

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 13, 2024, 7:00 P.M.  
COMMISSION CHAMBERS

- A. Vice-Chair Holtrop called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
- B. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Quinn.
- C. Roll Call:  
Members Present: Bill Benoit, Dan Holtrop, Ed Kape, Alex Porter, Ray Poyner, Darius Quinn, Doug VanderMeer, Sarah Weir  
Members Absent: Sandra Jones (absent with notification)  
Others Present: Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, and the applicants.

**Motion by Kape, supported by Quinn, to excuse Jones from the meeting.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

- D. Declaration of Conflict of Interest

There was no conflict of interest statement expressed.

- E. Approval of the Minutes and Findings of Fact

**Motion by Commissioner Quinn, supported by Commissioner Poyner, to approve the Minutes of January 23, 2024 and the Findings of Fact for: Case#1-24 – Storage Five Kentwood LLC – Rezoning of 5.87 acres of land from C-2 Commercial to Conditional I-1 located at 1800-1900 44<sup>th</sup> Street SE; Case#2-24 –Rezoning of 6.11 acres of land from I-1 Industrial to Conditional C-2 Commercial Located at 5080, 5090, 5140 Broadmoor Ave SE and 4581 – 52<sup>nd</sup> Street SE**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

- F. Approval of the Agenda

**Motion by Commissioner Poyner, supported by Commissioner Quinn, to approve the agenda for the February 13, 2024, meeting.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

- G. Acknowledge visitors wishing to speak to non-agenda items.

There was no public comment.

There was no Old Business

I. Public Hearing

**Case#4-24** Midwest United FC Practice Facility – Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for a Small Group Fitness and Rehabilitation Training Facility Located at 3445 – 36<sup>th</sup> Street

Pung stated the request is for special land use and site plan review for a small group fitness and rehab training facility. He stated the applicant will be located within an existing building off of 36<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated their intent is to use up to 13,500 square feet of the existing almost 20,000 square foot building for an indoor turf training space with an instructor to trainee ratio of up to 1:8.

Pung stated the zoning ordinance under the current definition would restrict the use to no more than 4,976 square feet with an instructor to trainee ratio of 1:4. He stated in November of last year the applicant went to the Zoning Board of Appeals and received variances to allow up to 15,000 square feet for the use with an instructor to trainee ratio of 1:8.

Pung stated the applicant submitted a revised operations description. It addressed any issues and concerns raised at the work session. He stated there are no changes to the outside of the building or the site. The only changes will be to the interior of the building.

Pung stated he is recommending conditional approval of the special land use and site plan review as described in his memos dated January 30, 2024.

Holtrop opened the public hearing.

There was no public comment.

**Motion by Kape, supported by Poyner to close the public hearing.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

**Motion by Poyner, supported by Benoit, to grant conditional approval of the Special Land Use Small Group Fitness and Rehabilitation Training Facility as described in Case 04-24 Midwest United FC Practice Facility. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1-3 and basis point 1-5 as described in Pung’s memo dated January 30, 2024.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

**Motion by Poyner, supported by Benoit, to grant conditional approval of the site plan dated April 24, 2018, as described in Case 04-24 Midwest United FC Practice Facility. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1-3 and basis point 1-3 as described in Pung's memo dated January 30, 2024.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

J. Work Session

**Case#5-24** – Vanderwall Brothers- Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for a Building Supply Company Located at 3652 29<sup>th</sup> Street St

Pung stated the request is for special land use and preliminary site plan review for a building supply company. He stated the applicant will need to come back for a final site plan review with engineering details. Pung stated right now they want approval for the use and the general layout.

Pung stated the applicant is looking at having building supply material. He stated they provide materials for outdoor display. He stated they would be selling the building supply materials. He stated only employees would be accessing the storage area. He stated the public would have access to the building. The landscape area will be showcasing what you can do with the product.

Pung stated staff has asked for a more detailed business description which would explain in detail where the public would have access to and how the materials would be picked up or delivered. He stated in speaking with the applicant the public cannot come in buy materials and leave with it. Most of their supplies are supplied to other contractors. Therefore a contractor would come in and pick up the materials or they would have to deliver it to the site. He stated staff would like this to be put into the operations statement so if another use comes in that is similar this will be how they will have to operate.

Pung stated some issues that came up was parking. Parking is currently on the south of the parking lot adjacent to the building. The zoning ordinance doesn't allow parking within the required front yard. They showed switching the parking to the north side, they are going to flip it back to where it is now and have the parking adjacent to the building which would be in conformance of setback requirements for parking in the front yard.

Pung stated there is currently display in the required front yard. The zoning ordinance doesn't allow for parking or display within the front yard; that would have to be removed. He stated he is asking to verify the lot coverage. The zoning ordinance would limit the lot coverage to 75% that is basically everything that is not landscaped. He stated that it looks like they meet that but just need to verify that they are in compliance.

Pung stated the storage area will need to be paved as required by the zoning ordinance.

Pung stated they are showing a firepit display in the back, however it is not clear how someone is going to get back there to look at it. If they are going to have that there staff will need to know how that is supposed to be accessed if someone wants to look at how a firepit is set up.

Pung stated staff is also looking at detail on the stacking height of materials. The ordinance requires that it be screened therefore it can't stack any higher than any solid fence or wall that is screening the area. Pung stated staff would also like to know the hours of operation.

Kurt, with Vanderwall Brothers was present. He stated they are a company that has been around since 1922 in Spring Lake. He stated they do three primary things. They are a manufacturer of dry cast concrete products. They have two manufacturing facilities where they make concrete masonry units, hardscapes, landscaping products things that are used in the K-12 market, educational space and lots of municipalities. Kurt stated they are mechanical contractors who specialize in yellow flame, fireplaces indoors and outdoors. Their third segment is stone, brick, and hardscapes.

Kurt stated their objective is to have more presence in the Grand Rapids market. Their intent is to provide some landscaping and show some of the products that they manufacture and have an ability to sell into the Grand Rapids market through that location.

Kape questioned what will be in the employees only area. Kurt stated that would be the area where they will have products that are able to be picked up and put into a trailer or truck.

Porter questioned what would be the biggest truck coming into that employee area to pick things up and is there room for them to come in and turn around. Kurt stated he thinks it would be a 10 cube truck. They have actually brought their straight truck in there and able to maneuver it to pull in and pull back out. Porter questioned would any equipment be stored there. Kurt stated the equipment would be just a hi-lo to move things around but not for rent or sale.

Holtrop stated on the west side of the building he has a paper that says hottub garden and firepit garden and it is right on the driveway. Kurt stated that is part of their landscape design. Holtrop questioned how much can they store in their storage yard. Kurt stated there are a fair number of cubes there and it will be helpful if he gives them a picture of what the pallet size looks like.

**Case#3-24** – Breton Ravines RPUD – Rezoning and Preliminary PUD Approval for a Residential Planned Unit Development Located at 2720 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, 2854 52<sup>nd</sup> Street and 5491 Wing Avenue SE;

Golder stated the proposed development is located on an overall 66.64 acre property located west of Wing Avenue and south of 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. The applicant is proposing a total of 256 housing units, or 3.84 units per acre (gross density). In terms of unit types, 24 site condos, 11 single free-standing condominiums, 82 duplex condo units, (41 building) 51 - triplex townhouse condominiums (17 buildings) 88 fourplex townhouse condominiums.

Golder stated the Master Plan was amended to recommend high density residential east of Breton near 52<sup>nd</sup> Street. Medium density was recommended on the west side Breton and low density on the east side of Breton. She stated high density residential means it is 8-12 units per acre, medium 4-8 units per acre and low is 0-4 units per acre. Averaged out the maximum density would be between 300 and 469 units that would be possible if they want to be consistent with our Master Plan. That would equal 6.82 units per acre. She stated what is being proposed is 256 units and that is 3.84 units per acre. She stated when you look at the net density you have to take out the right-of-way They have done that and the density is 4.93 units per acre. She stated what the applicant didn't account for was a utility easement that goes out to Wing Avenue. Once they add that to calculate net density, it should still fall within the maximum 6.82 units per acre.

Golder stated the project involves the extension of Breton Avenue. She stated Breton extended would go through and connect eventually with Breton Avenue coming from 60<sup>th</sup> Street. The City did a couple iterations of the precise plat of Breton Avenue over time. The precise plat had to be amended for Bretonfield and with this new proposed development by Allen Edwin it will have to be amended again. The road will connect to the Bretonfield development to the south near the Paul Henry trail.

Golder stated Breton Avenue is proposed with 80 feet of ROW with one lane in each direction, a center turn lane and a requirement for medians. The west side will have a non-motorized trail, the east side will have sidewalk.. She stated staff is going to require a traffic study of the applicant. That will help the City determine what the intersection of Breton at 52<sup>nd</sup> Street looks like. She stated they will also look at traffic light timing and where the medians should be located so there is adequate space for turning. There will be a new light at Breton and the developer will participate in the cost of that new light/intersection improvements.

Golder stated that there are a lot of wetlands that go through the site. The applicant is showing 6 detention ponds. The City Engineer is asking for those to be combined.

Golder stated staff met and regarding the road. It is the desire of the City to have the road put in from 52<sup>nd</sup> to the Pual Henry Trail at the outset of the project. She stated we will have to work on how that is going to happen. The City is generally responsible monetarily for the oversizing of the site. Oversizing includes one travel lane as well as the nonmotorized trail.

Golder stated the developer has submitted a PUD statement. The statement discusses their efforts to preserve the mature trees and open space. She stated the recommendation

will include a statement regarding how they are going to preserve the open space and make sure it is not damaged or destroyed.

Golder stated the roads appear to meet our private road standards with the exception of when there are over 16 units, two sides of sidewalk are required. She stated there are areas where there is only one side of sidewalk and in order to comply with that regulation they would have to extend the sidewalk.

Golder displayed photos of the building elevations for phase one. She stated phase one looks like they meet the transparency in the front. She stated it isn't clear if they have windows planned for the corner lots. She stated it appears the building could meet 4 of our proposed design elements. We will also look for variations in color and design elements. She stated the applicants also have a design for a duplex condominium and generally speaking; that does not meet our architectural requirements mostly because they don't have enough transparency.

Golder stated at the work session there was discussion about not wanting garages for duplexes directly adjacent. They will have to break them up, having a house in between garages.

Golder stated the rest of the development are townhouses. The loading townhouse they are like the ones on Walma that are being constructed. She stated they do not meet our transparency requirements. Golder stated the rear loading townhouses appear to meet our standards with respect to transparency. The applicant made the point that they are really expensive to build.

Golder stated a lot of these units have difficulty meeting transparency requirements our architectural requirements due to the existence of the garage in front.

Golder stated she sent a list of the things that are still needed:

- \*The traffic study

- \*the Breton Avenue extension the requirement for the two sides of the sidewalk, where does it stop on Breton extended, since it is not continued on the south side of the trail.

- \*She has asked the developer to look at adequate setbacks for all the buildings.

- \*She stated we were asking for a nonmotorized trail along 52<sup>nd</sup> Street.

- \*The net density calculations we need to make sure that the elevations meet the proposed architectural requirements.

- \*How the developer will ensure that the preservation area will be left natural

- \* the detention pond issue they are working through with the Engineering Department.

Dan Larabel, with Allen Edwin Homes was present. He displayed the elevations. He stated some of the updates they discussed splitting up the garages. He displayed a rendering of a 4 bedroom unit. He stated if the garage is set back 15 feet behind the front façade, you just measure the front façade without the garage to consider compliance with

transparency requirements. He stated he submitted 14 feet, but he can bump it back to 15 feet. He displayed renderings of the 3 unit buildings. He stated they prefer the 4 bedrooms and most customers prefer the 4 bedrooms as well. He displayed renderings of the site condominiums. He stated that he did add more variation. He added a full front porch, stating that is an 8,000 dollar option.

Larabel stated regarding the traffic study; they do that following a preliminary approval.

Larabel stated regarding sidewalk coverage he looked at that further and thinks he can get very close to doing all of the sidewalk required by the ordinance. There are three areas that are very challenging to get the sidewalks. Because of the wetlands. The other area where sidewalk is required he has to push the buildings back and the house would be at the bottom of the ravine and the wetlands. He would like flexibility on the three areas. He stated the rest of the site he is happy to get sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Larabel stated the development mostly meets setbacks. He stated he believes that was building S2 that is 25 feet from the PUD boundary the rest of the buildings are 35 feet on the PUD boundaries, so he is looking for a 25 foot rear setback on that one.

Larabel stated regarding the nonmotorized trails on 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, there is a desire for a 10 foot wide sidewalk. He stated he would be looking to expand just the width of the existing sidewalk by an additional 5 feet.

He stated there is some house keeping on the density which he said is well understood.

Larabel addressed how will developer will make sure that the preservation area is kept natural. He stated he it is a condominium ownership typically people own to their walls. Only site condominiums when you own more of the outside of the walls. He stated there is not a lot of exterior maintenance, because that is what the condominium HOA will do. He stated in terms of protecting the boundary, he would ask for something similar of what they have done at Woodhaven. Discussion ensued.

Larabel addressed issues regarding the number of detention ponds. There are a couple of spots throughout the site, they will work with the Engineering Department to consolidate those and come to something agreeable to the City.

Golder stated for phase 1 they don't need the sidewalks all the way around the street unless there are 16 units.

Benoit stated he is happy with the density. He stated they used to require for PUD's that were in the sensitive areas, make them incorporate into their master deed. The Master Deed includes how the areas should be maintained. Also they can put signage up that says natural wetland area, don't disturb. He stated in the master deed the homeowners association would be responsible if the sign fades or falls over. They would be

responsible for putting it back up. Golder stated she is concerned about the time during construction. Discussion ensued.

Benoit stated he is seeing a lot of the wetland in the cul-de-sac in the single family and questioned if Larabel was going to EGLE to get those taken out. Larabel stated he would like to, but he doesn't know if EGLE will do it, that is what the application process is for. Larabel stated he sees the amount of wetlands on the site as challenging. Discussion ensued.

Poyner stated his questions are about the setbacks not being met. Golder stated she thinks in phase 2 they might not, but at this scale it is hard to tell. She stated she is going to trust that the developer is going to check that out because if he wants a waiver then he will want to get that approved rather than have to come back. Poyner stated he likes the density. Poyner questioned if they feel comfortable with the distance between the homes and Breton Avenue. Golder stated it is a big hill there. Discussion ensued.

Porter stated he likes the sidewalks and the wetlands. But, he thinks that there are some spots where he has a choice. If it came down to the choice between a wetland and a sidewalk do we have to do anything to let the wetlands win. Golder stated she believes that the standards for private roads are suggested, but you can waive them to some extent in a PUD. Discussion ensued. Porter questioned the density. Golder stated it will be more dense when they take out the easement. Porter questioned if there is a chance if they have some of the wetlands up in the higher density area that you have to compromise on, would he add some units in the less dense areas. Larabel stated yes but when he looked at the plan, he would have done that already if he could without impacting the wetlands. This is the best plan. Discussion ensued.

Kape stated he has seen some of their other projects and feels like their other outside community areas outside of Kentwood seem to get a little more special care. Larabel stated what they are proposing here includes a bold siding color and it pops.

Quinn questioned what is the corner houses transparency. Gold stated it is the 3 windows of 6 square feet each on the corner lot. Quinn stated this is something that there will be a lot of focus on. Quinn questioned if it is possible that the density may change with the updated report. Golder stated yes, the density will go up.

Larabel discussed a survey that is sent to their customers 3 months after they closed on their homes and he indicated that they are satisfied, proud happy customers. VanderMeer stated he would like to see the surveys of the quality of the product. Porter stated we are also concerned about how it looks from the curb to the rest of the community.

VanderMeer stated in other communities Allen Edwin has the option of 50 spec homes, however in Kentwood they only have the option of 3 homes. Larabel stated they build about 5 or 6 of the same spec homes over and over. Discussion ensued. VanderMeer stated he would like to see more transparency on the windows.

VanderMeer questioned if he has come up with their projection is for the number of rentals that they will build. He stated he would like to continue 15%. Golder stated these are just units that Allen Edwin would rent out, it doesn't preclude someone from renting their own home. Discussion ensued regarding rentals in Kentwood.

VanderMeer stated their desire is to end the sidewalk after the last southern cul de sac street, but to him if he is walking along and comes to the end he is now going to have to cross over Breton. He stated he would desire to see it go out to the end. Golder stated there is nothing south of the Paul Henry. VanderMeer stated he would like the sidewalk to go to the Paul Henry. Discussion ensued.

Holtrop questioned if there is a way to specify that if the sidewalk is plainly visible from a major arterial road, there should be something to break up that façade. Holtrop stated he doesn't want to see those blank walls. Golder stated they can include this provision in their PUD statement.

Holtrop questioned can the product be previewed before future phases. Golder stated the Planning Commission will see the final, but if they don't like the product now, they might want to let Allen Edwin know. He has 4 different types of products and that would be what we are getting. Discussion ensued. Larabel stated on the townhouses, he is happy to discuss suggestions and enhancements. He is happy to submit information on windows and trim, etc. Holtrop said they would want to see these products. Larabel stated they can put that in the PUD agreement.

Holtrop stated there was discussion about the fire department and 1300 feet and having a secondary access. Larabel stated one of staff's comment is there is a desire for the whole entire route of Breton Avenue to be built out at one time. That is why he skipped discussion on that point. Discussion ensued.

Holtrop questioned if there will be any landscaping on the corners of all the private drives that attach to Breton. Larabel stated it will probably be a case by case basis they are going after minimal disturbance, maximum preservation.

Schweitzer stated on the elevations for the site condos that he presented it appears that there are zero entry homes. Larabel stated it is by nature that they are slab on grade. Slab on grade doesn't have such a big step up. It is a nice feature. Discussion ensued.

Poyner wanted to make sure he knows we don't see walls without windows that he has seen in some of their other developments.

Golder stated she would like to see the stairs to the porch of the townhouse stoop go across the whole front porch rather than just the stoop. The wall in between the garages looks awkward. She stated the size of pillars could be increased.

**Motion by Benoit, supported by VanderMeer, to Set public hearing date of March 12, 2024, for: Case#6-24 – Structures and Improvements Plan (SIP) 2024-2030**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

L. Other Business

1. Commissioners' Comments

Quinn stated to make sure their car doors are locked people are breaking into cars.

Holtrop stated we have had a lot of projects with right in right out and was wondering if we ask for them to put signage on that. Golder stated we don't require that.

Holtrop stated there was a LUZ Committee meeting. A request to change the Master Plan from Industrial to C2 on the corner of 44<sup>th</sup> and Patterson opposite from Dykstra.

2. Staff's Comments

Schweitzer stated we can have an SIP Committee meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> if we can find a room.

Schweitzer stated the Michigan Association of Planning and Zoning Essentials presentation and there is an opportunity again this March they are having it virtually March 26 and 27 or the day program in Frankenmuth.

Golder stated we are going to get the Bosgraff development Walma and 44<sup>th</sup> Street

M. Adjournment

**Motion by Commissioner Benoit, supported by Commissioner to adjourn the meeting.**

- Motion Carried (8-0) –
- Jones absent -

Meeting adjourned at 8:45pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary