

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION  
APRIL 9, 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 Holtrop.
- C. Roll Call:  
Members Present: Dan Holtrop, Sandra Jones, Alex Porter, Ray Poyner, Darius Quinn, Doug VanderMeer, Sarah Weir  
Members Absent: Ed Kape (with notification)  
Others Present: Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier, the applicants and about 50 citizens.

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

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape 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 Quinn, to approve the Minutes of March 26, 2024 and the Findings of Fact for: Case#7-24 – Heyboer Acres Phase 2 – Preliminary Plat and Final Site Plan Review Located at 2500 52<sup>nd</sup> Street SE;**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

- F. Approval of the Agenda

**Motion by Commissioner Quinn, supported by Commissioner Porter, to approve the agenda for the April 9, 2024 meeting.**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

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

There was no public comment.

**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 (**Applicant is requesting to table to the April 23, 2024 meeting.**)

**Motion by Holtrop, supported by Poyner., to table Case#3-24 – Breton Ravines RPUD to the April 23, 2024, meeting.**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

I. Public Hearing

**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 (**Staff is recommending tabling to the April 23, 2024 meeting.**)

Pung stated the request is rezoning of approximately 28.93 acres of land from R1-B Residential to RPUD-2 and Preliminary Site Plan Review. Pung stated his recommendation is to table.

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 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, but they would be selling individual lots to people or other developers to build the homes. He stated they will not be constructing the homes themselves.

Pung stated as indicated, the applicant presented a parallel plan showing how they could develop the property with 50 lots under the current zoning. He stated they would like to have 57 lots. They indicated that part of the reason for wanting the 57 lot is that it will cover the increased expenses under the PUD requirements.

Pung stated at the last meeting there were some concerns raised regarding the architecture, the number of lots, speeding, sight distance and accidents.

Pung stated regarding sight distance the applicant's engineer went out and measured the sight distance for southbound traffic and they indicated that they have 452 feet. The minimum requirement at 40 miles per hour is 445 feet; therefore, they are just within the minimum sight distance requirements. Pung stated the City Engineer indicated if that is accurate, they meet the requirements for sight distance.

Pung stated they are keeping the lots to 57, but to address some of the architectural issues they submitted a revised PUD agreement. He stated they are going to require our draft architectural standards that require homes to have at least 4 design elements. He stated they are indicating that each home would have to have at least 5 design elements. They are going above the minimum that we would be requiring. He stated they listed 8 design elements that are going to create more of a country style home and within that each home would be required to use 5 of the 8 design elements. They are also looking to have a minimum unit size of 1,200 square feet of finished living area.

Pung stated regarding speeding he received information from the police department that everything is well within the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. Through their studies speeding has not been an issue. He stated regarding accidents, in 2022 there were 2 accidents on Wing. At 52<sup>nd</sup> and Wing there were 3 accidents and at Wing and 60<sup>th</sup> Street there were two accidents. He stated in 2021, there were 3 accidents on Wing Avenue and 1 accident on 52<sup>nd</sup> and Wing Avenue and nothing at 60<sup>th</sup> and Wing.

Adam Feenstra, with Feenstra and Associates, Project Engineer, 3462 Rockwood Dr. Hudsonville was present. He stated the land is zoned R1-B. He stated provided they meet the standard ordinance requirements of the zoning, the Planning and City Commission would be required to approve that development. He stated they have prepared a parallel plan which meets the R1-B requirements and is also acceptable to the developers. He stated the parallel plan allows for the 50 lots. He stated they would have the right to move forward with that plan for 50 lots under the current zoning. He stated they recognize that there is a wide variety of people that have an interest in how this land gets developed. Therefore, they have submitted the PUD plan. They believe the PUD plan offers a multitude of benefits for the neighbors, the community, the city, the future lot purchasers and the developers. They believe the proposed PUD which represents a slight increase in density, offers a variety of elements which are superior to the R1B parallel plan while at the same time providing for additional input by the Planning Commission, City Commission, and the public.

Feenstra presented the benefits of the PUD plan and contrast those to the parallel by right plan.

1. Buffering and Open Space – the biggest benefit

**south property line**

- a. PUD plan 13 lots backing up to the property line.
- b. R1-B plan 12 lots backing up to the property line.
- c. PUD plan estimated house distance from property line based on 20' front yard setback (assume 60' deep house due to lot width) = 67 feet
- d. R1-B plan estimated house distance from property line based on 40' front yard setback (assume 40' deep house) = 60 feet
- e. PUD plan provides enhanced buffering due to open space easement

**east property line**

- a. PUD plan 7 lots backing up to the property line.
- b. R1-B plan 9 lots backing up to the property line.
- c. PUD plan estimated house distance from property line based on 20' front yard setback (assume 60' deep house due to lot width) = 200 feet
- d. R1-B plan estimated house distance from property line based on 40' front yard setback (assume 40' deep house) = 70 feet
- e. PUD plan provides enhanced buffering due to shorter cul-de-sacs and open space easement.

**north property line**

- a. PUD plan 3 lots backing up to the property line.
- b. R1-B plan 3 lots backing up to the property line.
- c. PUD plan estimated house distance from property line based on 20' front yard setback (assume 60' deep house due to lot width) = 220 feet
- d. R1-B plan estimated house distance from property line based on 40' front yard setback (assume 40' deep house) = 90 feet
- e. PUD plan provides enhanced buffering due to shorter cul-de-sacs and open space easement.

**north 1/2 of west property line**

- a. PUD plan 6 lots backing up to the property line.
- b. R1-B plan 4 lots backing up to the property line.
- c. PUD plan estimated house distance from property line based on 20' front yard setback (assume 60' deep house due to lot width) = 60 feet
- d. R1-B plan estimated house distance from property line based on 40' front yard setback (assume 40' deep house) = 60 feet
- e. PUD plan provides enhanced buffering due to open space easement.

**south 1/2 of west property line**

- a. PUD plan 5 lots backing up to the property line.
- b. R1-B plan 4 lots backing up to the property line.
  - c. PUD plan estimated house distance from property line based on 20' front yard setback (assume 60' deep house due to lot width) = 70 feet
  - d. R1-B plan estimated house distance from property line based on 40' front yard setback (assume 40' deep house) = 60 feet
  - e. PUD plan provides enhanced buffering due to association maintained evergreen screen.

## **2. Natural Benefits**

- a. 11.87 acres open space (40% of total development area) preserved with the PUD vs no open space preserved with the R1-b plan.
- b. 7.71 acres of forested land disturbed for 57 houses with the PUD vs 12.57 acres of forested land disturbed for 50 houses with the R1-b plan.

## **3. Neighbors benefits**

- a. 1,200 SF minimum house size with the PUD vs 1040 SF with the R1-B.
- b. Architectural requirements with the PUD to help ensure the development is cohesive with existing houses.
- c. Better buffering to the neighbors with the PUD plan vs the R1-B plan.

## **4. Traffic**

- a. As brought up in previous meetings the city engineer has stated that there is sufficient capacity on Wing Ave for the proposed development.
- b. Wing Ave is fairly hilly and there were some concerns about sight distance at the proposed intersection. We have physically measured the sight distance and found it is sufficient to meet MDOT requirements.
- c. The 50 lots of the R1-B plan vs the 57 lots of the PUD plan will not make a noticeable difference in overall traffic.

## **5. Pedestrian Traffic**

- a. Sidewalks are required by the city for the development. Since sidewalks are not desired in Wing Ave we will plan on our sidewalks being internal only. While this may not be common in the City of Kentwood there are many suburban developments that do not have sidewalk connectivity outside of the development. People still use these sidewalks every day for exercise and general enjoyment of the outdoors.
- b. Via the open space the PUD will allow residents access to natural, undeveloped areas without needing to walk down Wing Ave to either Paris Park Drive (to the Paris Park Nature Reserve) or to the Paul Henry Trail.

## **6. City Benefits**

- a. Adapting and exceeding the city's proposed architectural requirements with the PUD.
- b. Less road to maintain and plow with the PUD vs the R1-B plan.

- c. Wider tax base with the PUD plan.
- d. Better emergency response time with the PUD due to shorter roads.

**7. Developer Benefits**

- a. Less infrastructure cost with the PUD
- b. Less conflict with adjacent property owners with the PUD
- c. Better overall lot value due to preserved natural areas with the PUD

**8. Perspective Lot Buyers Benefit**

- a. Bring your own builder, this is a benefit with either plan.
- b. Design your own house, no set house plans to pick from, this is a benefit with either plan.
- c. Better resale value since future buyers will appreciate the architectural diversity that the variety of builders and house plans bring to the development. This will be true for either plan but the PUD would see more benefit by ensuring some overall cohesion to the development so your country Victorian doesn't end up next to a modern flat roof house.
- d. More trees, more shade on more of the lots with the PUD.
- e. Cheaper lot prices since the infrastructure cost is less with the PUD.

Feenstra stated they feel that the PUD benefits all interested parties over the R1-B Parallel Plan and asked for support and approval.

Jones opened the public hearing.

Dwight Lemmon, 3036 Paris Park; John Houghton 3241 Paris Park; Bonnie Huyser, 3029 Paris Park; Jill Anderson, 5615 Wing Ave; Troy Smith, 3118 Paris Park; Terry Jacobs, 3195 Paris Park; Tom Black, 2251 Wolfboro, Angela VanHouten, 3191 Paris Park; Attah Obande, 5570 Wing; Gary Wernlund, 5483 Settlers Pass; Mark Anderson, 5615 Wing Ave; David Moore 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward City Commissioner 3170 Lindenwood Dr; Donna Edoff, 5496 Wing; Dave Owsinski, 3065 Paris Park; Jonathan Delange, 3062 Paris Park were present.

Their concerns were they look like starter homes, the lot sizes, density, safety, traffic, accidents, displacement of wild life, wetlands, will hydrants be put in, where will all the water go, detention ponds, how will people get from the development to Paris Park; a light at 52<sup>nd</sup> Street and Wing Avenue, has there been an environmental study done, will there be additional police and fire with the additional people in the community; will school buses be able to maneuver, will this disrupt the drainage and pollute the existing creek.

**Motion by Holtrop, supported by Poyner to table the public hearing to April 23, 2024.**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

Spencer Galloway, owner of the property, was present. He stated he is confused about why staff is recommending tabling. The three reasons staff discussed tabling have been addressed. He stated the notice that was sent to the public did not indicate that the request would be tabled. He stated if there are things related to the PUD that they would like for them to add more information to he understands, but if not, they would like to move forward. He stated at the last meeting there was mention that they would only want to see 50 lots or nothing. He stated and if that is the case, they would like to know that and then they would proceed with the by right plan and abandon the PUD. If they are open to consider the PUD, they would like to know that and know the things they would like for them to address and not just have an open meeting not knowing what they are addressing.

Galloway stated he appreciates the comments from the residents. He stated he understands that nobody wants to see open space developed in their neighborhood and he can sympathize with that. However, there is a demand for housing. He stated the land was for sale, they studied the zoning that applies to the property and understood what they could build and purchased the property. He stated he thinks the PUD plan is superior. It makes the lots smaller but the reason it does that is to provide the open space and buffering and guaranteed buffering to the neighborhood. He stated they were trying to be sensitive to the neighbors with the PUD plan. Galloway stated there is no land left in Kentwood. He stated they bought the land to develop it. He stated if the City would like to turn that land into a park they would be happy to sell it to them. They would just keep the two homes that are there and sell the rest of the land. He stated if the community wants to put their money together and buy the property from them and leave it undeveloped they are happy to consider that too. He stated they hope to develop something positive to the community and allow a number of people to move into this area and have a home in Kentwood.

Galloway stated as it relates to speed and traffic that should be addressed by police traffic enforcement. He stated he realizes this will increase the traffic on the road, but it doesn't increase it beyond the design standards for the road. He stated hopefully when they put Breton in, it will relieve a little bit of the traffic pressure.

Galloway stated as it relates to water run off, all the water that runs off this land, all the driveways have to slope to the street, all the water runs into the storm sewer, the roof drains into the front and into the sewers and then all that water goes into the retention pond and it has to be held there. Whatever the engineer says, they calculate how much water naturally runs off of that land currently and they say you can not discharge that water any faster than what it currently is into the creek or into the neighbors' backyards. He stated if it is engineered properly, they should not see an increase in runoff that comes from this development.

Quinn stated he has heard all of the neighbors. He stated one of the primary concerns he continues to hear was the traffic light at 52<sup>nd</sup> and Wing Avenue and questioned what would need to happen for a traffic light to be considered. Schweitzer stated when Wing Avenue was constructed a few years back, part of the analysis was to look at the traffic in the area. There was a recognition that there was a lot of delay at that intersection that was caused for concern. At the point that the improvement was made it was still at a threshold that was considered to be

reasonable. Schweitzer stated as time goes on and as traffic routes change, we have to be cognitive of that. There is a process by which there would be an analysis of the activity taking into account the number of vehicles going through there, speeds of traffic and delays during parts of the day. He stated those things are factored into place to determine at what point whether that improvement would take place. Quinn questioned if we could make that a condition of approval to have the analysis done at 52<sup>nd</sup> and Wing Avenue.

Quinn stated at the last meeting he remembers 49 lots and questioned what they are looking for. Galloway stated there have been several plans and has had reconfigurations. Galloway stated the last reconfiguration allows for 50 lots. He stated they are comparing the by right plan of 50 lots or the PUD request at 57 lots. Quinn stated a few of the commissioner stated 49 lots is fine and he still stands by that to keep the character of the community.

Quinn questioned if there has been any discussion with neighbors. Galloway stated there was been an attempt to meet with each of the adjoining neighbors. They weren't able to connect with all of them. There were 17 that they were able to connect with.

Galloway stated if you look at the perspective that there is going to be one or the other there is much more open space on the PUD plan, there is guaranteed open space, there are barriers that cannot be destroyed. Whereas if people owned their lots within the by right plan, they can do what they want. Discussion ensued. Galloway stated they would be happy to meet with homeowners if there could be a consensus.

Porter stated this is tough, because you want to preserve the ground and the property. Porter questioned the water, is there something to be done to ensure they are not going to have a lot of water. Porter stated there is a lot of water that goes through there. Is the rule that it has to match the current flow or can the City Engineer look at something that would help the neighborhood. Feenstra stated the rule currently in the City of Kentwood is a release rate of .26cfs per acre of land. Feenstra stated chances are they would be reducing the rate that they are outleting water. If there are problem areas downstream or where their outlet is, they would be open to discussions with the City Engineer about reducing that rate even further to help protect downstream. Feenstra stated there are always pros and cons to everything. If you restrict it further, it can cause unintended issues. You have to be careful when you balance that. Feenstra stated drainage is also a major consideration with any development. Discussion ensued. Porter stated this may be an opportunity to engage and work through this and actually improve their drainage situation he doesn't know but it is worth discussing.

Porter stated one of the questions that was raised was about well water. He questioned if anything they are doing with the drainage is going to change the water level for well water. Feenstra stated the current regulations are that residential wells have to be dug to a depth of greater than 25 feet; unless the well is old, they will be operating at a depth greater than 25 feet. Any dewatering that they would have to do would be for sanitary sewer. In that case they are digging down to a depth of 15 to 16 feet. The chance of impacting a well that is deeper than 25 feet he doesn't see it. Discussion ensued. He stated he couldn't guarantee that they wouldn't impact a shallow well, but he doesn't think they will.



Porter stated some of the residents mentioned the environmental study and questioned what are the rules about that. Pung stated that isn't a requirement of our zoning ordinance. Porter stated there was mention regarding the flowers and the plants that were in the area that were unique. He stated there is a lot of wildlife; deer, turkeys, fox and wanted to know what is possible. Feenstra stated they had a company who specializes in wetland delineations come through the site and mark up the property. They just received an official report from them and their plan is to send that to EGLE for confirmation of the wetland delineation where they go out and double check the work. Feenstra stated when they go in for any environmental impact permit for any small area of wetlands they might impact; EGLE automatically does an endangered species analysis as part of that permit application. Porter questioned if study would be made available. Feenstra stated he will send it to staff as part of the packet.

Porter questioned what it will take to look at the CIP cost to put in a bike trail for a sidewalk through the neighborhood down to the trail so that it is a safe way to use the sidewalk and get into the trail system. City Commissioner Moore stated that would be a team effort, something they would look at very carefully to make sure that they are addressing all needs. Porter stated he is very concerned because there is no room for pedestrians. Galloway stated they would be willing to pay for the excavation and the installation of a bike path or sidewalk from their development as far as Paris Park street.

VanderMeer stated the Planning Commission is trying to find the happy median to please everybody. VanderMeer questioned what were some of the comments from the neighbors that he has been in contact with. Granzotto stated he dropped off pamphlets and knocked on doors. Granzotto stated the overwhelming comment is that in the mornings they are not able to turn onto 52<sup>nd</sup> Street from Wing Avenue, some people said that they don't want anything there, others were more receptive.

VanderMeer questioned the tree preservation. Feenstra stated there are street tree and landscaping requirements. One of the architectural requirements options in the City is various landscaping and when they require 5 out of the 6 options, he almost guarantees that everyone will pick the landscaping option. Pung stated there are 3 trees in the architectural plan and that would be in addition to 1 street tree for every 80 lineal feet of road on both sides. Feenstra stated you would be looking at 4 trees per lot.

Holtrop stated the developer asked what he needed to do before the next meeting. Holtrop stated from his standpoint, it was the number of homes. He likes that he has included the design standards he was more in favor with the lower number of homes. He stated by right 50 lots and the PUD 57 lots, if he could come back with a happy median that would be good to him. He stated he also understands the economics. Holtrop mentioned that the developer has the right to develop and trying to do the best he can and if somebody wants to buy it from him and do what they want, they can do that as well.

Weir thanked the residents that have come out. She stated she agrees with the other commissioners.

Poyner stated he agrees with the commissioners regarding the traffic, safety, tree preservation, the bike path, water retention, and architectural design standards. He concurs with everything that was said. Poyner stated if it really is truly an interest in the neighborhood of trying to preserve it and not have it developed, there may be an opportunity to get together and pull money together and see if the developer will sell them the land that is always an option.

Carson Galloway stated the benefits of the PUD is that there is a lot less lineal footage of road that would need to be maintained by the City and the natural preservation. He stated with the PUD it is pulling the houses further away from all the property lines instead of them being able to build closer to their neighbors. He stated trees are able to be maintained and required to be maintained by anybody that builds there. The houses have to be built closer to the road because the PUD standards are 20 feet off the road, the R1B standards are 40 feet. He thinks that consolidating the houses to bring it away from the neighboring properties and maintaining the trees he sees this as a major benefit. Discussion ensued. Galloway stated what they are trying to get everyone to understand is the benefits of the 57 lots of the PUD. He stated leaning towards the 50 lots takes away all those potential benefits. He stated there would be 5 acres of forested land that would have to be disturbed.

Quinn questioned if there is a way we can hear from the community. He would like to know how important the maintaining of wild life and open space actually is to the community. How can we find out what the community desires. Jones stated based on what the community has heard tonight, they have the opportunity to come back on April 23 and will have the opportunity to think about the pros and cons of the two plans.

Jones stated we have heard the concerns of the community. She stated it has happened where the neighbors pulled their funds and came together and purchased property that they don't want developed. She stated the only way you can control what someone else does to property they own is to buy it from them. She stated the commissioners are in a situation where you can look at the PUD with the benefits although it is 57 homes. She stated with the benefits of a PUD, that offers a measure of protection because you know what will be going in there versus what they can do by right under R1B. She stated they can sell those plats and people who buy them can do whatever they want within the law. She stated the way the developer has designed the PUD in such a way that it shields people's eyes from having to see this development very easily from the roadway is a benefit as well. She stated the community mentioned that these are starter homes; these will be homes in the 450k-500k range. These are not starter homes, they have been willing to work with us in terms of designs. Discussion ensued. Jones stated she is hoping that there will be continued conversation between the developers and the neighbors.

Pung stated the developer wants to know if they are ok with the 50 or 57 lots. He needs to know how many lots the commissioners prefer. Jones stated she is fine with 57 lots only because of the PUD and the protections that come with the PUD. Quinn stated he is fine with the 57 specifically for the greenspace, preservation and maintain habitat for the wildlife. Porter stated he is leaning towards 57 because if we are going to not impact the environment, they are going to live closer together. There are more lots tight together but that leaves more room for the environment. VanderMeer stated he is looking for what the developer feels based on what he has

heard. Holtrop and Poyner stated less than 57 would be better. Weir stated she is leaning towards the 57 lots to have more control of what it is going to look like.

J. Work Session

**Case#9-24** – 44<sup>th</sup> Street and Walma Avenue Condominium Project - Rezoning of 4.95 acres of land from C4 Office to RPUD-1 Attached Residential Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review located at the SE corner of 44<sup>th</sup> Street and Walma Avenue

Golder stated the request is to rezone 4.72 acres of land, it originally stated 4.95 acres, but that included the ROW. She stated the applicant is looking for a rezoning from C4 to RPUD and Preliminary and Final PUD site plan approval.

Golder stated they are looking at a 33-unit condominium units. She stated we amended the Master Plan in 2022 from office to medium density residential. She stated medium density is 4-8 units per acre. She stated the commissioners felt more comfortable about limiting the density to 6 units per acre; but were willing to look at the design to determine if it could go to the higher end of the 4 to 8 units per acre.

Golder stated the concerns that the commissioners had with the Master Plan was no rentals, adequate buffer on 44<sup>th</sup> Street, the appearance of buildings that face 44<sup>th</sup> Street, internal and external sidewalks and visitor parking and site amenities.

Golder stated looking at the site it drops towards the back. There are wetlands on the south side and the stormwater detention will end up in this location. She stated they have a driveway access onto 44<sup>th</sup> Street and then a main east/west driveway and then a north/south driveway.

Golder stated there will be 33 attached condominiums with 3-5 units attached and two different styles. There will be 2-3 bedroom units 12 of them have 2 stall garages and the rest will have 1 stall garages. There will be 12 extra parking spaces throughout. She stated those that have the 1 stall garage their second space comes from the driveway in front of the 1 stall garage.

Golder stated the density of the development is medium density residential coming in at 6.99 units per acre. That is the gross density. She stated we still need more information on the net density. She stated it basically meets our rezoning criteria. The proposed private roads are 22 feet in width. The east/west road has 25 units. She stated if this were outside a PUD that private road would have to be a 60-foot easement with 30-foot pavement with two sides of sidewalk. She stated in a PUD we use these standards as guidelines. She stated they have one side of sidewalk on those two streets; a 24 foot easement and a 22-foot paved street. She stated that seems narrow to her. She stated in a parking lot for 90-degree parking, we require a 24 foot of drive aisle, therefore it seems

narrow at 22 feet. She stated however, we do have some narrow streets in PUD's within the City. Discussion ensued regarding narrow streets.

Golder stated there is a patio right next to a parking space and there is only 15 feet from the drive aisle to the garage, if a car parked there it would be a clear vision issue.

Golder stated the waivers they are looking at is the 16-foot house setback. The RPUD-1 requires 20 feet.

Golder stated the overall acreage for a PUD had to be 5 acres and this is 4.72 acres therefore they would need a waiver for that.

Golder stated regarding the architectural standards, the developer proposed two different building types. She stated transparency is 12% and 17% for each. She isn't sure what other architectural standards features are proposed but they meet the transparency requirements.

Golder stated she attached to the staff report homes that have been built in Allendale she thinks they look good. They have stone on the front which wraps around the porch

Mike Corby, with Integrated Architecture, 840 Ottawa, Grand Rapids was present. He stated they have gone through the Master Plan amendment. He stated they originally came with a plan that had closer to 40 units on the property. He stated they are now at 33 units. He stated they want to construct a quality development. He stated this property has challenges. They now have a plan with 8 buildings on the property. They are working with the grades. Some of the units are walkouts to take advantage of the grades, and some of them back up to 44<sup>th</sup> Street and they have accommodations for screening.

Corby stated they are requesting to rezone to a PUD. They are under the 5 acres but the request for them to pursue PUD came from City Staff and Planning Commission so that the plan could have some of the benefits that you get from a prescriptive zoning like the PUD.

Corby stated one of the challenges was the berm and the setback on 44<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated they have a 40-foot setback along the north property line. They will be providing a berm as well as landscaping. That was one of the conditions that was discussed in early conversations.

Corby stated they are within the zoning density requirements. They had to reduce the number of units that they showed to achieve that and also to get the greenspace. They feel it is a good combination of adding greenspace and still getting a project that makes economic sense.

Corby stated the internal sidewalk connections that were mentioned, they also have them connected to the current city sidewalk network both on Walma Avenue and 44<sup>th</sup> Street.

Two sidewalk connections are on 44th Street and then one that heads west towards Walma.

Corby stated they are not touching the wetlands. The wetlands in their current state will be preserved. He stated they do have the large detention area. He stated they met with staff and the City Engineer indicated that the standards that you have to go through now for stormwater actually improve the rates of runoff and the runoff situation.

Corby stated staff's comment that came after the staff review work session was to increase the easterly setback from 20 feet. He stated they considered it a sideyard because they are looking at 44<sup>th</sup> Street as the front. He stated staff pointed out because the units are backing up to the east property line it should be looked at more as a rear yard setback so they increased that to the minimum 30 feet, and up to 35 feet. That allowed them to address preserving the existing trees lot that are on the east property line.

Corby stated they got some specific comments on the architecture and they will be looking at that before they make formal application for the rezone. He stated Bosgraff is known for their quality design and appreciated staff for going out to the project that they are emulating.

Corby stated that they are not subject to private drive requirements, but there are things that make roads, driveways and vehicular movement safe. He stated the wider the road, the more lane you have, the faster you go. He stated in their development they will not allow parking on the road. That is why they are adding separate parking spaces for guests. The 26-foot-wide roads to the east of this development allows parking on the road.

Corby stated they meet the clear vision corners. Some of the drives are close but they meet the clear vision corners. He stated the 16-foot waiver is only for one building. They have 8 buildings on the property and there is one building they are requesting a waiver from the 20 foot to the 16 foot setback. All the other buildings have at least 20 feet of greenspace from the pavement to the building. He stated the minimum drive depth is 20, feet many of the driveways are deeper than the 20 feet. Their driveway width does not include a 5-foot sidewalk that is planned on one side.

Poyner questioned where the sidewalks will be. Golder stated that they should extend to Walma and 44<sup>th</sup> Street. The proposed sidewalk goes up the east/west street and the north/south street. Corby stated they connect through the whole project with the sidewalk that goes out to Walma.

Poyner questioned if the buffering will screen the back of the condos. Golder stated that is the intent. They described it as being similar to Cobblestone (on the north side of 44<sup>th</sup> Street).

Weir questioned the price point. Mike Bosgraff stated that the homes would be in the 350-400k range. Weir stated she likes the look.

Holtrop questioned the parking. Corby stated each unit will have 2 spaces that they own and the end units will have 4 spaces and then the extra spaces for guests. Bosgraff stated the advantage of a condominium project is they are able to restrict parking by their association bylaws and restrictions. They will restrict parking on the drive. Holtrop stated there was concern about traffic, but he thinks the traffic is going to be ok. Holtrop stated the transparency is good, he likes the stone, he likes the horizontal stripes. For building 2 break up the horizontal stripe. Another feature can be a band board. Bosgraff stated they can go about 8 feet with siding before they need a band board. Corby stated they have the renderings of the elevation.

VanderMeer stated he is struggling when he looks at the corner and sees the wetlands. He stated architecturally they did a nice job it meets the transparency requirements.

Porter questioned where they will put the snow. Corby stated they do have some areas that don't have either parking or drives. They don't have a lot. Porter stated he likes where the drive is on 44<sup>th</sup> Street.

Quinn questioned if there was a patio area. Corwe stated there is a community social area. It may just be a nice sitting area that has views of the wetlands or a firepit the city stated as long as it is a gas type firepit unit it would be allowed. Quinn stated 44<sup>th</sup> Street drive may be challenging, but he will trust what the experts say.

Jones stated the streets seem extremely narrow. She stated she has concerns about the lack of parking especially on the holidays when you have family gatherings. Jones stated she doesn't like the sidewalk only on one side. She thinks about the ones who have mobility challenges. And also, if someone has children, it is a safety concern. Jones stated she doesn't want to see people parking their cars over the sidewalk. Jones stated she likes this, but she can't support this because of the sidewalk on one side and parking over the sidewalks.

K. New Business

**Motion by Holtrop, supported by Quinn, to set public hearing date of May 14, 2024, for: 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**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

L. Other Business

1. Commissioners' Comments

Holtrop stated there was a LUZ Committee meeting prior to the Planning Commission meeting. At Eastern and 48<sup>th</sup> the owner could put in 11 homes, but he would prefer to put in 16 townhouses. Then he said he wanted to rent them. The commissioners explained why they don't want more rentals.

VanderMeer wanted a comparison of homes being built in other communities versus the homes that are being built in Kentwood.

## 2. Staff's Comments

Golder stated Storage 5 was approved at City Commission.

Golder stated she made contact with Lowes and they may be coming in for a special land use amendment.

## M. Adjournment

**Motion by Commissioner Weir, supported by Commissioner Poyner, to adjourn the meeting.**

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Kape absent -

Meeting adjourned at 10:15pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary