

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 12, 2024, 7:00 P.M.
COMMISSION CHAMBERS

- A. Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
- B. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner VanderMeer.
- C. Roll Call:
Members Present: Dan Holtrop, Sandra Jones, Ed Kape, Alex Porter, Ray Poyner, Doug VanderMeer, Sarah Weir
Members Absent: Bill Benoit and Darius Quinn (absent with notification)
Others Present: Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier, Deputy Finance Director Bhama Cairns, Director of Engineering and Inspection Services Jim Kirkwood, Deputy Director of Parks & Recreation, Spencer McKellar and Fleet Services Supervisor Jamie King the applicants and one citizen.

Motion by Kape, supported by Weir, to excuse Benoit and Quinn from the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn 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 Holtrop, supported by Commissioner Porter, to approve the Minutes of February 28, 2024 and the Findings of Fact for: Case#5-24 – Vanderwall Brothers- Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for a Building Supply Company Located at 3652 29th Street St

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

- F. Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Holtrop, supported by Commissioner Porter, to approve the agenda for the March 12, 2024, meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

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

There was no public comment.

H. Old Business

Case#3-24 – Breton Ravines RPUD – Rezoning and Preliminary PUD Approval for a Residential Planned Unit Development Located at 2720 52nd Street, 2854 52nd Street and 5491 Wing Avenue SE; (**Applicant has requested to table to March 26, 2024**)

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Kape, to table Case#3-24 Breton Ravines to March 26, 2024.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

I. Public Hearing

Case#6-24 – Structures and Improvements Plan (SIP) 2024-2030

Schweitzer stated the SIP Plan is broken down into a variety of project types. The SIP is an overview of the City's Annual Capital Improvements Program that sets forth improvements over the next 6-year period and in this case years July 1, 2024- June 30, 2030. He stated this plan covers Building and Site Improvements; Parks; Streets, Sidewalks and Non-Motorized Trails, Water, Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Management Systems.

Schweitzer stated Bhama Cairns, Deputy Finance Director, Jim Kirkwood, Director of Engineering and Inspection, Spencer McKeller, Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation were present.

Jones opened the public hearing.

There was no public comment.

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

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

Holtrop questioned why only \$125,000 dollars was being spent out of the Parks & Recreation millage funds. Deputy Finance Director Bhama Cairns stated the other expenditures will be the maintenance for the parks and won't be in this document because this is capital improvements budget expenditures.

Poyner stated he would have thought that there would be some projected additional investment with the millage. He questioned what will the residents see a breakdown on how the money for the millage is being spent. McKellar stated the community center is a \$20-\$30 million dollar investment. The park and recreation millage brings in about 2.4

million each year. McKellar stated the Parks and Recreation have a Master Plan and there are a variety of projects that are on there, however to stretch the taxpayer dollars and be a fiscally responsible as possible they are seeking private donations and partnerships and grants. Discussion ensued. McKellar stated there is a millage page on the website and a committee page with some other documents like the business plan that showcases what the community asked for through surveys.

Deputy Director Spencer McKellar stated that the full millage funds will be spent on the community center. McKellar stated the construction of the new community center we need a large amount of money up from front; therefore we will borrow some monies from other funds that the City has. He stated each year thereafter, they are going to use a portion of the millage total to pay back the borrowed money. Another portion of the millage is going towards staff and towards other projects. He stated in the foreseeable future that entire millage fund will be spent on the projects listed in the SIP.

Porter stated he noticed there are 8 backup generators and questioned whether that will be replaced from 2025-2030 and he noticed they were all different sizes and questioned the fuel they use and if there is anything that can be done to make them consistent. Fleet Supervisor Jamie King stated the generators are sized based on the load. He stated as far as the fuel they are on two different types of fuel, natural gas and diesel fuel. Discussion ensued.

Poyner questioned the big investment in the generators is there an opportunity to bundle. King stated he does an evaluation on each unit on an annual basis. Several of the units will out last the SIP schedule. He stated it is his understanding that none of the generators were in a budget for replacement. They were put in the SIP because at some point they are going to need to be replaced. King stated this is a very conservative schedule. King stated that currently there are two generators that he would consider in the foreseeable future to need replacement. Discussion ensued.

Porter questioned if there was a reason why the Justice Center roof replacement and parking lot were combined. Schweitzer stated both projects have been delayed pending the result of the Police and Fire millage request in May. Therefore, we wanted to hold off on some of the repairs until we get a better view of what investment might take place if the millage were to pass.

Jones questioned the replacement of Library community room tables and chairs that are in progress. McKellar stated the tables and chairs are in progress because they are able to fix some of them, but it is getting costly. The reason they are holding off the project is because the City is taking the responsibility to do all the furniture and fixtures for the new community center. They are trying to see if they can stretch the life of the tables and chairs to meet that timeline to order furniture together to get the best and lowest price.

Jones questioned if the cemetery during the day is staffed and Jaycees Park is done.

Jones questioned whether Kelloggwoods Park is partnering with KBL. McKellar stated as community members come with thoughts or ideas Parks and Rec always prepared to explore them to see if they can fit within the Master Plan and the funding, but nothing is set in stone at this time. Discussion ensued.

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Poyner, to recommend to the City Commission to adopt the Structures and Improvements Plan for July 1, 2024- June 30, 2030.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

J. Work Session

Case#7-24 – Heyboer Acres Phase 2 – Preliminary Plat and Final Site Plan Review
Located at 2500 52nd Street SE

Golder stated the request is for Preliminary Plat and Final Site Plan Review. She stated Phase 1 was approved which was 17 lots. The City rezoned an 82.8 acre property in 2022. She stated phase 2 is 43 lots on 17.75 acres. She stated the only thing that came up in the initial review is that we don't want to have detention ponds where nobody owns them.

Golder stated at the applicant/staff review there was discussion about what kind of maintenance we expect in detention areas. She stated the City Commissioners wanted to make it clear a property owners responsibility if you own one of these lots. Engineering doesn't want any trees to be growing in the ponds, but there needs to be some clarity on what you are supposed to do to make sure you are fulfilling maintenance requirements. That needs to be communicated to the future property owners. She stated there aren't a lot of detention ponds in Phase 1, they are mostly in Phase 2.

Poyner questioned if there will be any feedback from the City Commission regarding maintenance of the detention ponds before the public hearing. Golder stated this will be more of an engineering question and policy that we need to adopt for detention ponds. Poyner asked about tree preservation. Golder stated from her understating some trees were preserved and some had to be taken out.

Porter questioned the access to the development. Golder stated you can access from Plover. There will be a point when they have to put a construction road. She can find out when that will be. Porter stated once developed each phase will be accessing through 60th and 52nd Street through the side streets. Golder stated there are a lot of ways to get out. You can go through Bretonfield development and Princeton. Porter questioned if we need to look at a traffic study to see how that is going to impact the neighborhood. Golder stated there is not going to be a traffic study at this time.

Holtrop questioned when the new architecture requirements will apply to projects. Golder stated they will apply officially when we adopt them. She stated the Heyboer family has

adopted their own and staff has a copy of the deed restrictions that we can share with the commissioners. Golder stated that we do not have a PUD but the Heyboers have forwarded the City's proposed standards to the builders that they will be working with. It would be better if the City had new standards formally adopted.

VanderMeer stated when the Heyboer did their presentation at the parks they were very adamant that the development of the homes were going to mirror the Princeton area. He stated and that helped please the Princeton residents. Vandermeer stated regarding the detention pond, the residents are going to own them, but they can't put anything on them. Golder stated that is correct.

Jones stated making sure the detention ponds stay clear of trees and etc. would that be a deed restriction. Golder stated yes, but as you know people don't always pay attention to these documents, so we want to make sure that people know what they are getting into if the requirement is they have to maintain the detention pond. Discussion ensued. Jones stated it will be good to get the City Attorney's input.

Case#8-24 – Hope Haven – Rezoning of 28.93 acres of land from R1-B Residential to RPUD-2 Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review Located at 5578 Wing Avenue, 5606 Wing Avenue, 5632 Wing Avenue, 5600 Wing Avenue

Pung stated the request is rezoning of 28.93 acres of land from R1-B Residential to RPUD-2 Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Site Plan Review

Pung stated the proposed development encompasses four (4) parcels (two vacant parcels and two parcels with existing single family homes). The site is encumbered by floodplain and wetlands There are wooded areas throughout the site There are significant elevation changes, especially at the perimeter of the development.

Pung stated the current proposal would have 54 lots about 1.87 units per acre would be the gross density with a net density of under 3 acres. The area is currently master planned for low density residential which is less than 4 units per acre; therefore, it is consistent with the master plan.

Pung stated as a PUD they are required to have open space. The current intent is to incorporate that open space into the lots similar to what was done with Wildflower Estates. He stated we would require easements over that open space to ensure that it remains common open space that the residents have access and that the property owners can't come in and fence it off or prevent access to what is designated open space.

Pung stated in the past we have had the open space as a separate lot to be maintained by a homeowners association. He stated if the homeowner association goes defunct there is nobody paying the taxes it goes up for tax sale someone tries to buy it cheap and leads to

problems down the road. He stated you can extend the property lines so the open space gets put into an easement and not under a separate lot it is all incorporated into existing lots.

Pung stated the applicant does not intend to build. They will sell individual lots to either builders or individuals wanting to build a home.

Pung stated there are significant changes planned to the site layout. The applicant has asked to table the public hearing to April 9. He stated the street design will be changed to eliminate the need for emergency access to the site. They may request a variance to the street length to allow them to go from 1320 to 1370. They are working on new plans. He stated they are going to extend the PUD to include the existing home add another 14,00 square feet to the PUD rezoning.

Pung stated although the layout will change some of the issues in the staff report will remain. He stated architecture and how the homes will fit on the lots is going to be important. He stated we would want the details of what kind of restrictions they are going to have included with the PUD agreement along with sample building designs that can fit on the lots. He stated this will be especially important since they are not going to be building the homes. It needs to be clear to whoever comes in and buys the lot what the requirements and restrictions are going to be so they know what they are getting into when they purchase a lot to build on it. He stated the applicant is working on getting different building designs that will meet our draft architectural standards and fit on the specific lots.

Pung stated we are looking for an updated PUD agreement which would include information with regards to architectural details. It would also include the easement restrictions for the open space and how that would be accessed.

Pung stated if you look at Wing Avenue all the homes in the area are very large lots. This would be a significant change to that area. There is going to be concern regarding the number of lots and the size of the lots. Even though it meets our Master Plan requirements, it has to somewhat fit into the area and also that any homes are going to work on the lots that are proposed. Their narrowest lot is 62 feet. Bretonfield the narrowest is 52 feet, 10 feet larger but some of the sizing issues may still apply.

Pung stated they are aware that we will be looking at the garage itself having a setback of 35 feet although the home themselves can come up to that 20 foot setback.

Pung stated they are looking at requesting tabling the public hearing, but we still have to open the public hearing because it has already been published in the newspaper, so we will treat it as another work session.

VanderMeer stated being sensitive to the residents on Wing Ave and how they appreciate their rural road conceptually there will be an additional 50 cars that are going to be

moving up and down the street. He stated there will probably be some concern regarding that traffic. He stated from an environmental standpoint he believes it is a wooded area, what is the intent for the trees that are going to be removed from that area to build. He stated he is also concerned about the lot size you can reach out and touch your neighbor when you are looking at 50-60 foot lot and you have 6 feet on each side

Paul Granzotto, 3328 Riverton Dr. Hudsonville MI was present. He stated when he went through the plans, he tried to base them on Pfeffer Drive. He stated Eaglecreek currently has the same 62-foot width on their lots and he wanted to do something relatively similar. He stated it has worked out great and there are four different buildings in there and it has turned out awesome.

VanderMeer stated from an environmental standpoint what is the plan. Granzotto stated along the edge there are going to be quite a few trees and it is wetlands and they are going to keep all of that there. He stated most of the trees that are in the main area are sparse and thin trees that are over 8 inches around.

VanderMeer questioned if he had spoken to any of the residents. Granzotto stated they modified their plans, and he has called a few but has not been able to get a hold of all of them. VanderMeer stated it looks like there is only one exit onto Wing it might be congested. Granzotto stated in their next plan it is going to be nicer. Vandermeer stated he isn't comfortable right now where they are at.

Kape questioned the emergency access and if this will be gated. Granzotto stated the plan was to gate it off and have two homes, one on each side but they have addressed this in the new plan they won't even need the emergency fire access.

Adam Feenstra with Feenstra and Associates was present. He stated they don't have a completed plan of the revision, but he has a conceptual plan. He displayed the conceptual plan and stated for the emergency access he has had conversations with the homeowner that owns the property that the easement is across; it was vague in how much emergency access they would be allowed per the wording of the easement it was emergency access for up to three lots and they are proposing emergency access for 54. He stated they found out the drive is well outside the actual easement that would also need to be addressed before they could consider using that. The homeowner was very reluctant to grant a new easement for this purpose for almost the middle of this property. He stated they pulled back from that and switched to the idea of keeping their street lengths under control to meet the 1,320 foot length in the requirements. Discussion ensued. He stated if they can't they will ask for a variance for 50 feet.

Kape stated one the conditions say verify at least 25% of the open space will be exclusive from the ponds storm water and detention facilities. Where will the 25% be. Feenstra stated 42% of the overall property is open space and of the open space area about 34% is upland and not incumbered by the detention. Kape questioned if the green space was shifted around and not consumed so much would he be able to have larger lots. Feenstra

stated another consideration is the depth of the sanitary sewer. The sanitary sewer on Wing Avenue at their tie in point is 12 or 13 feet deep. In order to serve all these lots, they will be picking the grade up at the end of the cul-de-sacs. Even then they only expect to have the minimum required cover over the sanitary sewer that Grand Rapids allows which is 5 feet. He stated there will be a number of houses in this development that will not be able to serve a basement with sewer. He stated the main floor and second floor no problem. That is why they can't extend the road further and enlarge the lots in general because they are constrained by the length they can generate just from the sanitary sewer itself.

Weir stated she also had concern with the traffic and questioned if a traffic study would be done. Feenstra stated that is up to staff to tell them if it is needed. He stated GVMC also has traffic counts for all of Kent County. They could compare what the traffic counts are on Wing Avenue and what it was designed for. Pung stated based on the initial units or lots the numbers didn't warrant a traffic study, and he has spoke to the City Engineer of what the design volume would be for Wing Avenue and waiting for him to get back to him.

Holtrop questioned if visibility north and south, left and right is good. Pung stated the City Engineer did not mention that as an issue. Holtrop also questioned points of access in the open space. Feenstra stated they will have points of access so residents could access all the open space in the back. Discussion ensued regarding lot sizes and the number of homes.

Porter questioned the trees on lots 36-39 and will they all be removed. Feenstra stated most of those trees are in the wetland so no, the majority would stay. Discussion ensued regarding trees. Porter stated he is concerned about how many of the trees are going.

Porter stated there are sidewalk that are going to lead out to Wing but there are no sidewalks on Wing how close do those sidewalks come out to where the Paul Henry Trail. Pung stated it is quite a bit further to the south. Porter questioned if we are setting up a pedestrian danger zone where they have tripled traffic but no sidewalk on Wing. Pung stated the access is almost down to 60th Street. Porter stated he would be very concerned about that. Discussion ensued. Schweitzer stated the prospect is there; on the west side of the street is a watermain and that would be the most ideal location to put at least a 5-foot-wide sidewalk along that area. Porter stated he would ask staff to look at the infrastructure and from a pedestrian point of view is the infrastructure sufficient.

Poyner stated regarding the traffic it will be some additional traffic but a relatively small number of vehicles. If the traffic study came back and showed a problem what would happen. Pung stated the City Engineer will be looking at the design capacity. Schweitzer stated he doesn't think they will expand the road one thing to consider hopefully the extension of Breton Avenue from 52nd Street will come into play and that could change some travel patterns through there to reduce the amount of traffic using it.

Poyner questioned the price point of the homes. Granzotto stated Pfeiffer Pines which he was comparing to are selling anywhere from 460k-550k. Lots 41, 42, and 43 their hopes were they would make more of an executive house and nicer homes that there will be a demand for.

Poyner questioned if there will be an HOA. Feenstra stated yes there will be an HOA to help with maintenance but pretty minimal.

Jones stated people on Wing fought sidewalks and the improvements that we see are what they would agree to. They really wanted to keep it as a natural beauty road and this is why it is they way it is.

Jones questioned if he has met with neighbors. He stated he has spoke to the gentleman that owns the property that had the fire lane access otherwise he has not spoke to the neighbors. Jones encouraged him to have some conversation if possible.

K. New Business

There was no New Business.

L. Other Business

1. Master Plan Implementation Schedule

Golder stated the changes that are in the Master Plan are related to housing policy and told the commissioners to reach out to staff if they have any questions. She stated in the next fiscal year we are going to be looking at a housing policy and decide what the City want to do with respect to rental properties, the properties that the City owns, and the remaining developable properties in the City.

2. Commissioners' Comments

Porter stated he will not be at the March 26 meeting.

3. Staff's Comments

M. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Poyner, supported by Commissioner Porter, to adjourn the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Benoit and Quinn absent -

Meeting adjourned at 9:00pm

Approved Minutes
Planning Commission
March 12, 2024
Page 10

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary