River Dr. described more specifically as parcel number 70-16-25-475-006. The applicant seeks permission for a contractor's facility with outdoor storage. The property is zoned C-3 Highway Commercial.

Mr. VanderZwaag is looking to relocate his business, Macatawa Plumbing, from 10702 Chicago Dr. to 840 Black River Dr. He plans to use the north section of the property for trailer storage/extra parking for equipment. Berms and fencing would be constructed for both visual obstructions and security. The fencing would be similar to Semco Energy's fencing that is on Black River Drive, south of Adams Street.

Mr. VanderZwaag plans on using 12,000 sq. ft. of the total 17,000 sq. ft. leaving approximately 5,000 sq. ft. for an income tenant. The building needs a lot of repairs and they plan on fixing up the building. Currently there are U-Haul trucks that block a portion of the parking lot and those would be gone, as those tenants would no longer be there.

Mr. VanderZwaag pointed out that there are some drainage issues and that he has talked to Mr. Bush at the Ottawa County Drain Commission and he is working with him to correct these problems. There is also drainage from the sidewalk but he will fix that when he re-does the parking lot. He is planning to clean up and improve the whole property.

Mr. Nykamp questioned the size of the additional storage area/parking in the back of the property. Staff commented that they do not know the exact size of that part of the property at this point and questioned Mr. VanderZwaag if he knows the dimension or if this is just a concept at this point. Mr. VanderZwaag replied that it is just a concept at this point. They would install berms and landscaping; the fencing would just be for security. They have also talked about the possibility of an outdoor building. Staff pointed out that if he would want to move forward with a building, he would need to get an amendment to the special use. The setback for the storage area would be 50' from the road and a setback from the rear lot line would be 25'.

Mr. Gebben inquired if there is enough parking on the parcel. Mr. VanderZwaag answered that they will only need 10 employee parking spaces during the day and the back-storage area would be for the equipment. They are looking to have more of a store front for counter sales and leave parking spaces for customers as well. There is also room for parking behind the building for company vehicles. There are possibly 80 spaces there so they feel they have lots of extra parking.

Staff noted that Mr. VanderZwaag has cooperated fully with staff and staff wanted to point out that they have appreciated that.

Public Comment: None.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Gebben to close the hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

Staff brought up several points: 1) If approved they would like to see the U-Haul trucks that block entrances and drive aisles moved. 2) The fenced outdoor storage would need to meet zoning requirements and they would like to see drive aisles paved with the adjacent storage locations paved with some sort of aggregate material. 3) Work with staff on landscaping to try to bring it closer to the site's original site plan approval and today's standards.

Mr. VanderZwaag noted that the U-Haul trucks will not be on the property any more.

The standards for special uses were reviewed by the Commission.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Zylstra to grant the request with the stipulation that they comply with parking requirements, section 9.22, and with landscaping. All in favor. Motion carried.

### **Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)**

The applicant, **Robert McCaigue/Continental 512 Fund LLC**, is seeking Final Development Plan and Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for a 264-unit multi-family rental residential project, to be called 'Authentix Quincy Street', on the south side of Quincy Street, west of 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The applicant received Preliminary PUD approval at the November 5, 2019 meeting, after the property had been rezoned to R-2A Medium Density Residential from the previous AG Agricultural District.

Mr. McCaigue was present to speak to this request. He stated that they are looking to receive final approval tonight so that they can break ground on the construction in the spring.

Mr. McCaigue stated that they are looking for approval with the following conditions:

1) Offsite easements – They have obtained and recorded the necessary sewer easement. They are committed to providing an easement for future road connection on their property but were not able to come to an agreement with the three property owners adjoining to them to be able to connect all the way to Beeline Rd. Mr. McCaigue asked if they needed to obtain the easement and have that recorded before they are able to obtain final approval or if that can be a condition of approval.

2) An understanding of floor plans and storage areas – Floorplans and data table have been submitted and have not been changed. They are asking for an allowance for non-compliance of square footage of the 1-bedroom and studio style apartments as well as for an allowance in the storage requirement for those same style apartments. They are asking to be allowed varying storage sizes based on the size of the units with none of the units meeting the 120 sq. ft. storage requirement.

3) Landscaping – The current plans are short on the ordinance requirements. They are willing to meet ordinance but failed to show that on the plans. They are asking for a condition for Phase 1 to not meet ordinance at this time but the final development will meet landscaping requirements in the end. However, they are willing to meet landscaping requirements during Phase 1 if that will allow them to receive final approval from the Commission.

4) Parking – They are requesting a variance for parking by allowing front parking to allow for a greater number of units to have a view and exposure to the pond. They do have a deferred parking plan if the Commission does not like this parking plan. They would prefer not to change this unless there is a strong reason to change it. They also are asking for clarification of the minutes from their preliminary approval meeting on November 3, 2019, on the parking near the clubhouse/entrance. Mr. McCaigue feels that the Commission did not intend to place as a condition of the preliminary PUD that they remove all of the on-street parking from the plan near the clubhouse. They feel it is necessary for them to have that parking near the clubhouse for residents to have easier access to the amenities of the development.

They are asking for the above to be conditions of final approval that they can then work out with staff as they move forward.

Staff responded to the parking issue and stated that they did indeed intend to remove that parking at the preliminary approval meeting due to the fact that the parking is right at the entrance to the development.



This poses a couple of potential problems. It creates a danger to pedestrians crossing the road and presents a potential for traffic to back up on Quincy as cars are entering the development. Staff and the Commission feel that because this is the only access point in and out of the development it needs to be free from any congestion as well as vehicles backing out of the parking spaces along the road. Mr. McCaigue stated that they would be losing 13 spaces on the east side of the road and potentially 12-13 additional spaces on the west side of the road for a total of 25 spaces lost. Mr. McCaigue stated this would also cause a lack of parking by Building 1 and the clubhouse. They feel these spaces are critical to the plan. It was suggested by the Commission that the parking be deferred to the north side of the clubhouse and extent to the west. If this is something that Commission feels should be a condition of approval, they are willing to make adjustments with staff as they move forward.

Staff brought up that they could include deferred parking as an extension of the north parking lot near the clubhouse if the need arises. Mr. Nykamp inquired who would determine that need? The management/development company or the township? Staff answered that it would be determined by complaints coming into the township by residents. It then would most likely have to come before the Planning Commission again and possibly even the Township Board for approval.

Mr. Gebben stated that he feels uncomfortable with what seems to be an ad hoc design being presented to the Commission. He stated that there are 6 items that staff brought up in the Staff Report that are concerns. Mr. Gebben feels this is a concern to him that it seems like none of these items have been addressed in the new plans. He is wondering if this request should be tabled at this time to allow the applicant to make the necessary changes to the plan before coming to the Commission for final approval.

Mr. McCaigue feels that there may have been a lack of communication between Commission and the applicant at the preliminary approval stage of what the conditions of approval were for them. They feel that these are all items that can be worked out with staff after final approval and that they were not stated as specific items for revision at the last meeting.

Staff does not agree with the applicant on these points. All of these topics are listed as requirements by the zoning ordinance and were noted in previous emails sent to the applicant in early December. Staff asked the applicant to respond with revised plans because it is all required as approval of the PUD. However, staff never received a response from the applicant. They feel the applicant ignored the requirements. Staff stated that this is the one chance the township has to get this project right. Staff does not feel it is appropriate for Commission to move forward when the requirements have not been met. Staff had identified everything that needed to be done in early December and the applicant never responded. They did not bring in revised plans until today at 4:15pm; that is too late for submittal for tonight's meeting as it does not give the Commission members time to review the updated plans. They also received 5 emails late this afternoon regarding the utility easement and other information that they had no information about prior to this point today. Staff would implore Commission to not move forward with this project at this point and instead table it as requested in the Staff Report.

Staff also stated that if they table the request tonight that this would give them time to give them direction on easements. Within the last day or two they now know there is a 40' easement going through the Carini property for the sewer easement and that may be an area for an access easement. Staff stated that we have clearly heard they were not able to obtain easements to Beeline but this is a possibility for a different access point to the west to Greenly. Staff would like to see them get an easement in place even though a road doesn't need to be built right now but at least there are a couple of options for access points to the

development if access can be obtained further down the road in adjoining properties. Staff also mentioned that unit sizes are another big issue. They feel there is a rush to build smaller unit sizes to fill the need for more affordable housing but that they need to consider the ordinances that are in place and that they were put into place for many reasons.

Mr. VanderMeulen addressed the motion that was made in November. He stated that the motion was put in place with the understanding that the comments made during the preliminary hearing would be address before coming before the Commission for final approval. He noticed that none of the comments were addressed in the plans that were submitted for final approval. Mr. VanderMeulen felt that they were being taken advantage of by the applicant. Mr. McCaigue answered that they felt that these issues could be conditions of approval and did not feel that they needed to spend the money upfront to get the easements in place ahead of approval from the Commission. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that due to what staff has stated that it seems like the documentation came in after the deadlines and that doesn't seem right to not give the Commission time to review them before the meeting. Mr. McCaigue responded that the materials submitted today were actually in preparation for next months' meeting in the event that their request was tabled tonight as today was the deadline for submittal for the February meeting. These new plans have corrected the landscaping plan and pointed out to where they are committing the easement. Staff clarified that existing applicants do not have to meet that deadline; today's deadline is for new applications to be submitted. Staff explained that they request plans and information as early as they can for applicants that are already in the process and working with the Township on projects but they do not have to submit by the 4-week deadline. Staff committed to provide comments on the plans that were submitted today by the end of the week to the applicant. Then provide the Commission members with the information for the February meeting. Mr. Gebben would like to hear in the staff report that the applicant has satisfied all of the ordinance requirements. If there are exemptions requested, he would like those stated in the staff report with reasons why staff might oppose those exemptions but until he gets that definitive statement of any controversy, he is not comfortable moving forward. Mr. Gebben is ready to table at this point with so many issues.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that they are not planning to meet unit sizes but they should address the other issues brought up at tonight's meeting. Mr. McCaigue asked for clarification on the parking by the clubhouse. Mr. VanderMeulen responded to the question by asking if the parking needed. Maybe it would be something that could be planned as future additional parking. Staff is asking for that parking along the road be removed and relocated to the north side of the clubhouse. Mr. Nykamp asked if they are removing the parking along the entry and moving it to the north side or just marking it as deferred parking if needed at a later point. Staff responded that they do not want to see parking until after the intersection that would split off the number of vehicles by 50% on each road. They are at a 2.05 ratio but with taking out these 25 spaces they are below that number. Staff is asking if they should still be required to maintain the 2.05 spaces per unit and come up with that ratio elsewhere. Mr. VanderMeulen asked if a 2.05 ratio is adequate parking? Mr. McCaigue stated that typically they are at 1.75 at other projects. For them the overall parking ratio is less of a concern as localized parking for each building. Mr. VanderMeulen stated we are clear that there is to be no parking on the traffic lane and differed parking going further to the west going along the frontage.

Mr. McCaigue asked what is the Commission asking in regards to the easement so they know how to move forward. Mr. VanderMeulen stated that they really feel they need an emergency entrance for the fire department. Mr. McCaigue answered that they have provided that. They just need to know if they need

to go through the expense with the lawyers to draw up the easement in the back of the property before final approval or if they can do that after final approval. Staff is happy to work with them on an easement stub to the east and now an easement to the west toward the Carini property. Mr. McCaigue stated that they are committed to it and are happy to oblige to the easements they just need to know if they need these in place before final approval. Staff needs to see the easement shown on the final plan and can be a minor amendment at staff level if it needs to be moved slightly in the future. But we need it to be shown on the final plan.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Gebben and supported by Mr. Kortering to table the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

### **Other Business**

**Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) submitted by Vishal Arora/Magnus Capital Partners** for property located at 12191 and 12199 Felch Street described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-16-200-063. The applicant is requesting an amendment from C-1 Neighborhood Commercial, AG Agricultural, and R-2 Moderate Density Residential to R-3 High Density Residential.

Staff is comfortable with the surrounding zoning and feels that this parcel fits in well being zoned R-3.

The Commission reviewed the Zoning Map Amendment Standards and found that this parcel meets all of the criteria.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Nykamp and supported by Mr. Zylstra to approve the request. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) submitted by Vishal Arora/Magnus Capital Partners** for property located at 12191 and 12199 Felch Street described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-16-200-063. The applicant is requesting Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for a 114-unit multi-family development served by watermain, sanitary sewer, private internal drives, and private stormwater detention facilities.

Mr. Arora stated that their vision is to provide high quality workforce housing. They have found that the need is in the middle of the market rather than at the high or low end.

Mr. Arora is proposing a large open courtyard, greenspace, pathways, a playground, and BBQ areas. These amenities would be located closer to the rear building away from the road for safety. The rear building will house the leasing office, a dog washing station, fitness facility, bike storage, etc. They feel that these are amenities that are typically reserved for more expensive developments and they feel that is unfair and they are choosing to offer them at this lower price point. Mr. Arora is proposing parking all along the perimeter of the property. They are proposing a parking ratio of 1.75 to 1 with reserve parking at the north part of the site. This area in the back of the property is near a walking path. If this additional parking was developed the walking path would need to be moved but it would not be taken out just moved as well as relocating the dog park.

Mr. Arora stated that they meet the requirements for square footages in all unit types. They are asking for an allowance in storage space for the 1-bedroom units. They are below the required 120 sq. ft. in these unit styles with 46 sq. ft. They do have a large walk-in closet and a large kitchen island with storage so they are hoping those items help to fulfill the 120 sq. ft. requirement. They also will be offering bike

storage in the building for residents to use. The 1-bedroom units are less than 20% of the total number of units in the development, approximately 18 units. They feel that adding the kitchen island has been typically reserved for more high-end units and they feel this is now a way of life that we are all using the island and are happy to offer these in these units.

Mr. VanderMeulen questioned if having the mechanical closet located in the bedroom is a good idea. The applicant responded to the type of mechanical units these closets would contain and the Commission agreed that this would be an allowed location for those type of units.

Mr. Arora pointed out the breakdown of the unit sizes in this development would be comprised of 18% 1-bedroom/1 bath, 54% 2-bedroom/1 bath and 28% 3-bedroom/2 bath units for a total of 114 units. He believes affordable housing with quality features is important in this market. This includes a number of access points to Felch to encourage a healthy lifestyle of being able to walk to local retailers.

Mr. Arora is asking for conditions to Ordinances 16.1, 16.2 & 16.8 by requesting a 20% density bonus to get them to the 114 units in the development.

Mr. Gebben mentioned that the proposal mentions a PILOT (Payment In Lieu Of Taxes). It was stated that the PILOT would be obtained through the Township Board not through the Planning Commission.

Mr. VanderMeulen questioned how the driveways would line up with the proposed Westshore Development. Staff stated that the location of the driveways will be determined by the Ottawa County Road Commission based on who applies for their driveways first.

Mr. Nykamp inquired about school bus stops or mailboxes. Mr. Arora stated that they had not given consideration to that at this point. Mr. Arora stated that they anticipate 30-40% of the units would have at least 1 child ranging in age from infant/toddler to middle school. The target is the workforce and the workforce typically have children so they are anticipating children in the development.

Mr. Kortering asked if they had considered charging stations for electric cars. Mr. Arora stated that they had not looked into the utilization rates at local businesses nearby and but would give it consideration. They feel it's a bit early to be planning for them at this point but they will begin to look into this.

Mr. Nykamp stated that they need to have a bus shelter for the school bus. Staff confirmed that Falcon Woods has a bus stop at the entrance to their development right at 120<sup>th</sup>. The school bus does not go into the development and they would assume that the bus would not go into this development either and that the bus stop would most likely be at the entrance to the development along Felch Street.

Mr. VanderMeulen commented that he feels they came a long way in their presentation and it makes a lot of things work.

Staff commented about the minimum requirements and that they are happy they are meeting the minimums overall with the only exception being the storage area in the 1-bedroom units. Staff also brought up that they would encourage a driveway to connect to the Falcon Woods development and limiting curb cuts onto Felch St. Final plans will need to show these changes. 26' wide drive aisle with parking on either side with 9' x 18' parking spaces. Staff stated that they need to make sure to provide the landscape plans at final. Parking requirements need to be shown on the final plans as well. Staff is not comfortable with going down to 1.75 parking spaces with the number of 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom

apartments. Staff would encourage a ratio of closer to 2.05 parking spaces per unit as discussed with the Quincy Street applicant. Garbage enclosures need to conform to necessary setbacks.

Commission reviewed the Preliminary Approval Standards and feels that they meet those.

\*\* It was moved by Mr. Kortering and supported by Mr. Zylstra to approve the preliminary PUD based on the applicable Standards, those items noted by staff concerning Falcon Woods driveway approval, dumpster enclosures meeting setbacks, 26' driveway widths, and landscaping, lighting, and fencing that meets applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements. All in favor. Motion carried.

**Planned Unit Development (PUD) Pre-Application Review (Multi-family Project)** Riley Street, east of West Shore Drive, described more specifically as Parcel Number 70-16-16-100-130. Brandon Visser is seeking preliminary review for proposed multi-family development.

The (potential) applicants seek Planning Commission input for a conceptual proposed multi-family residential project on the subject property southeast of the Riley Street/West Shore Drive intersection, which contains approximately 3.23 acres. The concept includes two three-story multi-family residential buildings with 24 units in each, for a total of 48 dwelling units (DU).

Mr. Brandon Visser is looking to give the parcel new life and bring closure to this property by bringing in a residential development. Mr. Visser pointed out that this parcel is a flag lot with only 66' of frontage on Riley St. and is over 300' feet from the curb. He expressed how this does not lend itself to retail buildings as there would be no view from the road. Mr. Visser is looking to create a desired use for this property. He is submitting a plan that is basically the same plan that he believes was brought before the Commission in 2017 that made it all the way to final PUD approval but was withdrawn when the hotel to the west purchased its land which then was a portion of this parcel.

Mr. Visser pointed out that this location would provide walkability for the residents to grocery stores and other retail nearby. He is looking to help prevent urban sprawl by providing in-fill and he feels this option is a good way to do this. Mr. Visser is proposing studio, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom apartments which all meet minimum requirements for square footage as well as minimum storage space requirements. He is also proposing 120 parking spaces for 48 units, which is a 2.5 to 1 ratio. Mr. Visser's proposal has parking along the area closest to each building and added carports across the parking lot. He is looking to follow all ordinances.

Mr. Visser pointed out the amenities that he is looking to provide would include a coffee lounge with couches, laptop work spaces, etc. as well as a common space outside on patios with tables and chairs to connect to the indoor common spaces. He is wanting to provide a smaller community feel to the development as well as a place that is very close to retail in a walkable area.

Staff confirmed that this project was a part of a larger PUD years ago. Back then the project had the connection at the southern part of the property with a second point of egress which provided the connectivity to vehicular traffic. This project lacks connectivity to other surrounding projects. Staff also stated that this project assumes a 20% density bonus but exceeds that density bonus by 1 so they would need to see a reduction to at least 47 units. Staff would like to see a second connection for emergency

access; staff can speak with the Fire Chief more about this next week to see if he has any recommendations. The accessory buildings setbacks are less than 12' on the plans but need to be 15'. The applicant would also need to obtain approvals from the Water Recourses Commission and the Road Commission. Staff pointed out that there are new landscaping buffers since the original PUD was brought before the Commission years ago, therefore, the landscaping design would need to be changed to meet today's standards.

Mr. Kortering asked if there would be an opportunity to connect to the hotel parking lot for emergency vehicles. There is an easement for public utilities but staff is not sure who that is granted too and if that would be an option.

Mr. Gebben asked if we typically do a PUD just to give the 20% bonus? He pointed out that without the 20% bonus 38 units would not be viable for the owner. Mr. Gebben asked if there needs to be other things than just the bonus to qualify for a PUD? Staff responded that there really needs to be connectivity. The previous application for a PUD had the connection to the south by the Dairy Queen but this property does not have that option. Staff agrees that this is a terrible site for commercial but how do you solve that problem. Right now, the C-2 zoning would require any sort of residential to be above commercial. If they can provide connections to some of the commercial properties, that may be just enough to provide for a residential use here via the PUD.

Mr. Gebben stated this needs to be a viable residential neighborhood creating a community. He does not see how this could integrate with the surrounding office and commercial properties.

Mr. Visser feels their concept creates a natural transition between hotels to residential living to the office buildings on the other side.

Staff commented that the owner of the property had the responsibility to plan ahead for connectivity to the surrounding lots. Staff also pointed out that the goal is to meet the standards. This is a tough site with the size limitations that were self-imposed by the owner. Mr. Visser pointed out that he actually was not the owner when the parcel was split. He is currently under contract to buy the land but does not actually own the land at this point. Therefore, he is just trying to work with what is currently there as would any other potential buyer for this parcel.

Mr. Gebben wondered if this is not really a PUD then what options are there for the owner to develop this land. Staff answered that they would have to build something that falls into the C-2 zoning, which would either be a commercial or institutional facility or an office. Staff pointed out that the price of the property should reflect the limited uses available on this property.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that he feels Mr. Visser is trying to get too much into space they just don't have. He also commented that he doesn't feel the Fire Chief is going to be friendly to this design.

Mr. Visser went through the qualifications for a PUD and noted that staff only found them to qualify for 3 of the items when 4 is required. Mr. Visser feels that he would also potentially qualify for three additional items. Item #3 which states the project contains higher quality architecture beyond the site plan requirements of this ordinance. He is proposing higher quality siding material, higher quality interior

finishes and glass hand rails. Item #4 for landscaping requirements. He stated that they have not yet developed a landscaping plan so he feels it would be too early to say they do not qualify for that. Item #8 which states to efficiently consolidated a poorly dimensioned lot with difficult site conditions. Mr. Visser pointed out that this has mainly been all they have talked about so far.

Ms. Rynsburger voiced her concern over the fact that there are no outdoor play spaces for children. She noted that there are 2-bedroom units and with those larger units tend to come children. She would like to see outdoor play spaces for those children. Mr. Visser suggested that they could possibly downsize the amount of parking to add the necessary green space to provide a play area.

Mr. Visser questioned if it is even a possibility for a residential development to be built on this property or if he needs to go in a completely different direction? Mr. Gebben asked if C-2 would have the same fire vehicle issue. Staff answered no they would not because there are not people actually living there, once there are beds that creates a whole different scenario.

Mr. VanderMeulen stated that without amenities on-site you will end up with lower rental prices therefore brining along the problems that come with low rental developments.

Mr. Visser commented that as he does not currently own the property, he is just trying to get the holistic view from the Commission to see what his options are on this property. He feels this option would satisfy the mixed-use element needed in this area. Staff replied that this parcel may need rezoning to allow for the residential building if it cannot fit under the PUD criteria. Mr. VanderMeulen closed by saying that Mr. Visser should continue brainstorming and come back with another option as this option may not be something that is viable. Staff clarified that residential is not a for sure yes or a for sure no coming from the Commission it just depends on connectivity and other issues that have been discussed.

Mr. Visser closed by saying that he is a builder in Wyoming. He considers this a small project and personal and how it turns out matters to him. Ms. Rynsburger suggested that with the location and lack of available green space she would recommend that the target audience be young professionals without children. Mr. VanderMeulen wondered about a work-live where someone works out of their house. Mr. Gebben asked if Ms. Rynsburger is suggesting offering only the smaller bedroom units. Ms. Rynsburger stated yes that is what she is suggesting because it does not seem like a good space for families. Staff also reminded Mr. Visser there needs to be connectivity. Mr. Visser is hoping there are options for connectivity to the south in the undeveloped land or to the east to the offices there. He will continue to be in contact with the surrounding land owners and see if they can work something out with them.

Mr. VanderMeulen brought up if Commission should be talking about a moratorium on Hotels. Staff stated that is a topic that is handled at the Township Executive Committee level and at this point they are going to let the free market sort this out.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 4, 2020 at 7:00 pm.  
Meeting adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Kiekintveld  
Recording Secretary