

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 23, 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 Porter.
- C. Roll Call:
Members Present: Dan Holtrop, Sandra Jones, Ed Kape, Alex Porter, Ray Poyner, Darius Quinn, Doug VanderMeer, Sarah Weir
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier, the applicants and about 40 citizens.

- 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 Kape, supported by Commissioner Quinn, to approve the Minutes of April 9, 2024.

- Motion Carried (8-0) –

- F. Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Quinn, supported by Commissioner Porter, to approve the agenda for the April 23, 2024 meeting.

- Motion Carried (8-0) –

- 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 tabling to the May 14, 2024**)

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Quinn, to table Case#3-24 Breton Ravines RPUD to the May 14, 2024, meeting.

- Motion Carried (8-0) -

Case#8-24 – Hope Haven – Rezoning of 28.93 acres of land from R1-B Residential to RPUD-2 Detached Residential Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review Located at 5578 Wing Avenue, 5606 Wing Avenue, 5632 Wing Avenue, 5600 Wing (**Tabled from the April 9, 2024**)

Pung stated the request is for rezoning of approximately 28.93 acres of land from R1-B Single Family Residential to RPUD-2 Detached Single Family Residential and Preliminary Site Plan Review.

Pung stated this project involves 4 lots, two of the lots have existing homes on them which would be preserved as part of the development. He stated there is significant wetland and floodplain on the property along the south and east and then to the north along the edges of the property.

Pung stated their proposal is for 57 lots. One of the existing homes will be on an outlot not part of the overall PUD. He stated this will have to be connected to both water and sewer to make sure it meets our ordinance requirements. He stated the gross density is 1.97 units per acre and a net density of 2 ½ units per acre. He stated the Master Plan is for low density residential which is less than 4 units per acre; therefore, it is consistent with the Master Plan recommendation.

Pung stated as part of the PUD there is requirement for open space and the intent is to incorporate the open space within the lots and have the open space area covered with an easement to ensure that it is not developed by the lot owners.

Pung stated the applicant indicated that they will not be building the homes, they would be selling individual lots to people or other developers to build the homes.

Pung stated the applicant reserved a room at the library on April 16 for two sessions to meet with the residents.

Pung stated with respect to the PUD, there are several things that the applicant is offering through the PUD agreement. He noted what they are offering. The developer will have review authority over all building plans. Based on some of the conversation at the meeting with the residents they indicated that no builder will be allowed to purchase more than 1/3 of the lots; if a developer has more than one lot, they would also require that they would have to be spread throughout the development. They also said that the same model home cannot be built on adjacent lots. He stated they are requiring at least 5 elements of the city's draft architectural standards with one of the elements being that they have to have at least 3 trees on the property. They are also requiring that all the homes have to use 5 out of the 8 elements that they are listing. The elements that they have listed are: gabled roofs, dormers, symmetrical double hung windows, porches that are a minimum of 6x12 feet; natural stone or wood accents, chimneys; window shutters, cedar shake or board and batten siding elements. Pung stated each home would have to have 5 out of these 8 elements as part of their design. They are also requiring that homes

have a minimum of 10 inch eaves. For a one-story home it is a minimum of 1200 square feet on the main floor. For a 2-story home a minimum of 800 square feet on the main floor with a minimum of 1400 square feet of finished living area overall. He stated if it is feasible they have to work with the city to put some type of pedestrian sidewalk or pathway from their road down to Paris Park Drive. They would contribute the soil preparation and also the pavement. They have also required that all backyard lighting has to be shielded downward. He stated if there are issues with people trying to put things in the wetlands or encroach into the open space areas they are willing to put in signs designating where the open space easements begin. Originally, they added landscape buffer along the west property line, they have extended along two lots. There is also an existing driveway which is going to be removed, they are looking to put in a couple of trees there. They spoke with the neighbors to the east and possibly looking at some additional landscaping depending on what has to be removed for the detention pond. Pung stated they indicated the maintenance of those additional landscaping trees would be the responsibility of the condo association and not just the homeowner. Pung stated they extended the open space along lots 7-12 and which cannot be built upon by those individual property owners.

Pung stated he is recommending to the City Commission conditional approval of the rezoning and as described in his memo adding the condition prohibiting the rental of more than one home or unit by a single purchaser. And he is also recommending to the City Commission conditional approval of the Preliminary PUD plan dated April 17, 2024 as described in his memo.

Adam Feenstra, with Feenstra and Associates, Project Engineer, 3462 Rockwood Dr. Hudsonville was present. He stated at the public meeting they had about 8 residents in the afternoon session and about 7 residents in the evening session. He stated everyone wasn't enthusiastic about having any development behind them, but, looking over the plans they pretty much all agreed that the PUD provided more benefit to them than the by rights zoning. He stated they are trying to be as good of a neighbor as they can be. He stated they think they have a great plan.

Spencer Galloway, one of the developers of the project was present. He stated over time they have meet with about 20 residents. He stated of all the comments that people brought to the table clearly was speeding and safety on Wing Avenue which is something that need to be addressed by the police department and he hopes the city is able to do that.

Galloway stated another significant issue with everybody was water retention. There is some significantly low land all around the development where they are already struggling with water, and they are very aware of that. He stated they are excavators, and they are going to be doing the excavation. They have more control over that issue because they are the excavators and they are going to do everything they can to work with the city engineers as it relates to the retention scenario but they promise to exceed the minimal standards of water retention. He stated they are going to make sure the silt fence is seeded

all the way around and maintained so they are not leeching sand or muck into people's properties when it rains. He stated they will do what they can to exceed the standards for the retention pond and anything else they can do to keep more water than is already flowing. He stated there is already water flowing from this property, but it is their job to slow it down and make sure they don't contribute to the neighboring properties and they don't accelerate the water that is getting onto their properties currently.

Jones opened the public hearing.

Jamie King, 5781 Wing Ave, was present. He was concerned about having a duplex or a condo being built and stated there is no language to prohibit that.

Joe Rewa, 3189 Paris Park, was present. He stated he went to one of the meetings the developer held. He stated his biggest concern is the water runoff. He stated it seems like what they are proposing could be a benefit to them and he is in support of the PUD because of the greenspace and the buffer it gives them to not have people building right up to the property line in his front yard.

Bonnie Huyser 3029 Paris Park was present. She stated that she is the second house in and the development will be right in her backyard. She stated she does support the PUD because of the greenspace. She stated the traffic is going to be an issue no matter what.

Laurie Sheldon, 5965 Wing, was present. She stated she doesn't want to see anything built there but understands that it is out of her control. She stated she wants to make sure that this development matches the neighborhood. Wing is supposed to be a rural country feel in the middle of the City and asked to please hold it to that standard. She stated traffic is a huge issue and something has got to be done. She stated since the change on 52nd Street when the road was redone and all that traffic was being rerouted down Wing and it has not left. Everybody uses that as a cut through, even big trucks. She stated adding more traffic on Wing is going to hurt the neighborhood even more.

Landon Mitchner, 5540 Wing, was present. He stated the structure of the street is not ready for this type of development. He stated the traffic on Wing is heavy. He stated the picture is being painted into something that it is not just a bunch of greedy developers coming in. He stated he is concerned regarding the safety of the kids. He stated there is no space for a school bus to turn around. He stated he is also concerned about the water. He would like to see them build the 49 homes.

Dwight Lemmon, 336 Paris Park was present. He stated he likes some of the idea of the PUD, but his concern is the closeness of the homes and the density of the lots. He also has traffic concerns. He stated at some point they are going to have to put a left turn lane in. He stated building up to the road doesn't seem like it is going to fit in. He would like to keep the PUD but have less lots. He is also concerned about property values.

Attah Obande, 5570 Wing was present. His concerns are with traffic on Wing. His concern was how did they go from 49 homes to 57 homes. He would like to see 49 homes. He would also like to know what is happening with the road that runs through his property.

Angela VanHouten, 3191 Paris Park. She stated they walked the property with the developers. She stated they are in favor of the PUD because it saves about 6-7 acres and gives them a border of trees as a perimeter to separate their property from the development. She stated she is concerned about the traffic.

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

- Motion Carried (8-0) -

Holtrop stated he is in favor of the PUD but wishes it was less than 57 but the developers have provided a nice buffer, good open space, and the PUD allows them to pull the homes closer to the street versus the other plan having them setback further off the main road.

Weir stated she appreciates the comments of the neighbors. She stated she is in favor of the PUD because it gives the commission more control.

Porter stated he too appreciates the participation from the neighbors and staff. Porter stated there was question regarding duplexes, however it is stated as single family dwellings. Pung stated it will be single family detached dwellings, the PUD itself only allows permitted uses in the R1-C and R1D attached units are not allowed and all the buildings elevations they provided are for single family detached and that will also be in the basis. Porter questioned if Wing was a truck route. Pung stated it is not a truck route.

Porter questioned if the turn arounds are big enough for a school bus to turn around. Feenstra stated that turnarounds are designed for the City of Kentwood standard requirements for all public street turnarounds which are designed around school buses, garbage trucks, fire trucks etc. to safely turn around.

Porter stated he thinks the PUD will give more open space overall and because of the control it gives the Commission he is in favor of the PUD.

Poyner stated at first, he liked the by right plan, but after listening to the residents he is leaning towards the PUD when he considers the additional elements of the PUD that it offers. He was also hoping the developer would come back and lower the number of units from 57.

VanderMeer stated he also appreciates the neighbor's concerns and comments. He stated he thinks the developer has done a good job listening to the residents concerns and he has

gone above and beyond addressing the issues that he can control. He stated he is in favor of the PUD.

Quinn stated he is in support of the PUD. Quinn stated the PUD allows for more open space, more natural space, more space for wildlife, and more control.

Carson Galloway explained the benefits of the PUD versus the by right. He stated with the PUD you won't be able to see the development, it won't be evident from the road

Jones stated she appreciates the community involvement. She appreciates the developer scheduling the meetings to create an opportunity for the neighbors to be heard in a different way. She stated she also appreciated them going above and beyond the proposed architectural standards for new home developments. She stated no one builder can own more than 1/3 of the units and that there can only be one rental per builder in the deed restrictions. She appreciates that the condo association will be responsible for the trees. She stated having the PUD offers the commissioners to shape what goes in there. She stated she supports the PUD.

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Poyner, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the request to rezone 28.93 acres from R1-B Single Family Residential to R-PUD-2 Detached Residential Planned Unit Development as described in Case No. 08-27. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1 -9 and basis points 1-2 as described in Pung's memo dated April 17, 2024.

- Motion Carried (8-0) -

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Porter, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the preliminary PUD Plan dated April 17, 2024, for the Hope Haven rezoning as described in Case 08-24. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1 – 8 and basis points 1-7 as described in Pung's memo dated April 17, 2024.

- Motion Carried (8-0) -

I. Public Hearing

Case#9-24 – 44th Street and Walma Avenue Condominium Project - Rezoning of 4.72 acres of land from C4 Commercial to RPUD-1 Attached Residential Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review located at the SE corner of 44th Street and Walma Avenue (**Applicant has requested tabling to the May 14, 2024 meeting**)

Motion by Kape, supported by Quinn, to table Case #9-24 - 44th Street and Walma Avenue Condominiums.

- Motion Carried (8-0) -

J. Work Session

Case#10-24 – Grand Rapids Temple the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints – Final Site Plan Review for a PUD Phase located at 2400 Forest Hill Avenue SE

Golder stated the request was part of a 79 acre PUD that was reviewed and approved in 1992 called Embassy Park PUD. This phase was originally going to be condominiums. Then Christ Community Church came and was constructed. They were originally asking for a 90,000 total square footage, a 1,000 person sanctuary for future use. The future expansion was never built. She stated what is built today is about 19,000 square feet.

Golder stated the LDS church is looking at a little over 20,000 square foot building. The temple is not used for Sunday worship only for special ceremonies called ordinances which would be for small groups. The hours they are open are from 6am-10pm Monday – Saturday and closed on Sunday. They would have 4-5 employees and then there would be volunteers going in and out as needed. They said in their description that it could be as many as 30-40 people at the most there at one time.

Golder stated once constructed, it is open briefly to the public. Once the church is dedicated then it will be closed to the public except for the grounds which will remain open during their operating hours, so people can walk around. She stated the landscape plan is very nice. There is a 4 foot high wrought iron fence that goes around the church.

Golder stated they are proposing a 4,000 square foot accessory building. The PUD allows the commission to vary from the standards of accessory uses in PUDs.

Golders stated the temple received a height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. They approved at 95 foot height for the steeple. They agreed that the spire would not be lit during the hours of 11pm-5am. They also lowered the grade of the site by 2 feet so that the appearance would be lower on the site for the neighbors.

Golder stated we are looking for additional information on the parking lot lighting, screening for headlights for the adjacent neighbors in the single family neighborhood to the east and the condominiums to the south. She said that some street trees should be added along Burton Avenue.

Rob LaPlaca, Civil Engineer with Progressive, 2250 Camden Avenue was present representing the request. He stated they are connecting where the existing sanitary and the existing water connect. He stated they are keeping the storm water in the same location. It will overlap the oversized area that is there now.

He stated he has updated plans that show more information about the lighting. He stated there are a couple of different types of lights. There will be lights for the building façade. Everything in the parking lot will be a 20 foot tall pole and there will be some more decorative ones that are interspersed throughout the walking paths. The lights will not cast light outside of the Temple property line.

He stated as far screening goes he thinks that they could accommodate anything that the city would require. They have proposed a lot of screening on the back south property side and on the front.

Porter questioned if the ground will be open for walking. LaPlaca stated the ground will be open for community members to come in and enjoy the gardens. There will be a high level of planting everywhere. There is a lot of pride that they take in maintaining their property well.

Porter questioned if the only entry to walk the ground would be on Forest Hill. LaPlaca stated that is correct Forest Hill is the only spot where there is entrance to site currently and most of that has to do with the significant grade change. Porter stated this was his question if this was a place where they public is walking around he wanted to make sure we aren't going to have people walking into the neighbors property. LaPlaca stated no it is protected.

Holtrop asked where the building sits in relation to the existing building. LaPlaca stated the proposed building is in about the same location as the current church they are not making detention any deeper they are at the same elevation along the road they are making it more defined as opposed to just being a large open space. Part of that will be restructuring grade and part of their work with the ZBA was to lower the site of the finished floor of the building. They have also put new grades in at what is required and permissible in terms of allowable slopes. What is out there now is not in compliance with code. Golder stated at the staff review they said they were going to plant some thing in the detention area to discourage sledding.

Holtrop stated maybe they can add shielding around their lights. LaPlaca stated they will make sure the engineer is savvy to that. He doesn't know if they are necessary for the light fixtures because they most of the parking lot lights are so far from the property. If they are required they can look at that. He stated that lights that they are proposing do not have an angle to them that cast out; they are all straight down. Golder questioned if they will be turned off with the spire light. Laplaca stated he would have to check on that and follow up.

Holtrop questioned if he had the opportunity to speak with the neighbor. LaPlaca stated yes they have. The client hosted a couple of events.

Holtrop stated he would like to know what a 35 foot building looks like. LaPlaca displayed some renderings.

Jones noted that the plan states Grand Rapids Temple, but this is the City of Kentwood

K. New Business

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Poyner, to set a public hearing date of May 28, 2024, for: Case#11-24 – Lakewood West Wing – Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review of a PUD located at 2920 – 52nd Street, 2854 52nd Street, 5253 Wing Avenue, 5491 Wing Avenue; Case#12-24 – Kentwood Community Center – Site Plan Review for a building in Open Space located at 4755 Walma Ave SE

- Motion Carried (8-0) –

L. Other Business

1. Commissioners' Comments

Holtrop stated we granted Arie Nol more space around the corner. He drove by and they have 4 cars parked next to their building and its constant. He stated we should give them a visit. Schweitzer stated staff has periodically been talking with them.

Porter stated he went to the training and said the declaration of conflict of interest came up and he noted that we have added it to our agenda and we are the only ones that are doing that it was an interesting idea.

Kape stated we are familiar with the millage that passed but now we have entered into a new phase a capital campaign phase. Part of the millage process the City has committed to raising private funds. He stated they have shifted into a capital campaign to raise funds. He stated they hired an outside professional fundraisers that is going to go after the big foundations. He stated if they know of a business that is willing to donate or personally would like to donate please let him know. They have to come up with about 6 million for the City Center and 6 million for Covenant Park.

2. Staff's Comments

M. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Weir, supported by Commissioner Kape to adjourn the meeting.

- Motion Carried (8-0) –

Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary