

**CITY OF HUDSONVILLE**

**Planning Commission Minutes**

August 19, 2015

(Approved September 16, 2015)

**FORMAL:** 3441 New Holland Street – Buttermilk Creek – Summer Creek PUD Amendment  
3284 & 3320 Chicago Drive and 3287 Prospect Street – Hudsonville Winery / Pike 51 – Special Use Permit and Preliminary PUD  
5471 North Bluff Drive – Dan & Ann Marie Meyaard – Special Use Permit  
4907 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Jeffrey & Nicole Kamer – Special Use Permit

**INFORMAL:** 6034 – 6090 Balsam Drive – Rezoning discussion

Present: Leatherman, Waterman, Van Doeselaar, VanDenBerg, Westrate, Raterink, Nesky, Schmuker, Strikwerda and Schut

Absent: Staal

**FORMAL SESSION:**

1. Chairman VanDenBerg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. A motion was made by Raterink, with support by Westrate, to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

3. **3441 New Holland Street – Buttermilk Creek – Summer Creek PUD Amendment**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Todd Stuive with Exxel Engineering representing Bob Deppe of Summergreen Loan, LLC who was also present, reviewed the request to amend the Preliminary PUD that received approval in May, 2014 for a 60-unit subdivision. The previously approved plan had most of the property east of Buttermilk Creek under the common ownership of the neighborhood. The main change since our last meeting is that the City Commission has approved transferring ownership of lot 60 to the city in conjunction with an approved development. Joe Bush with the Ottawa County Water Resource Commission was also present.

The staff report was presented.

The following discussion took place:

Ken Doss - Attorney for Summergreen Condominium Association, 301 Harvey Blvd, Holland MI. Would like to get a commitment on how long will it be before drainage plans are submitted. Ken would like sufficient time for the condominium engineer to review them. Strikwerda indicated that submitting the drainage plans would be part of the next step if the Planning Commission approves the Preliminary PUD Amendment. Stuive indicated it would be at least a 3-6 month process to move forward on the next step before they would be submitted for review. Strikwerda explained the process leading to final project approval.

Ruth Dillon - 4950 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Wanted to know what the values of the homes were going to be. Deppe indicated they would be \$250,000 and up. Each home will have between 2,000 to 2,600 s.f. of living space, and be two stories with attached garages.

Kevin Heemstra – 4858 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Lives across the street from the water tower, there is a retention pond across the street and a drainage ditch that runs through his property that flows into Buttermilk Creek. This water backs up onto the golf course when there is a heavy rain storm like the one in 2013. Where will all of that water go with this development?

Richard Colgan - 4857 Meadowview Court. Concern about the proposed pond backing up that is about 100 feet from his house. He indicated that there isn't very much freeboard. Is there some kind of flood control that allows water to escape from the pond when it backs up with heavy rain?

Scott Witte – 4970 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Was there going to be a traffic study done on 36<sup>th</sup> Ave and New Holland? There already is a lot of speeding and traffic, and it is hard to turn onto New Holland from 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. How much more traffic would this bring? Strikwerda explained it will create 600 trips per day. New Holland has a capacity of 8,000 trips per day with the highest traffic count being 3,600 by 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

Ed Cotts – 3248 Greenvale Court. What's going to happen to the storm water west of the creek, you can't fill it in because it is in a flood zone. There is another detention pond northeast of the subdivision.

Steve Warber - 4869 Greenridge Court. Wasn't there a proposal a few years ago that was turned down? Why not leave it as is? Strikwerda stated there was a preliminary PUD approval in the past.

Mary Lou Bogema - 3482 Golfside Drive. Has lived here since 1983, the condos on Golfside will be most affected by this project with the new homes being the closest to our homes.

- The golf course was part of the original development and when the property was split back in the late 1980's there didn't seem to be regulations for rear yard setback. Concerns with the rear setback between the homes.
- Concerned about the height of the new homes being two stories and raised. They would be looking down on our decks.

- Concerned about the foot traffic on the proposed pathway. With only two entrances we are worried about people crossing over the condo's property to get to and from the path.

Jim Krikke – 5024 36<sup>th</sup> Street. Has concern about the foot traffic with them cutting through his property. What is the depth of the pond? The proposed depth is 8-10'.

VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

- Has the city done a cost analysis on the upkeep of the pond? It was explained that the preliminary review has been done and that the new larger pond is physically tied into Buttermilk Creek; as such it is considered part of the creek and will be part of the drainage district. It will be dredged out, like the creek is every so many years by the Ottawa County Water Resources Commission's office. It's estimated the cost to maintain the property would be \$2,500 to \$5,000 up front with a smaller annual cost to maintain. The city would maintain the entrance to the path off New Holland and along the pathway by keeping it mowed. It will be designed to promote passive and active recreation. It will have a natural landscape design to minimize upkeep.
- Joe Bush, Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner, reviewed the meeting that he had with the City of Hudsonville staff members, the developer and engineer on this project. This is preliminary. A lot of the concerns that have been brought up were discussed and reviewed. The next set of plans will have to meet all of the standards and will be available for review by the engineers and attorneys. Ottawa County will be using Prein & Newhof Engineering for the review and the condos are using them as well. The 3 main objectives for the 3.7 acre pond will be:
  1. Flood control
  2. Water quality
  3. Environmental - fishing and recreational use
- It was asked how the water levels will be maintained when there is a large amount of rain in a short time and the water backs up. Where will the water go? There will be a spillway or control structure to control the levels.
- Will this project affect the creek to the south side of New Holland when we get heavy rains? Will it make it worse? It will probably make it better because water will fill the pond when it gets to a certain level.

#### **STATEMENT OF CONCLUSIONS**

A motion by Raterink and support by Leatherman to approve the Statement of Conclusions for Buttermilk Creek located at 3441 New Holland Street. This approval is based on the finding that the standards in Section 11-8 E. of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met with the following conditions:

1. Add sidewalk to the east side of the road, connecting to New Holland Street.
2. All streets shall have face curbing.
3. Widen the street at New Holland Street to allow for two egress lanes.
4. Change the pathway to meet MDOT standards.

The plan meets the regulations as set forth with the proposed deviations:

	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>1. Public road width</b>	30'	26'
<b>2. Public right-of-way width</b>	66'	56'
<b>3. Maximum cul-de-sac length</b>	800'	1,575'
<b>4. Front yard building setback</b>	N/A	30'
<b>5. Side yard between buildings</b>	25'	14'
<b>6. Rear yard</b>	50' (for 2 story)	30'
<b>7. Lot width</b>	150'	60'

The safeguards for each deviation are as follows:

1. The narrower 26' wide road is not a through street, which keeps the traffic volume to a minimum and results in less stormwater detention demand. On-street parking will only be permitted on one side of the street to allow better emergency vehicle access. A suggested second egress lane at New Holland will widen the entrance.
2. The narrower 56' right-of-way is not a through street. Part of the reason for a narrower right-of-way is due to a narrower road. This is not a through street and the narrower right-of-way fits the neighborhood type.
3. Most of the development is a looped street. Due to the small frontage and the creek, there aren't feasible options for a second access point.
4. 30' is a standard front yard building setback. A front yard setback has not been established since this is a new street.
5. The reduction in space between homes allows for a less intense development by having single-family homes instead of multi-family buildings. There is also open space behind all of the lots, except where they back onto the lots off of 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which have deeper than usual rear yards.
6. A single-family lot more commonly has a 40' rear yard building setback. There will be open space behind all of the lots, except where they back onto the lots off of 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which have deeper than usual rear yards so there is more open space to the rear than what a traditional development has.
7. The minimum 60' lot width is slightly narrower than what is permitted in a single-family subdivision with 65' being the narrowest allowed outside of the downtown area. This is seen as a more efficient design with an excessive amount of open space preserved throughout the development, including over 10 acres of open space east of the creek.

This project is less intense than the underlying zoning. The single-family residential use is compatible with the surrounding uses being less dense than the attached residential development to the north, east and south, and matching the single-family use to the west. It has a unique design that is consistent with the Master Plan's Goals for accentuating great neighborhoods. The pathway meets the Parks, Recreation, and Natural Areas Future Land Use Designation. The Master Plan encourages accentuating great neighborhoods by connecting them to other parts of the community, such as civic places,

and schools with green infrastructure, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian access. It also states to enhance and connect the non-motorized network.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

4. **3284 & 3320 Chicago Drive and 3287 Prospect Street – Hudsonville Winery/Pike 51 - Special Use Permit and Preliminary PUD**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Ron Snider, Vice President of Hudsonville Winery, Inc. and Edward J. Zwyghuizen, Gen1 Architectural Group reviewed their request for a Restaurant/Winery/Microbrewery/Banquet Facility that will include outdoor seating on the ground level and on the second story.

The staff report was presented.

The following discussion took place:

- Jim Luikens – 5489 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Is not in support of the project, he believed that Prospect Street was going to have auto related uses.
- A topographical survey has been completed. Now we will be able to do stormwater design and get the height of the building. There is a 3-4 foot grade change to deal with but for the most part it is a balanced (flat) site.
- There are ongoing meetings with MDOT with respect to the on-street parking and access management concerns.
- It was asked if parking spaces can be in the flood plain. Yes.

VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

A motion by Leatherman and support by Raterink, to approve the Special Use Permit for Hudsonville Winery/Pike 51 located at 3284 & 3320 Chicago Drive and 3287 Prospect Street. This approval is based on the finding that the standards in Section 15.02 A. of the Hudsonville Downtown Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

**STATEMENT OF CONCLUSIONS**

A motion by Raterink and support by Nesky to approve the Statement of Conclusions for the Hudsonville Winery located at 3284 and 3320 Chicago Drive, and 3287 Prospect Street. This approval is based on the finding that the standards in Section 15.08 E. of the Hudsonville Downtown Zoning Ordinance have been affirmatively met with the following conditions:

1. If possible, shift the building closer to Prospect Street to more closely meet the build to zone and eliminate a driveway that does not meet spacing requirements.
2. Sidewalk shall be at least 7' wide where it abuts 18' deep parking spaces.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

5. **5471 North Bluff Drive – Dan and Ann Marie Meyaard – Special Use Permit**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Dan and Ann Marie Meyaard have submitted a Special Use Permit application for a 1,700 s.f. accessory building where 864 s.f. is permitted. They also plan to rebuild the house with an attached garage that will be up to 1,200 s.f. for a total of up to 2,900 s.f. of accessory space where a total of 1,536 s.f. is permitted. Their architect Paul Fikse from Visbeen Architects was also present.

The following discussion took place:

- Dave Bolhuis - 5436 North Bluff Drive. Is in support of this project.
- The applicant will be coming back next month for a Special Use Permit for the height of this building because we did not get it on this request at the time it was submitted. After further design work the approximate height was better determined.
- Could the building meet the requirements? Paul Fikse indicated they want a steep pitch to the roof. It looks like a barn that way.
- The height is estimated to be about 18' but have requested 20' to make sure they're covered.
- The barn floor elevation is approximately 20' below the floor of the Bolhuis' house which is the closest home.
- There was consensus that the additional height should fit the surroundings and not cause a problem.

VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The staff report was presented.

A motion by Waterman and support by VanDoeselaar to approve the Special Use Permit at 5471 North Bluff Drive for a total 2,900 s.f. of accessory space where 1,536 s.f. is permitted and a 1,700 s.f. detached accessory building where 864 s.f. is permitted. This approval is based on the finding that all of the General Standards for Approval 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 of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance are met.

Yeas 8, Nays 0

6. **4907 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Jeffrey & Nicole Kamer – Special Use Permit**

Chairman VanDenBerg opened the public hearing.

Jeff and Nicole Kamer reviewed their Special Use Permit request for a 768 s.f. accessory building. They are permitted a total of 1,024 s.f. of accessory space. When the existing 484 s.f. attached garage is subtracted from that they are permitted by right to have a 540 s.f. detached accessory building.

The following discussion took place:

- Where is the building going to be placed on the property? In the southwest corner of the back yard. A driveway will be installed as well.
- There is a row of pine trees to buffer the building from the south and west.
- The resident at 4906 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be looking to submit a request for one on his property in the future.
- Concern was raised with setting precedence.
- What type of material will be used? Metal sides matching the house and shingles matching the roof.

VanDenBerg closed the public hearing.

The staff report was presented.

A motion by Waterman and support by Nesky to approve the Special Use Permit at 4907 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue for a 768 s.f. detached accessory building for a total of 1,252 s.f. of accessory space where 1,024 s.f. is permitted. This approval is based on the finding that all of the General Standards for Approval 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 of the Hudsonville Zoning Ordinance are met with the following condition:

1. The siding type and color need to match the house.

Yeas 5, Nays 3 (Leatherman, Raterink, VanDenBerg)

**INFORMAL SESSION**

7. **6034 – 6090 Balsam Drive – Rezoning discussion**

Per previous discussions on the vacant property along the east side of Balsam Drive it has been recommended to rezone the portion that is currently zoned “CBD-2”, General Commercial – Two to high density residential, which matches the Future Land Use Map designation. The city attorney concurs with this recommendation.

The following discussion took place:

- The background information was reviewed.
- It was suggested to rezone these properties to match the new Master Plan.

8. The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Teri Schut  
Planning / Zoning Assistant