

AGENDA CITY OF KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION TUESDAY, JULY 13, 2021 KENTWOOD COMMISSION CHAMBERS 4900 BRETON AVENUE 7:30 P.M.

6:30pm - LUZ Committee Meeting 1st Floor Conf. Rm. #119: Holtrop, Jones Kape, Pemberton

- A. Call to Order
- B. Pledge of Allegiance (Morgan)
- C. Roll Call
- D. Approval of the Minutes of June 22, 2021 and Findings of Fact for: <u>Case#16-21</u>- Windy West Plat Request of Bosco Development LLC for Preliminary Plat Review of Windy West Plat Located at 3491 52nd Street SE conditionally zoned R1-D Single Family Residential; <u>Case #17-21-</u> Lakewood PUD-Request of Lakewood Homes for a Rezoning from R1-B Single Family Residential to RPUD-2 Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and Preliminary PUD Site Plan Review for properties addressed: 2920 & 2854 52nd Street, SE and 5253 & 5491 Wing Avenue, SE
- E. Approval of the Agenda for July 13, 2021
- F. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to non- agenda items.
- G. Old Business

<u>Case#11-21</u> Aspen Pointe – Major Change to a Preliminary PUD located at 3345 52nd Street; (applicant has withdrawn their request)

<u>Case#12-21</u> Aspen Pointe – Site Condominiums and Final Site Plan Review Located at 3345 52nd Street; (applicant has withdrawn their request)

H. Public Hearing

<u>Case#18-21</u> Cobblestone at the Ravines Phase 3 – Request of Redstone Land Development LLC for a Major Change to a PUD Phase and Preliminary Site Plan Review Located at 4333 Shaffer Avenue SE Agenda - Planning Commission July 13, 2021 Page 2

I. Work Session

Case#19-21 –32nd Street Townhomes – Final Site Plan Review Located at 2918 32nd Street

J. New Business

Set public hearing date of August 10, 2021, for: <u>Case#20-21</u> – DMR Transportation – Rezoning of 16.4 acres of land from R1-C Single Family Residential to IPUD Industrial Planned Unit Development Located at 4251,4375 and 4401 36th Street, <u>Case#21-21</u> DMR Transportation – Special Land Use Review of a Vehicle Repair Establishment Located at 4251,4375 and 4401 36th Street; <u>Case#22-21</u> – Windy West Two - Request of Bosco Development LLC to conditionally rezone 8.91 and 8.86 acres of land from RPUD-1 High Density Residential Planned Unit Development and R1-A Estate Residential respectively to R1-D Single Family Residential. Located at 3345 – 52nd Street and 3281 Nature View Drive

- K. Other Business
 - 1. Master Plan Implementation
 - 2. Commissioners' Comments
 - 3. Staff's Comments
- L. Adjournment

*Public Hearing Format:

- 1. Staff Presentation Introduction of project, Staff Report and Recommendation Introduction of project representative
- 2. Project Presentation By project representative
- 3. Open Public Hearing (please state name, address and speak at podium. Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker; exceptions may be granted by the chair for representative speakers and applicants.)
- 4. Close Public Hearing
- 5. Commission Discussion Requests for clarification to project representative, public or staff
- 6. Commission decision Options
- a. postpone decision table to date certain
- b. reject proposal
- c. accept proposal
- d. accept proposal with conditions.



TO: Land Use and Zoning Committee

FROM: Terry Schweitzer, Community Development Director

DATE: July 8, 2021

RE: Southeast Corner of 52nd Street and Kalamazoo Avenue

Attached you will find a request from Atwell to discuss, on behalf of their clients, a development concept and considerations relating to the three vacant parcels on the southeast corner of 52nd Street and Kalamazoo Avenue. Their client is interested in building a convenience store with six vehicle fueling stations. They acknowledge the change in the 2020 Kentwood Master Plan for this corner from the previous office land use designation to commercial land use designation to allow both neighborhood commercial and office uses.

The Kalamazoo Avenue corridor is very distinctive given: its interchange with the M-6 limited access freeway less that one mile south of 60th Street; its classification as a commercial truck route; the significant presence of residential neighborhoods along and within the square miles off the corridor; and little or no allowance for direct left turn movements within the major arterial intersections at 60thStreet, 52nd Street and 44th Street. Subsequently the boulevard cross section of Kalamazoo Avenue is designed to preserve and protect the adjoining residential development as well as safely optimize the movement of traffic along the major arterial street while affording reasonable access to frontage properties.

These circumstances place a premium on cross/shared access between frontage parcels as well as locating driveways away from the major intersections and median crossovers. As properties at the major intersections redevelop, a traffic analysis will be required to assure the proposed point of access into the property complements the boulevard and safely accommodates the nature and volume of traffic associated with the new use.

At 52nd and Kalamazoo Avenue, the redevelopment of the southeast and southwest corners of the intersection may provide a revitalization that can provide a sense of place. At these locations, a PUD zone could be used to establish parking, setbacks, and to specify building materials. The C-5 Neighborhood Commercial zone may also be utilized by developers as this zone allows reduced setbacks and parking.

This area should be developed with the surrounding neighborhood in mind, keeping development to a small walkable scale. The emphasis should be on quality development that serves the immediate residents and allows for some convenience for commuters or people living within walking distance. It will be desirable to establish open space (green or hard scape plaza) at the intersection corner as well as provide parking behind buildings, if possible. Landscaped buffers/screens should be established along adjacent residential properties. If a convenience store were to be established, it would be desirable that it provide fresh and packaged food.



CONSULTING. ENGINEERING. CONSTRUCTION.

July 2, 2021

Mr. Terry Schweitzer City of Kentwood 4900 Breton Ave SE Kentwood, MI 49508

RE: Southeast corner of 52nd Street SE and Kalamazoo Avenue SE Parcel No. 41-18-33-101-001, 1616 52nd Street SE Parcel No. 41-18-33-101-036, 1632 52nd Street SE Parcel No. 41-18-33-101-010, 5230 Kalamazoo Ave SE

Dear Mr. Schweitzer,

Following up with our recent conversation regarding the above referenced parcels, please accept this letter as our request to attend the Land Use and Zoning Committee meeting prior to the July 13 Planning Commission meeting. We appreciate the opportunity to explain our intentions for the property and obtain feedback from this group. To clarify, the subject parcels are highlighted below:



Page 2

We understand that the Master Plan and Future Land Use Map was updated in 2020, which changed the Township's vision for this property from office use to commercial use. Current zoning of the property is C-4, which is consistent with the previous Master Plan designation of office use however does not appear to be in line with the current vision of commercial. The 2020 Master Plan document explains that *"The recommendation for this corner allows both neighborhood commercial and office uses"*. The Master Plan goes on to call for lower impact neighborhood commercial with appropriate screening to the Princeton Estates.

Our desire is to rezone the property from C-4 to C-2, which will allow the parcel to be developed in line with the Master Plan as a neighborhood commercial use. Our Client is interested in building a convenience store with six vehicle fueling stations at the site. We understand the vision and the concerns expressed in the Master Plan for this property and look forward to additional feedback from the Land Use and Zoning Committee. Our goal is to gather as much input as possible in order to move forward with a project that is in line with the goals of the Kentwood community.

Respectfully, **ATWELL, LLC**

Eric Lord, PE Vice President

PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 22, 2021, 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 Brainerd.
- C. Roll Call: Members Present: Bill Benoit, Catherine Brainerd, Dan Holtrop, Sandra Jones, Ed Kape, Clarkston Morgan, Ray Poyner, Mike Pemberton, Darius Quinn Members Absent: None Others Present: Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier, the applicants and about 4 citizens.
- D. Approval of the Minutes and Findings of Fact

Motion by Commissioner Holtrop, supported by Commissioner Pemberton, to approve the Minutes of June 8, 2021 and the Findings of Fact for: <u>Case#14-21</u> – My New House - Rezone .75 acres of land from C-2 Commercial to R1-C Single Family Residential Located at 1569 52nd Street SE; <u>Case#15-21</u> Woodsprings Suites – Request of Concord Hospitality– Final Site Plan Review of a Special Land Use Hotel– Located at 3781 – 32nd Street

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None
- E. Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Benoit, supported by Commissioner Kape, to approve the agenda for the June 22, 2021 meeting.

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None
- F. Acknowledge visitors wishing to speak to non-agenda items.

There was no public comment.

Proposed Minutes Planning Commission June 22, 2021 Page 2 G. Old Business

<u>Case#11-21</u> Aspen Pointe – Major Change to a Preliminary PUD located at 3345 52nd Street; (applicant has requested tabling to July 27, 2021)

<u>Case#12-21</u> Aspen Pointe – Site Condominiums and Final Site Plan Review Located at 3345 52nd Street; (applicant has requested tabling to July 27, 2021)

H. Public Hearing

<u>Case#16-21</u>- Windy West Plat – Request of Bosco Development LLC for Preliminary Plat Review of Windy West Plat Located at 3491 52nd Street SE conditionally zoned R1-D Single Family Residential

Golder stated the request is the preliminary plat related to the conditional zoning that was approved by the Planning an City Commission. She stated this is the site plan that goes along with the preliminary plat. Golder stated the site is under 12 acres, 14 lots are proposed and involves the extension of Breezewood Court into this parcel.

Golder stated at the work session regarding the plat, it was noted that 14 lots require 30 foot of pavement within a 60 foot of right-of-way (ROW). She stated that the ROW looks correct but the pavement does not look like 24 feet therefore that will need to be amended. Golder stated two sides of sidewalk will be required. That will be a condition of approval and is a requirement of our subdivision control regulations. Regarding the sidewalk on the existing Breezewood Court since it is outside of the plat we will also make sure that the extension of sidewalk becomes an infill sidewalk project on the radar of the City Engineer. Therefore, at some point a sidewalk can be added so it is not a sidewalk leading to nowhere.

Golder stated the applicant now shows an easement going to the north. She stated last time that was proposed as an out lot and we wanted it to be expressed as an easement. The applicant also put a note on the plan indicating how many lots this easement extension could serve however, this is not before the commission and they will not render an opinion on whether or not additional lots can be served outside the plat. She stated there are a lot of factors that go into that. She stated for now this is an easement that is proposed for the potential of building more homes to the north and we are going to leave it at that. Staff is asking the applicant to remove reference to the note regarding additional lots to the north from the site plan.

Golder stated we have also prepared a conditional zoning agreement for this site. The execution of the agreement is a condition of approval.

Golder stated this is a recommendation that goes to the City Commission. The recommendation is for approval with the following conditions:

Page 3

1.Execution and recording of the Conditional Zoning Agreement for the Windy West Development.; 2 Review and approval of the proposed plat by the Kentwood City Engineer and Fire Marshal.; 3.Street trees shall be provided along all public streets at 40 foot intervals.;4. Two sides of sidewalk must be provided within the development.; 5. Pavement width of the proposed extension of Breezewood Court shall be 30'.;6. Applicant shall remove General Requirements note 6.

Chris VanderHoff with Bosco Construction was present. He stated it was an oversight on the 24 foot width. He stated they are planning on the 30 foot to meet the ordinance.

Jones opened the public hearing.

There was no public comment.

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

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None

Benoit questioned if we have landlocked the piece of property to the north. Golder stated it might be somewhat landlocked Consumers Energy is in between this plat and the property to the north. This is their best hope of getting future access.

Poyner, Quinn, Kape, Morgan, Brainerd , Jones were ok with the request.

Pemberton stated once they get to the 6th house under construction, he would like the sidewalk from the Windy Wood development to the east extended along Breezewood Court so that by the time it is wrapped up and all the houses are in we have a connecting sidewalk. He doesn't want it to just lay around and then 2-3 years later we find out we have sidewalks that go to nowhere. Pemberton stated if we are going to require sidewalk, then it needs to connect. Golder stated she doesn't think we can tie it to VanderHoff's project because it is outside of his project. She stated she will have a conversation with the City Engineer.

Holtrop stated the Engineers report mentions a 70 foot circular terminal, he questioned whether is that fine. VanderHoff stated with the cul-de-sac the radius has to be a 75 foot diameter on the end of the cul-de-sac, they will have to comply. Holtrop questioned if you are on 52^{nd} Street will lots 9 - 14 be visible or will there be enough trees left at the back sides of their lots. VanderHoff stated they won't be visible to 52^{nd} at all, there is another parcel to the south on 52^{nd} with homes there.

Motion by Benoit, supported by Pemberton, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat for Windy West Plat as described in Case No. 16-21 and as provided on the site plan dated June 15, 2021. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1-6 and basis points 1-6 as described in Golder's memo dated June 16, 2021.

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None

<u>Case #17-21-</u> Lakewood PUD-Request of Lakewood Homes for a Rezoning from R1-B Single Family Residential to RPUD-2 Low Density Residential Planned Unit Development and Preliminary PUD Site Plan Review for properties addressed: 2920 & 2854 52nd Street, SE and 5253 & 5491 Wing Avenue, SE.

Golder stated the 6.8 acre development is proposed to be rezoned from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential Planned Unit Development, with a total of 15 housing units planned.

She stated the proposed 2020 Master Plan recommends low density residential for this site. The development is proposed for a density of 2.2 units per acre, the net density is 2.83 consistent with the Master Plan. The net density would take out the road easements and the easements for Consumers Energy.

She stated that one of the concerns at the work session was the developability of lot 1. She stated the applicant has shown a home on the site. She stated the road proposed has a 50 foot ROW and 24 feet of pavement; previously it showed an 18 foot pavement. That has been corrected.

Golder stated there was a concern regarding what the backs of the homes will look like. The applicant Had indicated that he could show the commissioners what they will look like.

Golder stated landscaping along 52nd Street has been provided in areas where it would not be left with existing natural vegetation. The applicant has added trees in that area.

Golder stated the applicant was also requested to address how they would varythe appearance of the units so that not all of the units will look alike and you won't have adjacent ones that look alike.

Golder stated the recommendation is

1. Review and Approval of the PUD Statement dated June 16, 2021 for the Lakewood PUD, and review and approval of the Lakewood PUD Development Agreement by Kentwood staff and the City Attorney. The PUD

Statement and Development Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Restrictions prohibiting the rental of more than one unit by a single purchaser.
- b. A statement regarding the improvements to be undertaken by the developers of the project.
- c. Detail on sidewalk provided in the development, open space within the development, and the maintenance of these areas.
- d. Detail regarding any public or private road improvement required for the development.
- City Staff and City Attorney review and approval of all condominium documents, including but not limited to, the condominium bylaws, the master deed, and the complete condominium subdivision plan. An expandable condominium, as defined in the Michigan Condominium Act, MCL 559.106(4) shall not be permitted. Convertible area, as defined in the Michigan Condominium Act, MCL 559.105(3) shall not be permitted.
- 3. Compliance with the City Engineer's memo dated June 16, 2021.
- 4. Review and approval by the Kentwood Fire Marshal.
- 5. Applicant shall obtain permits from the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy for wetland mitigation prior to the issuance of construction permits on the site.
- 6. Staff review and approval of the preliminary landscaping and lighting plans for the site. The landscaping plan shall indicate how the developer intends to preserve significant stands of trees.
- 7. Review and approval by staff of building elevations proposed within the project.
- 8. City Commission approval of the rezoning of the site from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential Planned Unit Development.

Jack Workman, Lakewood Homes and Dennis Cole Nederveld Inc.were present.

Dennis Cole stated in addition to the changes staff discussed they also show both watermain and stormwater detention, located off site. Cole stated they did show the 5 renderings of the different unit types that Lakewood homes proposes to do on this

project. He stated they don't have any additional detail with regard to the rears of the buildings, but it will suffice to say that the quality materials that are being proposed for the fronts and the sides will also be in the rear and that the intent is to make those as attractive as possible realizing that there is visibility from 52nd Street. He stated they have enhanced landscaping to have some trees in back which should do a fine job of screening.

Jones opened the public hearing.

Billy and Amy Smith, 2877 52nd Street were present. She stated they live directly behind the project and have lived in the family home almost 50 years. She stated it has been sad to see the nature in the area desecrated. She stated any enhanced landscaping is going to take a lot of work. She stated so much has been cut down and it looks horrible. They don't want their property values to go down.

Mark Hill, 5265 Wing Ave SE. He stated they were quite distressed when they found out this development was proposed. He stated he would like them to keep the best interest of the people who reside in Kentwood and protect their privacy, their safety and their property values. He stated he is also concerned of the proximity of the houses. Golder stated there will only be sidewalk on one side of the street. He stated he would like for sidewalk to be on the north side of the street.

Luan Nguyen, 5301 Wing was present. She stated her house is going to be adjacent to the 6 units that are going to be built. She stated debris has been in her yard. She stated she has concern as to whether or not there be any barriers, buffers, trees, fences.

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

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None

Holtrop questioned that without changing the zoning to the PUD a similar development could be built. Golder stated that is correct. Holtrop stated 15 homes could be there by right without Planning Commission approval. Holtrop stated per Mrs. Nguyen she made a comment that debris had gotten onto her land. He stated if the developer will just be cautious going forward that would be great. He stated he appreciates the landscaping on 52nd Street.

Brainerd stated she was a little disappointed of the clearing of the site. She stated she thought there might be more trees retained but she understands that is sometimes difficult with construction. She is hoping the additional landscaping brings some of it back.

Morgan stated his biggest concerns are the trees coming back. He questioned what type of trees they will plant to provide privacy between the two homes and what will be along 52^{nd} Street.

Pemberton stated he notices on the landscape plan some of the additional landscaping that has been proposed. He stated his concern is that the landscaping should be a bit more aggressive. He stated there has been quite a bit of buffer that has been added into this project and this is a benefit to the neighbors too. He stated however, he would like to see a little more aggressive landscape that goes around the corner down on the south side and across to the east and west to create a little more privacy. Discussion ensued.

Quinn, Poyner and Benoit echoed the previous commissioners regarding putting the landscaping along the south side of the development and wanted the developers to provide more detail on the elevations.

Benoit stated that the residents need to understand that the developer won't be able to completely block them from seeing the site. They are going to see the homes and the only way to stop that is to buy the land.

Jones concurred with the other commissioners comments. She stated she will give the developer the opportunity to discuss a greater buffer and more robust landscaping and some information about the housing types which would include information on the selling prices and what can be done to mitigate the view. The homes won't be hidden from anyone but if something can be done to preserve the residents privacy she would ask that the developer do that.

Dennis Cole stated the width of the landscape buffer behind 5265 Wing is 40 feet wide and long the property line on the first lot to the west lot (15) there is a 30 foot buffer there. He stated along the south of the development is a 50 foot wide open space landscape buffer before you would even go to the rears of those 6 units that are adjacent to the Nguyen's property. He stated on the north side along 52nd Street there is an 80 foot wide landscape and tree preservation area to provide enhanced landscaping. He stated depending on how the association decides to maintain it, it could become very natural and fill in over time providing a very healthy buffer in the backyards. He stated the types of trees that are intended to go in are a variety of trees: some deciduous and some evergreen to fill in some of those areas. To the north of the Hill's property are all arborvitae to provide the greatest amount of screening there. He stated in the other areas there is a selection of River Birch, Spruce etc.

Cole stated there was a question with regard to the south property line and the southeast corner of the property to beef up the landscaping. He stated there are some trees there. There has been quite a bit of clearing, but there are some existing trees, they will work with staff and try to make sure there are no large obvious gaps.

Cole addressed the question as to whether or not sidewalk can be switched to the north side of the road instead of the south. He stated he is not sure why the south side was chosen; he doesn't think there are any strong feelings one way or the other. Cole said that with respect to the placement of street trees relative to the sidewalk location within the ROW, he thinks the trees could fit regardless of the sidewalk.

Jack Workman was present. He stated he is trying to put in a nice development and there has been quite a bit of thought going into the project. He stated there are trees but a lot died because of the Ashboer. He stated he is leaving all the trees that are nice. He stated there weren't a lot of them that were nice at this point. He said they will make sure that they screen the neighbors because their houses are old and not up to date style. The neighbors don't want to look at their development and they don't want to look at neighbors. He stated he is willing to put 10 trees per lot for this development, he will plant 150 trees. He stated the homes they are building will be random designs he will put a variation in the development. He will do what the customer wants. Discussion ensued.

Morgan wanted clarification on the sidewalk. Workman stated he doesn't care if the sidewalk is on one side or the other. He stated it looked better to have it in the landscaped south end. Golder stated the applicant is showing sidewalk going from 52nd Street to the development. She stated the desire is to add sidewalk along Wing Avenue to the non-motorized trail. Discussion ensued regarding the sidewalk.

Golder stated Mr. Workman mentioned incorporating the 10 trees per parcel, per lot, therefore we can incorporate that into the recommendation. Workman stated that was on an average he is putting in a minimum of 150 trees on 15 lots and that is not counting the other landscaping. Golder stated it would be good to be specific as to what the commissioners want to see with the landscaping. Workman stated 10 trees on average for 15 lots for that development is sufficient. He stated he doesn't think there are other developments that have that high of average trees in their development. Discussion ensued. Workman stated he is putting in some taller landscaping but he can put in some smaller as well.

Poyner questioned if the commissioners should specify the size of the trees we expect. Golder stated staff can always bring the landscaping plan back to the commissioners for approval. Cole stated the minimum caliper shown on the plan is 2 ½ inches in diameter and the spruces are 7 foot at planting.

Pemberton said that anything that can be done to screen as much as they can will be helpful. He stated he doesn't think it is unreasonable for the homeowners who are adjacent to also maybe look at the possibility of adding some foliage or some trees to some gaps on their property so it really creates a mix and depth. Golder stated the final site plan for the RPUD will come back to the Planning Commission so they will have another opportunity to look at the landscaping more in detail.

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Benoit, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the rezoning of 6.8 acres of land from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential and approval of preliminary site plan dated June16, 2021 for the Lakewood PUD project as described in Case No. 17-21. Application is conditioned on conditions 1-8 and basis points 1-4 as described in Golder memo dated June 14, 2021.

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None

I. Work Session

<u>Case#18-21</u> Cobblestone at the Ravines Phase 3 – Request of Redstone Land Development LLC for a Major Change to a PUD Phase and Preliminary Site Plan Review Located at 4333 Shaffer Avenue SE

Golder stated the request is a major change to an approved PUD plan.

The original plan for Cobblestone at the Ravines was approved in 2004 with the overall plan for the Ravines Planned Unit Development. The original Phase 3 of Cobblestone included the following mix of housing:

<u>Original Plan</u> 1 - 6 unit building or 6 units 12 - 4 unit buildings or 48 units 5 - 3 unit or 15 units 1 - 2 unit or 2 units 14 - 1 unit or 1 unit

Total: 85 units

The proposed plan includes the following proposed housing mix:

<u>Proposed Plan:</u> 7 – 6 unit buildings or 42 units 8 – 4 unit buildings or 32 units 2 – 2 unit buildings or 4 units 9 – 1 unit buildings or 9 units

Total: 91 units

Golder stated since the number of units proposed in the development is more than the original development, a Major Change to the original site plan must be approved by the Planning and City Commissions.

The previously approved plan show no units exiting onto Stratton Boulevard; rather, they were served by alleys. The applicant should provide alley access to the 6 unit building. In fact, the original plan showed all but a few of the homes within Phase 3 served from alleys. All of the homes in the proposed Phase 3 are served from the private roads, rather than from alleys. The applicant should describe this change to the nature of the development in Phase 3.

The original Cobblestone PUD promoted pedestrian access, with sidewalk connections on both sides of the street, particularly within the Cobblestone portion of the development. The original plan for Cobblestone provides two sides of sidewalk along the private driveways. The proposed plan has sidewalk on only one side of the street in most locations. Staff recommends requiring two sides of sidewalk within the development.

Stratton Boulevard should be extended to the north property line. In addition, sidewalk should be extended to the development's north property line along Stratton.

The proposed 6-unit buildings include a good deal of pavement in the front yard to accommodate driveways. Again, the nature of much of the rest of Cobblestone is to have condominiums accessed from an alley. If these are allowed to remain as proposed, the front yard area must be improved with plantings or other amenities.

The applicant shall provide color renderings of the building elevations proposed for the development.

The applicant must provide landscaping plans, lighting plans, information on dumpsters and screening.

The applicant shall indicate whether any of the units are planned to be rented by the developer.

Issues:

- Two sides of sidewalk should be provided on all streets, as per the original Cobblestone development
- The 6 unit condominium on Stratton Boulevard should be served by an alley. None of the proposed condominiums are served by alleys within the development. Stratton fall short of the property line. Staff would like as much as possible to develop that right to the property line so that there is no question when Redstone is not here anymore as to whose responsibility it is to extend this further. This goes north into the ravine development and hooks into the part that is owned by Holland Home we want to make sure that is retained. So either extend it to the north or have some sort of agreement or escrow set aside to make sure that happens in the future
- More detail on units and landscaping
- Too much pavement in driveways for 6 unit buildings

Dave Stebbins, with Redstone and Justin Longstreth, Moore & Bruggink were present representing the request.

Longstreth said providing sidewalk on both sides of the street is not a problem that is something they can easily add. He stated they can provide the extension of Stratton to the north property line as well.

He discussed the building that is on Stratton and the orientation of that building. Between this plan and the last plan they have a lot more open space and they have some fairly large green spaces and open spaces at the center of the development. All of the buildings have a natural view. They are able to create a lot more greenspace and open space. He stated for this reason they would like to avoid putting an alley behind the building on Stratton. If they add pavement behind it, it breaks up that natural feel of what they are trying to accomplish at the rear of those buildings. He stated they are planning to provide natural berming in those areas. They are also going to landscape those areas behind the buildings. The goal and intent is to create a natural feel.

Benoit stated he isn't completely sold on the alley yet he would like to see what that looks like and see what it looks like natural. He questioned if staff was worried about parking. Golder stated there are no other units with driveways on Stratton. She stated this is a major entry into this development and you will have people backing up onto it. Longstreeth stated that Stratton comes in and around the clock tower and creates a decent traffic calming device. He stated that was one of the reasons they were more comfortable with the having driveway on Stratton is knowing they will have some features to slow traffic. David Stebbins stated their main east/west artery is Blairview Parkway which runs through phases 1 and phase 2 out to Shaffer. He stated they have several units that have driveways that are directly on Blairview Parkway. He stated they haven't seen any issues with those driveways.

Poyner stated he also is not sure about the alley way. He stated he understands the interest in more greenspace. He stated if they can have something at the public hearing as to what that would like that would be great. He stated he isn't sold on having an alley.

Pemberton stated he has never been a huge fan of alleys because it adds so much more pavement. He likes the idea of greenspace. He stated the only concern he has is that they have garages facing the street. He likes the front elevations; the rear elevations are boring. He stated he isn't sure it will be that visible by everybody but if there is something that can be done to dress those up a little bit that would go a long way. Pemberton stated in the upper left quadrant of this phase the buildings are setback a little bit and the drives up to the garages are broken up. He would like to see if it is possible with the rest of them, particularly the one on the main street. Maybe it can be setback a little bit so that it is just not all pavement. Golder stated she is wondering if they can just place that unit somewhere else.

Stebbins stated the units that are around the outside of the development are their ranch condominiums and they are building those same units in phase 2. The townhomes are in the

Proposed Minutes Planning Commission June 22, 2021 Page 12 middle, and the stand alones is a new product. Discussion ensued. He stated from the original designs he removed over 2200 of lineal feet of pavement.

Quinn questioned repositioning some of the units.

Morgan stated there are 32 units and 10 proposed visitor parking spaces. Morgan stated he is proposing additional visitor parking so that vehicles are not parked on the street to help keep a better flow of traffic. He suggested more parking in the northwest by East Cobblestone Court.

Morgan questioned High Gate Street. He stated there are 9 proposed buildings. Is there a reason to keep those 9 versus swapping out by certain areas to provide it a mix of units. He suggested maybe have 4 units then maybe a couple of detached houses in between just to change it up. Stebbins said the townhomes, the stand alones and the ranch condos there is one unit in each of the 4 plex buildings that has a one stall garage but there is room in the driveway for an additional car. All of the other units that have a two stall garage has room for two cars in the driveway. He stated they provide some extra guest parking. He stated the units themselves will have room for 4 vehicles.

Stebbins stated as far a mixing units up, it is a mixture of marketing and creating the neighborhood of like units together. He stated when you start mixing it is hard to do both in construction sequencing and sales. They want to come in and build all the stand alones and have that area completed, and then do same with the ranches. He stated in their developments they try to keep unit types together.

Morgan questioned if they would be opposed to having the parking on the east section, but the north west corner. Most families use their garages as storage. Stebbin stated they can add it, it's not an issue, but it does take up greenspace. Then you have the townhome units that are two story back there and you will be looking back there and seeing cars parked in their rear yard. If you look at parking on the east end, it is along the side of the building so it is not real visible. Discussion ensued.

Holtrop questioned ownership versus rental. Stebbins stated they will all be for sale for ownership. Holtrop stated this plan really didn't wow him. He saw 7- six unit buildings and just big blobs of parking. He stated it looks congested. He said greenspace it could be increased if they had fewer units. Holtrop stated nothing makes this spectacular to him. He stated he is not overwhelmed at all by the project. Stebbins stated the only thing he can suggest is go back to the original plan and what was originally proposed. Stebbins stated there were 33 buildings, he now has 27 buildings but more units overall in this phase.

Jones stated she echoes Holtrop. She doesn't see anything in this development that makes it stand out. She stated she liked the alley concept of the previous developers she liked the neighborhood concept. She stated it forces people to be neighborly. She stated she also liked the aesthetics of the homes that were being built. From an aesthetic prospective she questioned how will these newer home units mesh with what is already there. She also questioned whether there was any thought of making these homes fit with the concept of the housing styles that were a

Page 13

little more retro. Stebbins stated if you look at the ranch condos that face the north on both east and west those will be looking down into a wooded ravine. Discussion ensued He stated in the original development there was no greenspace. He stated they removed 2200 lineal feet of road and that gives them greenspace. He stated they still need to get their unit counts; that is what helps pay for the cost of the property and that is how they get a return on the development. He stated if he has to put 2200 lineal feet back into the development, with lumber prices today, then they have units that they can't sell because they won't be affordable. That is another component of this development trying to make this affordable with reasonably home prices. He stated they really think this will be a nice development.

J. New Business

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Benoit, to set public hearing date of July 27, 2021, for: <u>Case#19-21</u> –32nd Street Townhomes – Final Site Plan Review Located at 2918 32nd Street

- Motion Carried (9-0) –
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn Nays: None

K. Other Business

1. Commissioners' Comments

Quinn apologized for his absence at the last meeting and stated his family was able to sell their home and find another home and remain in Kentwood.

Kape stated the food truck rally was good. September 11 is the next Food Truck Rally celebration. He stated Thursday is the start of the concert series there are no covid restrictions. Kape stated there have been park millage discussions again. Quinn encouraged the commissioners to visit the website and take a few moments to take the survey.

Moran stated it will be nice seeing the commissioners in person.

Brainerd stated the Bark in the Park fundraiser at Kellogswood was a nice event.

Holtrop stated LUZ met the tonight, first dealing with storage facilities in Industrial zones. Storage facilities are allowed to have open air recreational vehicle storage on their property but it is limited to paved areas in the backyard and no more than 25%. They would like to have more outdoor recreational storage but not within those guidelines. The commissioners suggested they go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Holtrop stated the other LUZ request dealt with the PUD that includes Clark Homes they are looking for a major change for the portion of the development that includes the church and putting in some homes, but it was all rental. Staff told them they may want to reevaluate before they proceed. The concept plan looked good but it was a little under parked.

Jones stated she noticed the reconstruction activity within Jaycee Park appears to include some changes. Golder stated the project is being funded through a CDBG and they are putting in the new restroom and upgrading some of the playground area.

Jones stated the City Line apartment looks good however one of the buildings is being constructed close to the back of the house and much closer than what she would have anticipated. It is practically in their backyard.

2. Staff's Comments

Golder stated he needs to know whether August 10 or August 24 works best for them to have a joint City/Planning Commission meeting. She stated staff will send out an email in the upcoming week to allow for the commissioners to check their schedules.

L. Adjournment

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

- Motion Carried (9-0) -
- Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn
- Nays: None

Meeting adjourned at 9:10pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary



CITY OF KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT JULY 13, 2021

Golder 6-16-21		
PROJECT		Windy West Plat
APPLICATION		16-21
REQUEST:		Preliminary Plat and Final Site Plan Review for a Single Family Residential Subdivision
HEARING DATE:		June 22, 2021
MOTION:		Motion by Benoit, supported by Pemberton, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat for Windy West Plat as described in Case No. 16-21 and as provided on the site plan dated June 15, 2021. Approval is conditioned on conditions 1-6 and basis points 1-6 as described in Golder's memo dated June 16, 2021.
		 Motion Carried (9-0) – Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn Nays: None
CONDITIONS:	1.	Execution and recording of the Conditional Zoning Agreement for the Windy West Development.
	2.	Review and approval of the proposed plat by the Kentwood City Engineer and Fire Marshal.
	3.	Street trees shall be provided along all public streets at 40 foot intervals.
	4.	Two sides of sidewalk must be provided within the development.
	5.	Pavement width of the proposed extension of Breezewood Court shall be 30'.

6. Applicant shall remove General Requirements note 6.

BASIS:

- 1. The property was received Conditional Zoning approval under the provisions of Section 3.29 of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires execution of an agreement, incorporating the provisions offered by the applicant at the time of the rezoning.
- 2. Street trees and sidewalks are required under the Subdivision Control Regulations.
- 3. The applicant has not indicated that sidewalks shall be provided within the development. Staff will add the extension of sidewalk along the current Breezewood Court to the city's list of sidewalk infill projects to ensure that the sidewalks for Windy West connect to the development to the east.
- 4. The pavement width proposed for the plat appears to be 30' in width.
- 5. Lots 7-14 exceed the 1:4 width to depth ratio outlined in Section 3.23 of the Zoning Ordinance; however, exceptions to the 1:4 ratio can be permitted by the Planning Commission when steep topography, unusual soil conditions or drainage problems exist. In this case, Lots 7-14 are encumbered by significant wetlands and floodplain.
- 6. General Requirement Note #6 states that the driveway between Lots 5 and 6 may serve up to four parcels. The potential for development to the north is not part of the Windy West Plat. The easement shows the potential for future lots; other factors may affect whether the lots are actually viable.



CITY OF KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT JULY 13, 2021

June 14, 2021	
PROJECT:	Lakewood Ravines PUD
APPLICATION:	17-21
REQUEST:	Rezoning of 6.8 acres of Land from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential Planned Unit Development, and Preliminary Site Plan Approval for a 15 lot single family development
LOCATION:	2720 52 nd Street, 2854 52 nd Street (part), 5453 Wing Avenue and 5491 Wing Avenue (part)
HEARING DATE:	June 22, 2021
MOTION:	 Motion by Holtrop, supported by Benoit, to recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the rezoning of 6.8 acres of land from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential and approval of preliminary site plan dated June16, 2021 for the Lakewood PUD project as described in Case No. 17-21. Application is conditioned on conditions 1-8 and basis points 1-4 as described in Golder memo dated June 14, 2021. Motion Carried (9-0) – Yeas: Benoit, Brainerd, Holtrop, Jones, Kape, Morgan, Poyner, Pemberton, Quinn Nays: None
CONDITIONS:	

- 1. Review and Approval of the PUD Statement dated June 16, 2021 for the Lakewood PUD, and review and approval of the Lakewood PUD Development Agreement by Kentwood staff and the City Attorney. The PUD Statement and Development Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a. Restrictions prohibiting the rental of more than one unit by a single purchaser.

Findings of Fact Case No. 17-21 Lakewood Rezoning and Preliminary Site Plan Page 2

- b. A statement regarding the improvements to be undertaken by the developers of the project.
- c. Detail on sidewalk provided in the development, open space within the development, and the maintenance of these areas.
- d. Detail regarding any public or private road improvement required for the development.
- 2. City Staff and City Attorney review and approval of all condominium documents, including but not limited to, the condominium bylaws, the master deed, and the complete condominium subdivision plan. An expandable condominium, as defined in the Michigan Condominium Act, MCL 559.106(4) shall not be permitted. Convertible area, as defined in the Michigan Condominium Act, MCL 559.105(3) shall not be permitted.
- 3. Compliance with the City Engineer's memo dated June 16, 2021.
- 4. Review and approval by the Kentwood Fire Marshal.
- 5. Applicant shall obtain permits from the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy for wetland mitigation prior to the issuance of construction permits on the site.
- 6. Staff review and approval of the preliminary landscaping and lighting plans for the site. The landscaping plan shall indicate how the developer intends to preserve significant stands of trees.
- 7. Review and approval by staff of building elevations proposed within the project.
- 8. City Commission approval of the rezoning of the site from R1-B to RPUD-2 Single Family Residential Planned Unit Development.

BASIS

1. The PUD Statement and Development Agreement will address issues such as deviations from the ordinance requirements, improvements to be provided by the developer, and other requirements or restrictions made by the city. The review and approval of these documents will hold the Findings of Fact Case No. 17-21 Lakewood Rezoning and Preliminary Site Plan Page 3

development to these standards and give additional direction to the applicant as the project develops.

- 2. Review of condominium documents will ensure that the site plan, the proposed improvements, the restrictions on convertible area and the rental of condominium units by the developer are addressed and recorded for the benefit of prospective owners.
- 3. The landscaping plan shall include information on required street trees along 52nd Street, Wing Avenue, and the private road, as well as other landscaped areas and areas in which the existing vegetation will be retained.
- 4. Discussion during the work session and public hearings.

.

.

Pung, Joe

From:Joe Siereveld <joe@eaglecreekhomes.net>Sent:Wednesday, July 07, 2021 9:25 PMTo:Pung, JoeSubject:[EXTERNAL]Aspen Pointe

A Stop.Think.Read.This is an external email. Please use caution when clicking on any links or opening attachments.

Joe

I wanted to let you know that we have sold our interest in the aspen pointe development to the neighboring land owner(Chris Vanderhoff at Bosco). We found that the cost to develop that concept was not financially feasible to do, even in this current real estate climate. I appreciate all you did to assist us through the process, I feel that the Bosco guys will put something good together there.

Also, I was under the understanding there was a possibility of a refund on the deposit we had down with Kentwood. Can you let me know who to talk to in regards to that?

Thanks again, have a great evening!

Joe Siereveld Eagle Creek Homes LLC C: (616)262-1958 E: joe@eaglecreekhomes.net www.eaglecreekhomes.net

Sent from my iPhone

PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Golder 7/7/21

PROJECT:	Cobblestone 3
APPLICATION:	18-21
REQUEST:	Major Change of an Approved PUD Phase
LOCATION:	North of 44 th Street, Stratton Boulevard extended
HEARING DATE:	July 13, 2021
RECOMMENDATION:	Recommend to the City Commission conditional approval of the Major Change to a Preliminary Site Plan dated July 2, 2021 as described in Case No. 18-21. Approval is conditioned on the following:

CONDITIONS:

- 1. Review and approval of the site plan by the Kentwood City Engineer and Fire Marshal.
- 2. The Master Deed and Bylaws for the development and condominium association must be approved by the Kentwood City Attorney and City staff.
- 3. Applicant shall provide 8 additional parking spaces, located south of East Cobblestone Court (4 spaces) and West of Cobblestone Court (4 spaces), or at another location approved by staff.
- 4. Planning and City Commission approval of the waiver for rear yard setback for Buildings 1 and 2. Applicant shall amend the site plan to reflect the correct building setbacks for the RPUD-1 zone.
- 5. Applicant shall provide a grading and access easement, in a form to be approved by the City Attorney, to allow for the future construction of Stratton Boulevard to serve the property north of Cobblestone 3.
- 6. Staff review and approval of building elevations.

7. Staff approval of the landscaping and lighting plan for the site.

BASIS: 1. The PUD is part of the overall Ravines development and subject to any applicable conditions of the original approval and conditions.

- 2. Cobblestone 3 has seven buildings with 6 attached townhouses. The 6-unit buildings represent about half of the total condominium units proposed in Phase 3. The townhouses are three bedroom units, which may increase the likelihood of multiple drivers living within each condominium. Additional parking near these 6-unit condominiums is needed.
- 3. Buildings 1 and 2 have a setback of 20 feet; 30 is required per Section 12.03 C 3 c of the Zoning Ordinance. The site plan must be amended to reflect the correct setback requirements.
- 4. Stratton Boulevard was approved to extend north into the B-2 Neighborhood of the Ravines development. The road stops short of the common property line, since grading easements on the B-2 property would be required to continue the road to the north property line. The requirement for grading and access easements will allow a future developer to construct the connection to Stratton Boulevard, as required by the Preliminary PUD Plan.
- 5. Discussion during the work session and public hearing.



City of Kentwood

Occupancy: COBBLESTONE AT THE REVINES

Occupancy ID:

Address: 3147 BLAIRVIEW PKY SE KENTWOOD MI 49512

Inspection Type: SITE PLAN ONLY

By: LYNCH, BRYAN M (0292)

Time In: 15:40

Time Out: 00:00

Authorized Date: 07/07/2021

Inspection Date: 7/7/2021

By: LYNCH, BRYAN M (0292)

Form: PLAN REVIEW - IFC 2015

Inspection Topics:

REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.

We have reviewed your plans for the above facility. The following items are noted for compliance with code requirements. Code references to the International Fire Code 2015, as amended, are noted IFC; references to the Michigan/International Building Code are noted MBC; references to the City of Kentwood Code of Ordinances are noted KC; references to National Fire Protection Association codes and standards are noted NFPA. Please review the appropriate code for further details. All construction and processes must meet applicable code provisions.

Status: PLAN REVIEW Notes: Site Plan for Phase III

GENERAL; CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION

WASTE DISPOSAL/WASTE ACCUMULATION.

All combustible debris, rubbish and waste material must be removed daily, and shall not be disposed of by burning. (IFC 304.1, 3304.2)

Status: PLAN REVIEW

Notes:

SUPPLEMENTAL ADDRESS NUMBERS.

Install supplementary _____ inch Arabic address numerals on a post or mailbox on the same side of the public road as, and directly in front of, the building in such a manner as to be readily visible to occupants of fire department vehicles on the public road. (IFC 505.1.2.4, 505.1.3)

Status: PLAN REVIEW Notes:

HYDRANTS REQUIRED.

Construction involving combustible building materials shall not occur until operable fire hydrants are in place within 500 road feet of the furthest point of any building being constructed. (IFC 3312.1)

Status: PLAN REVIEW Notes:

MAINTENANCE OF MEANS OF EGRESS.

Required means of egress shall be maintained during construction and demolition, remodeling or alterations and additions to any building. (IFC 3311.2)

Status: PLAN REVIEW Notes:

PLANS APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

PLANS APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

We have reviewed your plans for the above facility and approve them as submitted. Any changes must be reviewed and approved by the Kentwood Fire Prevention Bureau. All construction and processes must meet applicable codes and standards.

Status: PLAN REVIEW Notes:

Additional Time Spent on Inspection:

Category

Start Date / Time End Date / Time

Notes: No Additional time recorded

Total Additional Time: 0 minutes Inspection Time: 0 minutes Total Time: 0 minutes

Summary:

Overall Result: Plan Review

Plan Review Completed.

Inspector Notes:

Inspector:

Name: LYNCH , BRYAN M Rank: FM Work Phone(s): (616) 554-0805 Email(s): lynchb@kentwood.us

Signature

Date



To:Kentwood Planning DepartmentFrom:Brad Boomstra, P.E.
City EngineerDate:July 8, 2021Re:Cobblestone Phase III
4333 Shaffer Avenue SE
41-18-22-451-003
Review of Site Plan Received 7-7-2021

We have completed our review of the proposed site plans dated 7-2-2021 and received in our office on 7-7-2021 for the above referenced project.

Kentwood Engineering has the following comments that will need to be addressed before this office can grant site plan / construction plan approval:

Overall Plan Comments:

1. The cover sheet, watermain and sanitary sewer plan sheets must be prepared in accordance with the City of Grand Rapids drafting standards. Any improvement sheet(s) listed in the sheet index on the cover sheet must include the words, "FOR REFERENCE ONLY".

Street / Sidewalk / Parking Lot:

- 1. A pavement section detail must be shown on the plan for the private streets.
- 2. Additional comments regarding the street and/or sidewalk may be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Grading:

- 1. Indicate and label the 1% chance (100-year) flood elevation on the site plan or add a note that none exists on this site.
 - 2. If retaining walls shown on the plans measure over 4 feet from the top of the foundation to the top of the wall, a Building Permit will be needed from the Kentwood Inspections Department prior to construction of the wall, including detailed structural plans. Contact Kentwood Inspections (Renee Hargrave, 554-0781) for more information.
 - 3. A significant amount of fill will be placed. Who will be monitoring and testing this fill placement to ensure that it gets properly placed and compacted? Are there project specifications that address this issue? This is critical to ensure that future structures placed on top of this fill will not experience unacceptable settlement.

Cobblestone Phase III

4333 Shaffer Avenue SE Page 2 of 5

4. Additional comments regarding grading will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Storm Sewer / Drainage:

- 1. Provide a tributary area map and calculations to verify the capacity of the proposed and existing storm pipes to carry a 10-year storm (or a 100-year event if no overland floodway is provided). Use the Kentwood Storm Sewer Design Standards available on the City's website; they contain a Kentwood-specific IDF curve and time of concentration (T_c) nomograph. Use a minimum initial T_c of 10 minutes. Maintain a minimum cleansing velocity of 2.5 ft/sec in the pipes. Calculations must be sealed by a registered engineer.
- 2. The Kentwood Standard Specifications allow a 5-year frequency storm for the design of storm sewers in a residential development.
- 3. For any residential development, drains must be enclosed along all front yards and side yards.
- 4. Developed runoff cannot be allowed to flow off the edge of the property.
- 5. To allow a proper transition from a point discharge to natural flow, 50 feet of downstream protection will be needed for the outlet of the storm pipes. This may consist of 4" concrete, grouted riprap, or properly sized riprap, all on filter fabric (MDOT "Geotextile Liner"). Both the surface material and the fabric must be toed in at least 18 inches at all earth interfaces, and the treatment must be extended completely around the end of the outlet pipe by two (2) feet to protect from eddy currents. The point source must be at least fifty (50) feet from the property line.
- 6. The storm sewer outfalls to the detention basin must be located at the toe of the slope.
- 7. For each of the storm pipes, indicate the size, slope, length and invert elevations.
- 8. How will the roofs be drained? Where will this flow go? It should be directed to the proposed storm sewer system.
- 9. All developments must carry a floodway through the development to preclude property damage. Overland floodways for a 1% chance (100-year) storm event will need to be designated.
- 10. According to Section 78-125(b)(6) of the Kentwood Stormwater Management Ordinance, a minimum rear yard of 25 feet prior to any drainage encumbrance is required. This will allow opportunity for rear yard use for sheds, play equipment etc., without concern about water damage or inconvenience.
- 11. The natural stream has to be protected by a 50 foot "do not disturb" zone, centered on the drain. Show this "do not disturb" zone on the plans.
- 12. Additional comments regarding drainage will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Cobblestone Phase III

4333 Shaffer Avenue SE Page 3 of 5

Soil Erosion and Sediment Control:

- 1. Per the requirements of Part 91 of Public Act 451, all proposed grading and soil erosion controls must be shown on a sheet(s) titled, at least in part, "SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL PLAN". This plan should show surface features related to grading and soil erosion and sediment control. The SESC Plan may be combined with other plans and improvements as long as clarity is retained. Two (2) copies of this sheet, once approved, will need to accompany the application for an earth change.
- 2. Place a note on the soil erosion control plan to indicate that existing and new catch basins shall be protected with an inlet filter drop (silt sack). Straw bales or fabric placed under the grate are NOT acceptable, and sediment traps alone are not sufficient to provide adequate sediment filtration. Such a note might read, "EXISTING AND NEW CATCH BASINS SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH AN INLET FABRIC DROP (SILT SACK)." Include a simple detail of the proposed silt sack on the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plan. We can provide you with an acceptable CAD detail upon request.
- 3. Place the following notes on the soil erosion control plan:
 - ALL SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL COMPLY WITH ARTICLE 2 OF CITY OF KENTWOOD ORDINANCE 78 AND PART 91 OF PUBLIC ACT 451.
 - ALL SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS SHALL BE INSPECTED AND MAINTAINED ON A DAILY BASIS AND IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING EVERY SIGNIFICANT RAINFALL EVENT.
 - ALL EXCESS SPOILS ARE TO BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE. OTHERWISE, STOCKPILES
 MUST BE PROVIDED WITH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT STABILIZATION MEASURES.
 - EXCESS DIRT IS NOT TO BE PLACED ON ANY AREAS ON OR ADJACENT TO THE SITE WHERE THE PLAN DOES NOT SHOW THE AREA BEING DISTURBED. (This area of disturbance, or grading limits, must be clearly shown on the site plan.)
 - SILT FENCING IS REQUIRED ALONG ALL DOWNSTREAM EDGES OF THE GRADING LIMITS AND MUST REMAIN IN PLACE UNTIL VEGETATION IS UNIFORMLY RE-ESTABLISHED. THE SILT FENCE MUST BE TOED IN A MINIMUM OF 6 INCHES ALONG ITS BASE. (Remember that silt fences are intended to intercept *sheet flow* only and must always be installed *parallel* with the ground contours. Silt fences must not cross ravines, overland floodways, ditches, swales, etc. where concentrated flows occur.)
 - ALL DISTURBED BANKS EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 4:1 AND THE DETENTION BASIN BANKS AND BOTTOM MUST BE COVERED WITH TOPSOIL, SEED AND NORTH AMERICAN GREEN S-150 (OR APPROVED EQUAL) EROSION CONTROL BLANKET. THIS BLANKET, ALONG WITH THE NECESSARY STAPLES OR WOOD PEGS, SHALL BE PLACED PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. SEAMS SHALL BE PLACED PARALLEL TO THE DIRECTION OF SURFACE RUNOFF. (Indicate such areas with shading or hatching on the plan.)
 - ALL SOIL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO ANY EARTH MOVING OPERATIONS AND SHALL BE MAINTAINED UNTIL VEGETATION IS UNIFORMLY RE-ESTABLISHED AND THE SITE IS PERMANENTLY STABILIZED.
 - NO SEDIMENT SHALL BE TRACKED ONTO THE ADJACENT PUBLIC STREET AND IF IT DOES OCCUR, IT SHALL BE CLEANED DAILY.

Cobblestone Phase III 4333 Shaffer Avenue SE Page 4 of 5

> • THE STORMWATER DETENTION BASIN IS TO BE THE FIRST ITEM OF EARTH MOVING AND SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INSTALLATION OF SOIL EROSION Additional soil erosion and sediment control comments may be made by Kentwood staff upon further review.

Utilities (Sanitary & Water):

- 1. The City of Grand Rapids owns, operates and maintains the sanitary sewer collection and water distribution systems in this portion of Kentwood. Any alterations, extensions or new connections to either of these systems will require approval from Grand Rapids. Construction plans (drafting standards) and specifications for the proposed watermain and sanitary sewer must conform to Grand Rapids requirements.
- 2. A construction agreement with the City of Grand Rapids will be required for the new watermain and sanitary sewer.
- 3. A representative of the City of Kentwood Inspections Department must be present when the tap is made into the existing sanitary sewer.
- 4. The Grand Rapids Water Department must be present to make the tap into the existing watermain. Notify the Grand Rapids Water Department before making the connection to the existing service lateral.
- 5. Show the grade and the material of the proposed sanitary lateral. The Michigan Plumbing Code requires 1/8" per foot (or 1%) slope for both 6-inch and 4-inch service laterals.
- 6. The new watermain, including the proposed hydrant, needs to be placed in a 20-foot wide utility easement. This easement should extend 10 feet beyond the end of the main and hydrants.
- 7. Additional comments regarding utilities will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Required Permits, Bonds, Fees [and Escrow]:

- 1. Because this parcel is adjacent to a public street, over one (1) acre is being disturbed, and is within 500 feet of a lake or steam, a Permit for an Earth Change (fee \$400) and a \$5,000 soil erosion control performance bond or an irrevocable letter of credit using the City of Kentwood format will be required through Kentwood Engineering. The Owner/Developer must sign the Permit for an Earth Change. Both the Owner/Developer and the Contractor must be named on the bond. Please contact us if you need a permit and/or a bond template form, or one can be accessed on the City's website at http://www.ci.kentwood.mi.us (hover over "CITY SERVICES" and "DEPARTMENTS" then click "ENGINEERING", then click the "SOIL EROSION AND STORM WATER" link near the top of the page). There is a 365-day limit to complete the work under this permit.
- 2. An NPDES Notice of Coverage will also be needed as the proposed area of disturbance exceeds 5 acres. At the time the Earth Change permit is issued by the Kentwood, your Notice of Coverage will immediately become effective as a "permit-by-rule" as soon as the NOC has been properly filed and the appropriate fee is paid.

Cobblestone Phase III

4333 Shaffer Avenue SE Page 5 of 5

- 3. A \$30,000 Site Grading and Stormwater Management Bond or an irrevocable letter of credit using the City of Kentwood format and an administrative fee of \$600 will be required through Kentwood Engineering. This bond is posted to assure that the plan, once approved, is constructed in the field according to that plan. Both the Owner/Developer and the Contractor must be named on the bond. Let us know if you need our bond template, or it can be accessed on the City's website.
- 4. A permit will be needed from EGLE for any proposed work within the existing wetlands.
- 5. Please note that <u>all</u> required bonds and permit applications and fees must be submitted to, and accepted by, Kentwood Engineering *before any permits can be issued!* There will be no "partial" or "conditional" permits issued.

Miscellaneous / Reminders:

- 1. Please be advised that at the completion of construction, a civil engineer or surveyor will need to provide an as-built plan to the City of Kentwood with a certification by a registered engineer stating that the site grading and the stormwater system were constructed in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of the certification form is available upon request or on the City's website.
- 2. We will also require copies of the final as-built mylar drawings for the Grand Rapids watermain and sanitary sewer.
- 3. The City of Grand Rapids will require a pre-construction meeting for this project. Please notify us of the time and location of this meeting, as <u>we must have a</u> <u>representative in attendance</u>! Otherwise, we will require a separate pre-construction meeting be held. We will address other construction-related topics at that time.
- 4. Remember that, for a Building Permit to be issued, other City departments (fire, assessor, treasurer, water, planning) may have comments regarding this plan. Contact Kentwood Inspections (Renee Hargrave, 554-0781) regarding building permit application procedures, fees, plan requirements and approval status.
- 5. Once final approval by all departments has been granted, make sure the contractor has the <u>latest approved</u> set of plans before beginning construction!

Should you have any questions regarding this department's review, please feel free to contact our office.

cc: Kentwood Engineering Permit Staff Justin Longstreth, P.E. – Moore & Bruggink

.




210166.01 Cobblestone Phase III- Kentwood\CAD\DWG\210166_Cobblestone Phase 3 DESIGN-SHEETS.dwg_7/6/2021 3:29:14 PM_LISA FR



0166.01 Cobblestone Phase III- Kentwood\CAD\DWG\210166_Cobblestone Phase 3 DESIGN-SHEETS.dwg_7/6/2021 3:29:26 PM_LISA FRIZ2



10166.01 Cobblestone Phase III- Kentwood\CAD\DWG\210166_Cobblestone Phase 3 DESIGN-SHEETS.dwg_7/6/2021 3:29:39 PM_LISA FRIZZEI

Acer rubrum 'October Glory'
October Glory Maple 2-2 <mark>1</mark> " B&B
Acer rubrum 'Armstrong'
Armstrong Columnar Maple 10'/12'B
Ginko Bilboa 'Autumn Gold"
Autumn Gold Ginko (male) 2—2½" B&B
Gleditsia tricanthos 'Suncole'
Sunburst Honey Locust 2-2½" B&I
Stewartia Pseudocamellia
Japanese Stewartia 6'-7' B&B
Abies concolor
Concolor Fir 6'-7' B&B
Picea omorika
Serbian Spruce 6' B&B
Amalanahian agadanaia 'Autump Brillianaa'
Autumn Brilliance Juneberry 7'-8'Clum
Betula Nigra
River Birch & Clump B&B

PREPARED FOR: REDSTONE HOMES 3330 GRAND RIDGE DRIVE, NE GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49525 (616) 403-6106 ATTN: MR. DAVID STEBBINS

06-01-2

SHEET NUMBER

8 OF **10**

PLANT LEGEND

Amelanchier candensis 'Autumn Brilliance' Buxus microphylla japonica 'Winter Gem' Winter Gem Boxwood 24" B&B

00

 \mathbf{X}

 \bigcirc

 \bigcirc

 \odot

+

- Taxus x. media densiformis Dense Yew 24" B&B
- Skyrocket Juniper 5-6' B&B Heuchera 'Carmel' Carmel Coral Bells #3 Pot
- Nepeta x Faassenii 'Walkers Low' Walkers Low Catmint #3 Pot
- Hemerocallis 'Happy Returns' Happy Returns Daylilly #1 18" o.c.
- Potentilla fruiticosa 'Gold Drop' Gold Drop Potentilla 24" B&B

32ND STREET	0 5 10 PLAN SCALE: 1" = 10' Respectively. Know what's below. Call before you dig.
NO SCALE:	PLAN REVISIONS
	Moore+Bruggink Consulting Engineers 2020 Monroe Ave. Grand Rapids, MI 49505 (616) 363-9801 mailbox@mbce.com
	SINGLE UNIT LANDSCAPE EXHIBIT PLAN FOR CITY OF KENTWOOD, KENT COUNTY, MI CITY OF KENTWOOD, KENT COUNTY, MI
PREPARED FOR: REDSTONE HOMES 3330 GRAND RIDGE DRIVE, NE GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49525 (616) 403-6106 ATTN: MR. DAVID STEBBINS	PROJECT NO.: 210166.01 DESIGN DRAWN BY: GPW DESIGNED BY: GPW CHECKED BY: JFL PLAN DATE: 06-01-21 SHEET NUMBER 9 OF 10

٨

Autumn Brilliance Juneberry 7'-8'Clump B&B

Juniperus scopulorum 'Skyrocket'

*?/210166.01 Cobblestone Phase III- Kentwood/CAD/DWG/210166 Photo Exhibit Map.dwg 6/29/2021 1:36:45 PM CHUCK F. BARTHOLOMEW

Statistics

Description

Street Lightir

Plan View Scale - 1" = 60ft

5			
	Max	Min	Max/Min
ng	5.0 fc	0.0 fc	N/A

Designer

Date 06/28/2021 Scale Not to Scale Drawing No. Summary

Generation Lighting reserves the right to revise the design of components of any product due to parts availability or change in safety listing standards without assuming any obligation or liability to modify any products previously manufactured and without notice. This literature depicts a product design that is the sole and exclusive property of Generation Lighting. In compliance with U.S copyright and patent requirements, notification is hereby presented in this form that this literature, or the product it depicts, is not to be copied, altered or used in any manner without the express written consent of, or contrary to the best interests of Generation Lighting, a Visual Comfort & Co brand.

PS518195EN page 1 March 2021 J M PM

TYPE D

				,	
				/	
V	۵	s	U	A	L

MANUFACTURER/NUMBER	LAMP
OR APPROVED FOUNT	40K
OK ALTROVED EQUAL	TOIL
MOUNT TO A 14' TALL ROUND ALUMINUM POLE WITH ROUND BASE COVER	
INSTALL ON 18" ROUND CONCRETE BASE 4" ABOVE GRADE	
OVERALL HEIGHT IS APPROXIMATELY 17'	
DIECAST ALUMINUM POLE MOUNTED SITE LUMINAIRE	
WITH TIPE 5 DISTRIBUTION	
MANUFACTURER/NUMBER	LAMP
OP APPROVED FOUNT	4012
OK AFTROVED EQUAL	TOR
MOUNT TO A 14' TALL BOUND ALUMINUM POLE WITH BOUND BASE COVER	
INSTALL ON 18" ROUND CONCRETE BASE 4" ABOVE GRADE	
OVERALL HEIGHT IS APPROXIMATELY 17'	
DIECAST ALUMINUM POLE MOUNTED SITE LUMINAIRE	
WITH TYPE 5 DISTRIBUTION	
MANUFACTURER/NUMBER	LAMP
KICHLER BARRIE 8.5" LIGHT	LED
OR APPROVED EQUAL	30K
MOUNT TO EXTERIOR OF STRUCTURE AT HEIGHT OF 7 FEET	
OR TO OWNERS SPECIFICATIONS	
8.5" WALL LIGHT TANNERY BRONZE WITH SCREW IN LED LAMP	
MANUFACTURER/NUMBER	LAMP
COOPER: HALO SLD612840	LED
OR APPROVED EQUAL	30K
MOUNT ON OUTPULLIC ADOUT ENTENDED OD	
MOUNT ON OVERHANG ABOVE ENTRIWAT DOOR	
6 INCH LED LUMINAIRE WHITE FINISH	
MANUFACTURER/NUMBER	LAMP
GENERATION LIGHTING 8637401-71	30K
OR APPROVED EQUAL	
MOINT TO EVITEBIOD OF STRUCTURE CENTERED ABOVE	
CAPACE AND FRONT DOORS	
GARAGE AND FROM LOOKS	
12" DIAMET'ER LUMINAIRE 75 WAT'T'S MAX WIT'H BRON'ZE FINISH	

LIGHTING SCHEDULE

S

S

U

Designer

Date 06/28/2021 Scale Not to Scale Drawing No.

STAFF REPORT:	July 8, 2021
PREPARED FOR:	Kentwood Planning Commission
PREPARED BY:	Joe Pung
CASE NO.:	19-21: 32 nd Townhomes

GENERAL INFORMATION

APPLICANT:	Daniel Holland 3643 Colby Avenue, SW Wyoming, MI 49509	Rep: Michael Brown 5470 Bentbrook Street, SE Kentwood, MI 49508
STATUS OF APPLICANT:	Property Owner	
REQUESTED ACTION:	Site plan review for a 4-unit a	apartment building
EXISTING ZONING OF SUBJECT PARCEL:	R4 High Density Residential	
GENERAL LOCATION:	2918–32 nd Street, SE	
PARCEL SIZE:	.43 acres	
EXISTING LAND USE ON THE PARCEL:	Vacant Land	
ADJACENT AREA LAND USES:	 N: 32nd Street ROW S: Attached Condominium I E: Single Family Home W: Duplex 	Development (82 units)
ZONING ON ADJOINING PARCELS:	N: R2 Two Family ResidentiS: R4 High Density ResidenE: R4 High Density ResidenW: R4 High Density Residen	al tial tial tial

Compatibility with Master Plan

The Master Plan recommendation is for medium density (up to 8 units per acre) residential development. The proposed overall density (9 units per acre) is not consistent with the Master Plan recommendation. Although not consistent with the Future Land Use Plan, the property is zoned R4 High Density Residential which permits a maximum density of 12 units per acre.

Relevant Zoning Ordinance Sections

Section 6.03.A requires Planning Commission site plan review and approval of the apartment building. Section 13.08 outlines the general review standards. Section 14.05 outlines site plan review standards.

Zoning History

The property had been zoned for multi-family residential development since at least 1976.

SITE INFORMATION

Site Characteristics

The site is currently vacant (there had been a 4-unit apartment building on the site but that was demolished in 2010). There is an existing curb cut which will be utilized as part of the development. There is a row of mature evergreen trees along the 32^{nd} Street frontage that will be retained. The site is essentially flat.

Traffic & Circulation

Access will be from a single driveway onto 32^{nd} Street located on the west side of the site. A five (5) foot wide concrete sidewalk will connect to the public sidewalk along 32^{nd} Street.

Parking

The Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of two (2) parking space per dwelling unit. Based on four (4) dwelling units, a minimum of eight (8) parking spaces are required; the site plan depicts seventeen (17) parking spaces (includes a space located in a 1-stall garage).

Engineering

All applicable Engineering Department standards and requirements will have to be met. See City Engineer's report dated July 6, 2021.

<u>Fire</u>

All applicable Fire Department standards and requirements will have to be met.

Staff Comments

- 1) The applicant wishes to construct a new 2-story townhouse apartment building consisting of four (4) 4-bedroom units. Section 6.03.B of the Zoning Ordinance requires that each unit have a minimum of 1,020 square feet of finished living area; based on information provided by the applicant, each unit will provide 2,026 square feet of finished living area.
- 2) In 1992 a 4-unit apartment building was constructed on the property (see Exhibit 2). In late 2010 the structure was demolished after significant damage due to a natural gas explosion on the property in May of 2010.
- 3) The proposed building would have a front yard setback of twenty-three (23) feet. Typically, the minimum front yard building setback in the R4 district would thirty-five (35) feet. Section 3.05.A of the Zoning Ordinance states that for unplatted property where an existing setback line has been established by existing buildings occupying fifty (50) percent or more of the frontage within two hundred (200) feet of the proposed building then such established setback shall apply. The two structures to the west within 200 feet have front yard setbacks of approximately twenty-three (23) feet (the building is proposed to be in line with those structures) and the two structures to the east within two hundred (200) feet have front yard setbacks of approximately forty-four (44) feet and twenty-four (24) feet.

In looking at the proposed building layout, if the units were reduced in size and the single stall attached garage/tenant storage area were removed, the front yard setback could be increased to approximately thirty-five (35) feet.

4) A landscape plan will need to be reviewed and approved by staff. Section 19.03.C of the Zoning Ordinance requires landscape buffer C (minimum width of ten (10) feet along with one (1) canopy or evergreen tree and 5 shrubs per each forty (40) linear along the property line) along the south, west, and east property lines.

Along the west side of the property, parking is proposed up to the property line. A variance would be required to place parking with the required ten (10) foot wide buffer area.

- 5) Section 13.08 of the Zoning Ordinance outlines the general review standards as follows:
 - 13.08.A Whether or not the request reasonably preserves the health, safety, and welfare of the public, and is in harmony with the general purpose of this Ordinance.

The proposed building is not anticipated to adversely impact the health, safety, and welfare of the public and is consistent with the general purpose of this Ordinance.

13.08.B Whether or not the request is generally consistent with the Master Plan and provisions of this Ordinance that are designed to lessen congestion in the streets, to secure safety from fire, panic, and other dangers.

The Master Plan recommendation is for medium density (4 - 8 units per acre) residential development. The proposed development comes in at approximately 9 units per acre. The development is consistent with the R4 High Density residential zoning which allows for up to twelve (12) units per acre.

13.08.C Whether or not the request will unduly interfere with the provision of adequate light and air, cause overcrowding of land, or cause and undue concentration of population.

The proposed development is not anticipated to unduly interfere with the provision of adequate light and air, nor cause overcrowding of the land or undue concentration of population.

13.08.D Whether or not the request will unduly interfere with or adversely affect traffic patterns and street, water supply, wastewater collection and disposal systems, park and recreational facilities and other public services.

The proposed use is not anticipated to unduly interfere with or adversely affect traffic patterns and street, water supply, wastewater collection and disposal systems, park and recreational facilities and other public services.

13.08.E Whether or not the request may have a substantial and permanent adverse impact on neighboring property.

The proposed development is not anticipated to have a substantial and permanent adverse impact on neighboring property.

13.08.F Whether or not the request may have a tendency to create any type of blight within the immediate area.

The proposed development is not anticipated to create any type of blight within the immediate area.

13.08.G Whether or not the request is generally aesthetically compatible with its surroundings.

The proposed building height is approximately thirty (30) feet (approximately thirty-four (34) feet to the peek). The adjacent

structures are single story buildings. The proposed building will be setback approximately forty-six (46) feet from the adjacent residence to the east, approximately fifty-eight (58) feet from the residence to the south, and eighty-six (86) feet from the residence to the west. The proposed exterior building materials are aesthetically compatible with the surrounding residential development.

Issues

- No required 10-foot wide buffer along the west property line.
- Landscape plan to be reviewed and approved by staff.

Exhibit 1: Project Location

Exhibit 2: October 2007 Picture of Original Apartment Building

Exhibit 3: April 2020 Pictometry Photo (view from the south)

Exhibit 4: April 2017 Pictometry Photo (view from the north)

Exhibit 5: April 2017 Pictometry Photo (view from the east)

Exhibit 6: April 2020 Pictometry Photo (view from the west)

Exhibit 8: July 7, 2021 View of Site from North Side of 32nd Street (Photo 2 of 3)

Exhibit 9: July 7, 2021 View of Site from North Side of 32nd Street (Photo 3 of 3)

Exhibit 10: Adjacent Duplex to the West

Exhibit 11: Adjacent Single-Family Residence to the East

To:	Kentwood Planning Department
From:	Brad Boomstra, P.E. City Engineer
Date:	July 6, 2021
Re:	32nd Street Townhomes 2918 32 nd Street SE 41-18-15-404-009 Review of Site Plan Received 6-30-2021

We have completed our review of the proposed undated site plan received in our office on 6-30-2021 for the above referenced project.

Kentwood Engineering has the following comments that will need to be addressed before this office can grant site plan approval:

Overall Plan Comments:

- 1. A location map is needed.
- 2. The plans need to be signed and sealed by a professional engineer.
- 3. Provide a legend that identifies the acronyms shown on the plans. (P/L, GU, SB/L, etc)
- 4. You will need to submit an application for Site Plan Construction approval.

Street / Sidewalk / Parking Lot:

- 1. No cutting of the 32nd Street pavement will be allowed.
- 2. Please indicate the width of the entry drive at the throat.
- 3. Dimension the proposed curb radii for each of the drive entrances.
- 4. A pavement section detail must be shown on the plan for the parking lot.
- 5. Concrete curb and gutter per MDOT standard plan R-30 series (Detail F4, as modified for the tilt of the gutter pan), and a commercial drive opening per MDOT standard plan R-29 series (Detail M) are required for the proposed drive approach entrance within the 32nd Street right-of-way. They must be referenced in the plan notes or included on your detail sheet.
- 6. The pavement within the commercial drive approach between the sidewalk and the gutter pan must be concrete at least 6 inches thick.
- 7. No single curb cut shall be less than 10 feet in width, nor more than thirty (30) feet in width.

- 8. For any curb cut which terminates less than five (5) feet from a construction joint, the contractor shall remove and replace the existing curb to the next joint.
- 9. The sidewalk must be carried across the commercial drive. Where it crosses, it must be at least 6" thick.
- 10. Include the City of Kentwood General Notes on the plan(s). These notes are required for the work being performed in the 32nd Street Drive right-of-way. Highway permit conditions, specifications and required general plan notes are posted on the City's website, and can be accessed at <u>http://www.ci.kentwood.mi.us</u> (hover over "CITY SERVICES" and "DEPARTMENTS" then click "ENGINEERING", then click the "RIGHT-OF-WAY" link near the top of the page).
- 11. Additional comments regarding the street and/or sidewalk may be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Grading:

- 1. Please identify at least one (1) benchmark on the plan.
- 2. Indicate the proposed limits of grading on the site plan. A thick, shaded line works well for this.
- 3. Indicate and label the 1% chance (100-year) flood elevation on the site plan or add a note that none exists on this site.
- 4. Indicate and label the wetland delineation line or add a note that none exist on this site.
- 5. Proposed grading (contours) and building floor elevation will be needed to show proposed surface drainage patterns.
- 6. Existing and proposed grading contours need to be provided within up to 100 feet outside of the property lines.
- 7. If the retaining wall shown on the plans measures over 4 feet from the top of the foundation to the top of the wall, a Building Permit will be needed from the Kentwood Inspections Department prior to construction of the wall, including detailed structural plans. Contact Kentwood Inspections (Renee Hargrave, 554-0781) for more information.
- 8. Show minimum window opening elevations for each of the structures. In accordance with Section 78-125(a)(2) of the City of Kentwood Ordinance, this elevation must allow 1 foot of freeboard above the high storm water level (in the basin), one foot above the 1% chance (100-year) floodplain, three feet above the top of any downstream culvert, four feet above the bottom of any drainageway, and five feet above the bottom of any drainageway that could be enclosed in pipe in the probable future.
- 9. Additional comments regarding grading will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Storm Sewer / Drainage:

1. Provide a tributary area map and calculations to verify the capacity of the proposed and existing storm pipes to carry a 10-year storm (or a 100-year event if no overland

floodway is provided). Use the Kentwood Storm Sewer Design Standards available on the City's website; they contain a Kentwood-specific IDF curve and time of concentration (T_c) nomograph. Use a minimum initial T_c of 10 minutes. Maintain a minimum cleansing velocity of 2.5 ft/sec in the pipes. Calculations must be sealed by a registered engineer.

- 2. Developed runoff cannot be allowed to flow off the edge of the property.
- 3. Please indicate the type of material being used for the storm pipe in various areas (i.e., under the roadway, under lawn areas, etc).
- 4. For each of the storm pipes, indicate the size, slope, length and invert elevations.
- 5. How will the roof be drained? Where will this flow go?
- 6. Connecting roof downspouts and footing drains to a sanitary sewer lateral is prohibited by State law.
- 7. Interior floor drains <u>must</u> connect to the sanitary sewer and not to the storm sewer.
- 8. The storm pipe leading into the right-of-way must be C-76 Class III concrete pipe. The remainder of the storm pipe may be plastic, but a minimum cover of three (3) feet must be maintained over the top of the pipe.
- 9. In order to preclude property damage, overland floodways for a 1% chance (100-year) storm event will need to be designated for the rear yard catch basins in the event that they become plugged or cannot accommodate the storm event for which they were designed. These must be shown within a floodway easement.
- 10. All developments must carry a floodway through the development to preclude property damage. Overland floodways for a 1% chance (100-year) storm event will need to be designated.
- 11. According to Section 78-125(b)(6) of the Kentwood Stormwater Management Ordinance, a minimum rear yard of 25 feet prior to any drainage encumbrance is required. This will allow opportunity for rear yard use for sheds, play equipment etc., without concern about water damage or inconvenience.
- 12. Basement under-slab and basement footing drains will be needed in the case of impervious soils or if the footings will be within 2 feet of the water table. If needed, these drains must be <u>pumped</u>, with a hydraulic break occurring outside the structure in the event of a storm sewer backup so as to prevent flooding of the basement of the structure. The City of Kentwood will not allow a direct gravity connection to the storm sewer, even if a check valve is provided.
- 13. If it is determined that basement footing drains are <u>not</u> needed due to pervious soils or if footings will be more than 2 feet of the water table, soil boring data will be needed from each parcel to verify the type(s) of soils present.
- 14. Additional comments regarding drainage will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Detention Basin:

Project Name Address Page 4 of 8

- 1. On-site stormwater detention may be required for this parcel. The amount of detention volume required may be based on an estimate of the percentage of impervious surface area based on the Kent County Subdivision Drainage Rules (short method #1), on the basis of 0.1 acre-ft per acre for the entire parcel (short method #2) or, alternately, a tabulation of actual reservoir routing (long method). Routing calculations usually result in the lowest required volume. The detention sizing must be based on a 25-year storm. We will need to see detention sizing and release calculations.
- 2. Kentwood Ordinance 78-127 (posted on the City's website) contains the Standard City Specification for leaching basins. If leaching basins are to be used, we will need to see the results of soil borings or test excavations to verify the ability of the soils to absorb this flow. Per the USDA Soil Survey for Kent County, the soils on this site consist of type 1A-Name (Silty Clay Loam). This type of soil is not normally considered to be adequate for the use of leaching basins.
- 3. If required, we will need to see a more detailed drawing of the proposed detention basin outlet control structure.
- 4. Kentwood allows a maximum detention release rate of 0.33 cfs/acre, based on the total parcel size.
- 5. The minimum diameter restrictor pipe size is 4 inches.
- 6. The emergency outlet pipe must be capable of carrying a 10-year, fully developed nondetained storm flow. Please provide calculations to show that the pipe can carry this flow.
- 7. An emergency spillway may also be used instead of an outlet pipe. Section V(E) of the City of Kentwood Standard Specifications for Design and Construction of Storm Detention Storage requires that the detention basin spillway "shall be constructed of hot-rolled plant mix asphalt or concrete, and must extend from the top of the berm to the intersection with the outfall channel. All interfaces with native soil shall be toed in." Show a detail on the plans.
- 8. Additional comments regarding stormwater detention will be made upon receipt of construction plans and calculations.

Soil Erosion and Sediment Control:

- 1. We will need to see some additional soil erosion control measures as part of the plan review. Section 78-62 of the City of Kentwood Ordinance (posted on the City's website) contains minimum requirements for information that shall be included on the plan. Go to: <u>http://www.ci.kentwood.mi.us</u> (hover over "CITY SERVICES" and "DEPARTMENTS" then click "ENGINEERING", then click the "SOIL EROSION AND STORMWATER" link near the top of the page). Please review this ordinance carefully.
- 2. Per the requirements of Part 91 of Public Act 451, all proposed grading and soil erosion controls must be shown on a sheet(s) titled, at least in part, "SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL PLAN". This plan should show surface features related to grading and soil erosion and sediment control. The SESC Plan may be combined with

other plans and improvements as long as clarity is retained. Two (2) copies of this sheet, once approved, will need to accompany the application for an earth change.

- 3. We need to see existing and proposed topography at a maximum of five (5) foot contour intervals. The existing topography shall include structures and natural features outside the site boundary line within 50 feet.
- 4. Indicate and label the 1% chance (100-year) flood elevation on the SESC plan or add a note that none exists on this site.
- 5. Indicate and label the wetland delineation line or add a note that none exist on this site.
- 6. Include a written description of the soil types of the exposed land area contemplated for an earth change.
- 7. Place a note on the soil erosion control plan to indicate that existing and new catch basins shall be protected with an inlet filter drop (silt sack). Straw bales or fabric placed under the grate are NOT acceptable, and sediment traps alone are not sufficient to provide adequate sediment filtration. Such a note might read, "EXISTING AND NEW CATCH BASINS SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH AN INLET FABRIC DROP (SILT SACK)." Include a simple detail of the proposed silt sack on the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plan. We can provide you with an acceptable CAD detail upon request.
- 8. Place the following notes on the soil erosion control plan:
 - ALL SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL COMPLY WITH ARTICLE 2 OF CITY OF KENTWOOD ORDINANCE 78 AND PART 91 OF PUBLIC ACT 451.
 - ALL SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS SHALL BE INSPECTED AND MAINTAINED ON A DAILY BASIS AND IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING EVERY SIGNIFICANT RAINFALL EVENT.
 - ALL EXCESS SPOILS ARE TO BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE. OTHERWISE, STOCKPILES MUST BE PROVIDED WITH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT STABILIZATION MEASURES.
 - EXCESS DIRT IS NOT TO BE PLACED ON ANY AREAS ON OR ADJACENT TO THE SITE WHERE THE PLAN DOES NOT SHOW THE AREA BEING DISTURBED. (This area of disturbance, or grading limits, must be clearly shown on the site plan.)
 - SILT FENCING IS REQUIRED ALONG ALL DOWNSTREAM EDGES OF THE GRADING LIMITS AND MUST REMAIN IN PLACE UNTIL VEGETATION IS UNIFORMLY RE-ESTABLISHED. THE SILT FENCE MUST BE TOED IN A MINIMUM OF 6 INCHES ALONG ITS BASE. (Remember that silt fences are intended to intercept *sheet flow* only and must always be installed *parallel* with the ground contours. Silt fences must not cross ravines, overland floodways, ditches, swales, etc. where concentrated flows occur.)
 - ALL DISTURBED BANKS EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 4:1 AND THE DETENTION BASIN BANKS AND BOTTOM MUST BE COVERED WITH TOPSOIL, SEED AND NORTH AMERICAN GREEN S-150 (OR APPROVED EQUAL) EROSION CONTROL BLANKET. THIS BLANKET, ALONG WITH THE NECESSARY STAPLES OR WOOD PEGS, SHALL BE PLACED PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. SEAMS SHALL BE PLACED PARALLEL TO THE DIRECTION OF SURFACE RUNOFF. (Indicate such areas with shading or hatching on the plan.) [*This includes the slopes created along the center of the lots for the proposed walkouts.*]

Project Name Address Page 6 of 8

- ALL SOIL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO ANY EARTH MOVING OPERATIONS AND SHALL BE MAINTAINED UNTIL VEGETATION IS UNIFORMLY RE-ESTABLISHED AND THE SITE IS PERMANENTLY STABILIZED.
- NO SEDIMENT SHALL BE TRACKED ONTO THE ADJACENT PUBLIC STREET AND IF IT DOES OCCUR, IT SHALL BE CLEANED DAILY.
- THE STORMWATER DETENTION BASIN IS TO BE THE FIRST ITEM OF EARTH MOVING AND SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INSTALLATION OF SOIL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES.
- 9. Per the requirements of Part 91 of P.A. 451, place on the soil erosion control plan a bar graph or chart showing the proposed timing and sequence of each proposed earth change. It must include the installation of both permanent and temporary soil erosion and sedimentation controls, as well as the removal of temporary controls. It must also show the sequence of any construction phases.
- 10. A stone construction exit must also be included as part of the soil erosion control plan. Indicate the location of this exit on the plan, along with a detail. The length of the rock construction exit shall be at least 50 feet and shall consist of a 6-inch minimum layer crushed rock or stone on top of non-woven geosynthetic fabric (MDOT "Heavy Geotextile Liner"). The size of the stone shall be selected so that it cannot get caught between dual truck tires.
- 11. Additional soil erosion and sediment control comments may be made by Kentwood staff upon further review.

Utilities (Sanitary & Water):

- 1. The City of Grand Rapids owns, operates and maintains the sanitary sewer collection and water distribution systems in this portion of Kentwood. Any alterations, extensions or new connections to either of these systems will require approval from Grand Rapids. Construction plans (drafting standards) and specifications for the proposed watermain and sanitary sewer must conform to Grand Rapids requirements.
- 2. A representative of the City of Kentwood Inspections Department must be present when the tap is made into the existing sanitary sewer.
- 3. The Grand Rapids Water Department must be present to make the tap into the existing watermain. Notify the Grand Rapids Water Department before making the connection to the existing service lateral.
- 4. [*if the fire lead is less than 100 feet in the GR district*] The fire suppression installation [*or modifications, if no DCVA exists*] will need to have a double check valve assembly placed inside the building. [*this includes new building additions, although the existing portion is grandfathered and won't need it*] If the new fire suppression lead is over 100 feet from the right-of-way line to the building, then a double-check assembly will need to be placed in a vault outside the building near the main. This needs to be shown on the plan. If you have any questions regarding this, please contact Kentwood Inspections (Tim Sparks, 554-0703). [*GR district*]
- 5. Deferred frontage assessments and/or trunkage (hookup) fees for water and sanitary sewer may be due upon hookup or development. Contact the City of Grand Rapids

(Larry Olson, 456-4074) for any assessments for utilities (water & sewer) that may be due.

- 6. Show the grade and the material of the proposed sanitary lateral. The Michigan Plumbing Code requires 1/8" per foot (or 1%) slope for both 6-inch and 4-inch service laterals.
- 7. Show the size of the proposed water service lead.
- 8. Additional comments regarding utilities will be made upon receipt of construction plans.

Required Permits, Bonds, Fees [and Escrow]:

- 1. Because this parcel is adjacent to a public street, over one (1) acre is being disturbed, and is within 500 feet of a lake or steam, a Permit for an Earth Change (fee \$400) and a \$5,000 soil erosion control performance bond or an irrevocable letter of credit using the City of Kentwood format will be required through Kentwood Engineering. The Owner/Developer must sign the Permit for an Earth Change. Both the Owner/Developer and the Contractor must be named on the bond. Please contact us if you need a permit and/or a bond template form, or one can be accessed on the City's website at http://www.ci.kentwood.mi.us (hover over "CITY SERVICES" and "DEPARTMENTS" then click "ENGINEERING", then click the "SOIL EROSION AND STORM WATER" link near the top of the page). There is a 365-day limit to complete the work under this permit.
- 2. Your contractor will need a Drive Permit from Kentwood Engineering for the proposed commercial drive into the 32^{nd} Street right-of-way. A \$10,000 annual ROW bond or an irrevocable letter of credit using the City of Kentwood format and a certificate of insurance (with the City of Kentwood named as additional insured) will also be required. We will need to see a plan of the proposed commercial driveway at a plan scale no greater than $1^{"} = 50^{"}$. Contact us if you need a permit and/or bond form, or they can be accessed on the City's website. Highway specifications, general conditions and required plan notes are also posted on the City's website.
- 3. A \$30,000 Site Grading and Stormwater Management Bond or an irrevocable letter of credit using the City of Kentwood format and an administrative fee of \$600 will be required through Kentwood Engineering. This bond is posted to assure that the plan, once approved, is constructed in the field according to that plan. Both the Owner/Developer and the Contractor must be named on the bond. Let us know if you need our bond template, or it can be accessed on the City's website.
- 4. Please note that <u>all</u> required bonds and permit applications and fees must be submitted to, and accepted by, Kentwood Engineering *before any permits can be issued!* <u>There will be no "partial" or "conditional" permits issued.</u>

Miscellaneous / Reminders:

1. Please be advised that at the completion of construction, a civil engineer or surveyor will need to provide an as-built plan to the City of Kentwood with a certification by a registered engineer stating that the site grading and the stormwater system were

constructed in accordance with the approved plans. A copy of the certification form is available upon request or on the City's website.

- 2. Remember that, for a Building Permit to be issued, other City departments (fire, assessor, treasurer, water, planning) may have comments regarding this plan. Contact Kentwood Inspections (Renee Hargrave, 554-0781) regarding building permit application procedures, fees, plan requirements and approval status.
- 3. Once final approval by all departments has been granted, make sure the contractor has the <u>latest approved</u> set of plans before beginning construction!

Should you have any questions regarding this department's review, please feel free to contact our office.

cc: Kentwood Engineering Permit Staff

ALL TRADES SHALL MAINTAIN A CLEAN WORK SITE AT THE END OF EACH WORK DAY.

PLEASE SEE ADDITIONAL NOTES CALLED OUT ON OTHER SHEETS.

OWNER: Daniel Holland	
PROJECT: 32nd ST Townhomes ADDRESS: 2918 32nd ST SE, Ker LEGAL: Parcel 41-18-15-404-009	ntı
FIRE DISTRICT	_
STORM WATER PERMIT: BUILDING PERMIT:	
DESIGNER: Michael LLC (616)427-8943 DESIGN CONSULTANT: Dan Construction, LLC (616) 493-4900	Bro iel
BUILDER: Daniel H LLC (616) 493-4900 SITE DISTURBANCE:	oll

ENGINEERING:

		Revision Table Number Revised By Description		DATE: DRAWN BY: MICHAEL BROWN
			2918 32ND ST	KENTWOOD, MI 49512 32nd St. Townhomes
	R FO	ENDERING RILLUSTRATION ONLY		(616) 493-4900 19509
bood, Michigan 49508	PROJECT SUMMARY SITE & DISTURBANCE PL PLOT PLAN AND SURROU PROPERTIES TOPO, ZONING, SURROU FRONT ELEVATIONS SIDE ELEVATIONS MAIN FLOOR PLAN BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN FOUNDATION PLAN CEILING PLAN 1ST FLOOR FRAMING WALL FRAMING ROOF & FRAMING PLAN 3D SECTIONS & SECTION SECTIONS & DETAILS DOOR & WINDOW SCHED INTERIOR ELEVATIONS INTERIOR PERSPECTIVE ELECTRICAL PLAN PLUMBING & HVAC PLAN BATH SUITE PLAN & ELEV	AN 2 JNDING 3 NDINGS 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15 15 14 10 11 12 13 15 15 16 17 5 18 19 20 (ATIONS 21	Caste Creek	CONSTRUCTION Castle Creek Construction, LLC 3643 Colby Avenue SW Wyoming, MI, 4


 _	
MATER	 CIM



ND SURROUNDING PROPERTIES 1"=20'	Revision Table Number Date Revised By Description	PLAN AND Scale @ 24" X 36" PLAN AND Scale @ 24" X 36" Scale @ 24" X 36" Sheet NUMBER PLAN AND DATE: DATE: DATE:
		2918 32ND ST KENTWOOD, MI 49512 32nd St. Townhomes PRC
		Castle Creek Construction, LLC 3643 Colby Avenue SW Wyoming, MI, 49509











<u>)</u>[

SIDE WALK AND CURB DETAIL

1. TRANSVERSE EXPANSION JOINTS TO BE A MAXIMUM OF 50 FEET. 2. ALL CONCRETE TO BE FINISHED WITH CURING COMPOUND.
 3. A 6 INCH DEPTH IS REQUIRED AT LOCATIONS OF DRIVEWAY CROSSINGS, AT STREET INTERSECTIONS (ALONG THE LENGTH OF RADIUS CURB RETURNS), AND IN THE HANDICAP RAMPS.





	EXTEDIOD NOTES
1	ASPHALT SHINGLES
2	VINYL SIDING
3	EGRESS WINDOW - SEE WINDOW SCHEDULE
4	ALL ROOF PLANES SHALL HAVE GUTTERS
5	STONE VENEER/MANUFACTURED STONE PANELS
6	ALL FORWARD FACING WINDOWS SHALL HAVE DECORATIVE SHUTTERS
1	PORCH ROOF SUPPORTS - BASE COVERED IN STONE TO MATCH WALLS WITH COMPOSITE POST/SLEEVE
٨	DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE
9	SLIDING DOOR - SEE DOOR SCHEDULE
10	DECK FOOTINGS
(11)	PRIVACY DIVIDING WALLS TO BE INSTALLED AFTER DECK SURFACE COMPLETE
(12)	POWER HOOK UP FOR AC CONDENSER UNITS
(13)	ACCESS TO STORAGE ABOVE GARAGE
(14)	2 EXTERIOR LIGHT FOR EACH DECK - SEE LIGHTING SCHEDULE
(15)	GARAGE ACCESS
16	TENANT STORAGE SPACE
17	ELECTRIC METER LOCATION. (5 TOTAL)
18	24" OVERHANG





Updated 7-9-2021



CITY OF KENTWOOD MASTER PLAN NEAR TERM IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE ASSIGNMENTS

Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
Housing - 70-30	04 2020	Confer with CC re new policy/res to count duplexes toward rental side	Completed
D	Q1 2021	Develop new 70/30 resolution to clarify city's position	Upcoming joint meeting
	Q1 2021	Recalculate housing mix and having ongoing method to update	
Economic Development	Ongoing	Continue R & E Program	Ongoing
	Ongoing	Continue to update website with new information/programs	Ongoing
	Q2 2021	Determine how to best utilize the Entrepreneurial Center to promote small	In EDC Strateoic Plan
		DUSINESS	200 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00
	Ongoing	Continue loan programconsider micro grant program	Ongoing
	Q1 2021	Work with high schools/businesses for job opportunities	Ongoing
	Q4 2020-Q1 2021	Develop property information for RRC program.	Meeting 7/2021
	03 2020	Track retail vacancies	
	Q1 2021	Identify commercial areas in declinestrategy to re-occupy vacancies	
	03 2021	Improve ped/transit access to mall/28th street	
	Q4 2021	Contact business regarding the formation of a neighborhood business assns.	Ongoing effort thru KPD Price Program
	Ongoing	KPD	

~

Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
City Sustainability	Q4 2020	Sustainability statement-research what other communities have done	Developing
	Q1 2021	Committee to review and determine benefits-	
	Q1 2021	Committee to propose sustainability policy	
	Q1 2021	List benefits, cost of proposed policy	
	Q1 2022	Replace recycling center that was removed by county	
	Q1 2021	Participate in Michigan Green Communities Challenge	
	Annually to begin in 2021	Set goal for tree planting	
	Ongoing	Set goal for annual maintenance of non-motorized trails	
	Q1 2022	Develop landscaping guidelines for 28th Street that are acceptable to businesses	
	Q4 2021	New buildings built to LEED standards (Policy)	
	Q4 2021	Options for recycling include requirements for waste haulers	
	Q2 2021	Look at low maintenance landscaping for public parks to reduce costs	Developing
	Q1 2021	Encourage community gardens	
Housing Condition	Completed	Review standards for PILOT agreement for maintenance of properties	Completed
	Q1 2021	Review standards for other rental properties-strengthen	
	Q32021	Hire full time rental inspector	Budgeted /157 Unty
	Q1 2022	Host periodic meetings with rental property owners	1912.111
	Q1 2021	Promote property maintenance services for homeowners and rentals	
	Q3 2020	Play role in update of Kent County Area Wide Housing Study	Completed
	Q4 2020	Work w/ mobile home communities to reduce rentals and improve conditions	
Complete Streets	Q2 2021	CC to adopt a Complete Street Policy/Ordinance	
	Q2 2021	List Streets for potential road diet	
	Q2 2021	Prioritize Four Corners recommendations into SCI & non-motorized plan	Partially completed
	Q1 2021	Improve crosswalk demarcation	GR / Krussed Searced Satery Connt To Dastery Ave - 402 to
		IN 2021-2022	i v

Continue to next page

Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
Complete Streets Continued	Q1 2021	Require sidewalk on all streets	Ordinance adopted
		Review ordinance languagereview by Ordinance Committee	Ordinance adopted
PRINCIPLES			
Open Space-Green Infrastructure	Q1 2021	Who is on OS Committeemeeting to establish goals	
		Collect information on maplocation, attributes	
	Q1 2021	Require sidewalks on all streets	Ordinance adopted
	Q1 2021	Amend ordinance to require the need for greenspace to connect to trails, bus routes	
	Q1 2021	Take steps to become a Tree City USA	Tree City Status Approved
Add greenspace reqt- plats, PUD	Q4 2020	Review existing greenspace requirement policy in all districts	
	Q4 2020	Review other communities' greenspace requirement	
	Q1 2021	Develop draft ordinance	
	Q1 2021	Review - developer and ordinance committee	
	Q2 2021	PC/CC review	
Add sidewalk reqt to	Q4 2020	Review proposed language with staff, City Attorney	Completed
plats, rous etc.	Q4 2020	Review w/ development community to understand costs	Completed
Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
Replace trees lost to disease	Q3 2021	Finish tree inventory	

.

M

and the second	102 2021	Grant research and ann - identify matching funds	Summer 2021
	03 2021 03 2021	Junitic cocareti and approximity maximity maximity function approximation of the second s	
	02 2021	Evaluate feasibility of street tree nursery	
	<u>03 2021</u>	Identify locations of street tree placement	
	Q4 2021	Apply for grants; use alternate funding	
Mobility-Major	01 2021	Formalize and adont a Complete Streets policy or ordinance	
Arterials	02 2021	Determine streets eligible for road diets	
	Q4 2020	Adopt Four Corners Transportation Study into Non-Motorized Plan	Completed
Primary Intersections	Q1 2021	Adopt policy for improved crosswalk demarcation	
Non-Motorized	Q4 2020	Adopt Non-Motorized Plan into Master Plan	Completed
	Q4 2020	Research action to become a more bike friendly community	
	Q1 2021	Develop ordinance to require sidewalk on all public streets	Completed
	Q1 2021	Define issue and basis, review w/ developers, PC/CC, adopt	Completed
	Q4 2020	List areas that might be suitable for mid-block crossings	
Transit	Ongoing	Support BRT Transit Study	Completed
	Ongoing	Connect pedestrian, bikes to transit	
Rail, Air, Truck	Ongoing	Incorporate rail & truck projections into GVMC Transportation model	
PLACE STRENGTHENING			
Gateways	Q1 2021	Determine gateway locations and map	Completed
	Q1 2022	Work toward branding and wayfinding concepts	
Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
Sense of Place	Ongoing	Continue to support events such as farmer markets and concerts	Ongoing
	Ongoing	Work with business associations to establish unique identity	

	Completed	Arts Commission to establish projects to provide public art in city	Completed
	Q3 2022	Project to install art on City Campus	
Partnerships	Ongoing through NM Plan	Coordinate connection of bike trails in adjacent communities	Ongoing
	Q1 2022	Investigate establishment of DDA or CIA as needed to provide public improvements	Beginning discussions
	Q1 2021	Establish review process for road projects on state and county corridors	EVAC Re-establish E. Bettlar Kalvi Bd.
Sustainability	01 2022	Appoint committee to address	
		Darticinata in Michigan Green Communities Challenge	Reviewed by staff
	Q3 2021	Plant trees-set a goal per year	
	Ongoing	Set goal for trail development and maintenance per year	
	Q1 2021	Review maintenance policies of city- (environmental issuesefficiency)	
	Q1 2023	Build new buildings to LEED standards	
	Q1 2023	Promote recycling-replace closed county recycling operation	-
	Q1 2022	Promote community gardenslocate one new community garden in city	
	(*************************************		
Commercial Dev./ Redevelopment		Determine whether shopping centers areas have too much retail use	hic the
		Use EDC members as ambassadors for the commercial areas to air any	Ongoing 10 December 1
	Ongoing	issues they have with the city	Com Com
	Ongoing	Identify assistance program for commercial businesses	Ongoing
	Q4 2021	Determine interest in business associations for commercial districts	
	Q1 2021	Work w/ MDOT to look for ways to make crossing of 28th St safer	
	Q1 2023	Consider banners, lighting & other public improvements for 28th St. corridor	
	Q1 2022	EDC to meet with commercial businesses along 28th St corridor	
Assionment	Target Date	Task	Status
SUBAREAS			

Y.

Division Ave. Sub			Completed
Area	Q4 2020	ID potential Operi Space of Division Averue	Completed
•	Q4 2020	Find ways to reduce speed on Divisionbuild a petter block example	completed
	Q2 2021	Apply for landscaping grants for corridor	
	Q2 2021	Improve crosswalk demarcationuse as experiment for city	
	Q2 2022	One new outdoor event/community garden	Better Block event
	01 2024	Establish gateway near Kville schools	
	Q4 2020	Host informational meetings for developers, realtors	Completed w/ Division United
	Ongoing	Loan programs targeted to area	
	Q2 2022	LED lighting	
	Q4 2020	Reduce FBC in areas where too much depth exists to reasonably develop	Completed
	Ongoing	Improve interest in business assn on Division	
	Q2 2021	Promote area through the RRC program	Certified RRC
	Q4 2020	Map sites with Phase 1 info from EPA grant	
		Work is Wyomany and DBA to estatish Awardent	۵۰۰
Kalamazoo Corridor	Q4 2020	Contact owners at developing corners at 52nd/60th re: green space/plaza requirement	Completed
	Q2 2020	Contact owners re: driveway restrictions	
In conjunction w/ roa	d improvements	Improve sidewalk demarcation at intersections	
	Q2 2021	Investigate interest in business assn with Gaines	Initial contact made to Gaines
	Q4 2020	Provide information on housing improvement programs	Ongoing
	Q2 2021	Host meeting of property owners at NE corner of 60th/Kzoo to discuss lack of development	List of developers identified
	_		
Assignment	Target Date	Task	Status
Section 34		Collect wetland data as becomes available	
	Ongoing	Talk to Heyboer family about retention of farm as a historic resource	Completed

Division Ave. Sub			
Area	Q4 2020	ID potential Open Space on Division Avenue	Completed
	Q4 2020	Find ways to reduce speed on Divisionbuild a better block example	Completed
	Q2 2021	Apply for landscaping grants for corridor	
	Q2 2021	Improve crosswalk demarcationuse as experiment for city	a and a surrow of the Architecture of the Arch
	Q2 2022	One new outdoor event/community garden	Better Block event
	01 2024	Establish gateway near Kville schools	
	Q4 2020	Host informational meetings for developers, realtors	Completed w/ Division United
	Ongoing	Loan programs targeted to area	
	Q2 2022	LED lighting	
	Q4 2020	Reduce FBC in areas where too much depth exists to reasonably develop	Completed
	Ongoing	Improve interest in business assn on Division	
	Q2 2021	Promote area through the RRC program	Certified RRC
	Q4 2020	Map sites with Phase 1 info from EPA grant	
	03 2021	IN trafe Make May tonendonent the condecation of	
Kalamazoo Corridor	Q4 2020	Contact owners at developing corners at 52nd/60th re: green space/plaza requirement	Completed
	Q2 2020	Contact owners re: driveway restrictions	
In conjunction w/ roa	d improvements	Improve sidewalk demarcation at intersections	
3	Q2 2021	Investigate interest in business assn with Gaines	Initial contact made to Gaines
	Q4 2020	Provide information on housing improvement programs	Ongoing
	Q2 2021	Host meeting of property owners at NE corner of 60th/Kzoo to discuss lack of development	List of developers identified
	_	_	

Completed Status Target DateTaskCollect wetland data as becomes availableOngoingTalk to Heyboer family about retention of farm as a historic resource Assignment Section 34

6

	و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و و	With future	development										Completed					Contact made		List identified,	prioritization ongoing				As per master	plan guidelines	Status
Di	Discuss potential development of new park in center of section		Breton extended listed as a complete street			Register expansion of Rolite 2 to Breton extended	Neducal cypanaton of Nouce 2 to at cross contract	Explore possibility of a community garden in Section 34		Collect data on wetlands and floodplain as it becomes available	Obtain rights to use Saddleback sewer easement for trail	Begin discussions with Consumer's Energy re Trail within row	Make direct contact with Pattersons.	Obtain easement for gateway feature at 28th, 36th and Patterson	Meet w/ MDOT, Cascade, KCRC to discuss ways to make Patterson/28 intersection safer	Amend MPUD, IPUD regulations to potentially accommodate uses within	the section	Meet w/ owners of Muller PUD to discuss realistic potential use of property	Develop stated policy re 28th/29th St street trees w/ input from city and MDOT		Prioritize missing sidewalk segments on 29th Street	Look for potential opportunities for public amenities in 28th Street area	Discuss w/ MDOT possibility of refuge islands on 28th Street in high traffic areas	Amend Zoning Ord to require cross access between adjacent uses	Incorporate connectors from 28th St sidewalk to businesses in non-	motorized plan	
	Q4 2021	As	development	occurs	Q4 2020	As dev. occurs	in area	ecides direction		As dev. occurs	As dev. occurs	As dev. occurs	Completed	As dev. occurs	Q1 2022	dments-02 2021		Q1 2021	Q1 2022		Q4 2021		Q2 2021	dments. 02 2021		With dev.	Tarrat Data
								As Heyboer family d	Patterson Farm							With ZO Ameno			28th/29th Street Corridor					W Z.O. Amen			Arctionmont

28th/29th Street Corridor continued	Q2 2021	Review ordinance relating to access control (incl. MDOT KCRC)	
		1.d. studies re: driveways and crashes and traffic flow efficiency	
		Get model cross access easement document from City Atty	Ve degebenn zur nannannen findet
		Planning/Engineering/city atty to review and evaluate the current access	
		control ordinance and rec. changes	
	Q4 2021	Work w/ MDOT to adopt a complete streets policy for 28th Street	
	Q1 2021	Review transit stops in light of pedestrian movement in the area	Salde service in the service of the
Campus	Q4 2021	Schedule meeting w/ County and USEPA to discuss options for use of landfill	
	Q4 2021	Provide wayfinding signage to the City Campus	
		Investigate possibility of using former landfill for renewable energy	
	Q4 2021	production	
Eastern and 52nd	Ongoing	Stay in touch with relators re area	Ongoing
	Q4 2020	Provide information on incentives	
		Support existing businesses already there, meeting/email w/ property	In EDC
	Q4 2020	owners	Strategic Plan
	Q1 2021	Continue/restart business association	
	Q1 2021	Periodic clean-up and events	
	Q1 2021	Gauge interest in other events	

Ő