

CITY OF HOLLAND
SUMMARY OF DECISIONS OF PLANNING COMMISSION
February 12, 2019

Members Present: Martin, Van Antwerp, Anderson, De Block, Lozano, Raymond, Kenyon, and Corbin

Members Absent: De Boer

Staff Present: Elswick, Chapman, Vanderploeg

4:00 pm Study Session

I. 24th & Waverly Ave Mixed Use Residential Concept Plan

Ryan Kilpatrick, Executive Director of Ottawa Housing Next explained that he intends to develop a variety of housing types that contains different levels of affordability across the market. His plan is to get feedback from the Planning Commission and eventually get a developer to build it then come back with a site plan approval. He intends the development acts as a catalyst for the neighborhood by including several intentional amenities. Walkability is important to give the residents the opportunity that doesn't require two vehicles. Diversity provides different housing types with a variety of price points. There is a strong sense of community with 1/3 being market rate units, and by highlighting the agricultural heritage by considering the suburban/ urban development to agricultural development transition in the area. An agricultural buffer will be located around the property with an agricultural manager on site. Ecological balance will be incorporated by managing stormwater on site and building photovoltaics on the rooftops.

The site will consist of three seamless housing elements – multifamily, townhomes, and single family detached at 80% AMI. A mixed use, 3 or 4 story building will be near the corner of Waverly and 24th with small retail that could be supported by the neighborhood. Live work space will be in the buildings facing the south.

De Block asked about the parking on the street and if the roads will be public or private? Kilpatrick responded that the preference is to make the roads public. Van Antwerp asked what is the density needed to support public transit in the area and questioned the walkability of the surrounding area? Kilpatrick stated that conversations with max transit is that Waverly could be commuter route and there would likely need to be 10 units per acre to make transit viable and that the sidewalks are there but the pedestrian experience is not. The pedestrian connections to the north would be the best option long term. Raymond asked if

there is a minimum square footage requirement? Kilpatrick stated that some units will be 400 sq. ft. but the city doesn't have requirement for a minimum. Martin stated that he liked the product type and asked if this will be a single build out or phased construction? Kilpatrick stated that he has talked to developers and will likely be built in phases but it depends on existing infrastructure and it will likely be constructed in a 2 to 4 year development cycle. Van Antwerp explained that he likes the plan generally and the appreciated the agriculture buffers. Raymond said that it seems like an efficient use of space. Lozano asked how we ensure that the affordability and units get built? Kilpatrick replied that the incentives need to be there in order to make the financials work.

II. Agenda Review

Elswick outlined the site plan for 393 Cleveland Ave for a 6000 sq. ft. banquet venue building with parking in the back parcel. Staff recommends approval. The applicant is requesting a waiver for off street parking that needs to be 10 ft. when adjacent to residential. The applicant is proposing 3 feet and there is an existing fence located on the neighboring property. Staff recommends approval with the condition that if the fence is ever removed then the applicant is responsible to construct a fence on their own property. Van Antwerp stated that he would have liked to have seen how close the neighboring house is to the property on the site plan.

An election will be needed for chair and vice chair of the Planning Commission.

III. 254 S River Ave Multifamily Residential Plan

Elswick explained that the applicant came to study session back in November and since that time have made improvements. The site plan meets many of the provisions that are described in the staff report but there are elements that the building doesn't meet as proposed. The consultant would like to request a table for the March meeting. Elswick pointed out positive design elements and then reviewed the five waiver requests that do not meet the ordinance and four optional plan reviews.

Martin asked how did we get here and at what point do we require another public outreach? Nathan Funk, Project Manager, stated several changes were made from the previous plan. Har Ye Khan, consultant, added this is still a work in progress and want to hear from you. Martin asked when does the side yard become a linear park? Nick Rolinski, consultant, stated that the side yard picks up the theme of the alley. Corbin asked why do you need all the setbacks? Khan went over the proposed setbacks and states that the pavilion in the northeast corner may not be

the best option. Raymond explained that it feels like the public amenity does not feel public with the private courtyard.

5:00 pm Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order

Martin called the regular meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion by De Block with support from Kenyon to approve the January 8, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.

Motion approved 8 – 0.

III. Election of Chair & Vice Chair

Martin asked for nominations for Vice Chair

Nomination of Van Antwerp by Raymond with support from De Block.

Motion passes 7 – 0.

Requested nominations for Chair

Nomination of Martin by Van Antwerp with support from De Block.

Motion passes 7-0.

IV. Communications from Audience – None

V. New Business

A. 393 Cleveland Avenue – Banquet Venue

Elswick outlined the details of the site plan approval request: 6,000 square foot, two story banquet venue building in the C-1 zone district. Parking lot to south is to be used as is for parking. Agreement with West Michigan Uniform for additional parking. Meet the parking requirement needs. Lighting complies. Landscaping complies. Working with Brian White on the stormwater permit, an in-depth storm water analysis was not yet conducted. Considering rain gardens throughout the site. Green roof amenities proposed. Completed the Sustainability Frameworks checklist and met many of those principles. One element not met is in section 39-54.1, must be 10 feet from the property line, they are proposing a 3-foot distance. Provision for

waiver is to provide fencing. Planning Commission required fence be erected on property.

Patricia Oosse from Innovative Design, 393 Cleveland shared that they plan to demo existing building to create a buffer area from other properties. The building will have 200 seats downstairs, catering kitchen, restrooms, bar and seasonal rooftop seating area.

Van Antwerp asked about the residential property view, as he has concerns surrounding the view. What types of events are planning to be held here?

Oosse stated weddings, parties, banquets.

Van Antwerp asked about noise level expectations.

All activities will be taking place on the northwest side. Anticipating noise will not be a problem for the property. Believe there is enough separation from the residential area.

Van Antwerp asked about lighting in the parking lot and the impact that additional light could have on the residential properties. Oosee planning to keep the lighting at a minimum. Proposing bollard lighting.

Van Antwerp asked about dumpster placement. Oosee shared it is next to the residential backyard, but that it will be enclosed.

Martin asked for clarification on stormwater plan.

Elswick shared this is being worked on with the applicant and White. New ordinance takes out the need for the Planning Commission's final review of this. Would need stormwater permit prior to receiving building permit.

Van Antwerp directed question to the staff, what would happen if waiver denied?

Elswick shared that parking lot would be smaller and this would cut back the number of parking spots. The number of spots is not critical, but preferred.

Anderson asked about type of material for the fencing. Martin shared it would be opaque for screening. Elswick stated the fence would correlate with current fence standards.

Chairperson Martin opened the public hearing. There being no comments, Chairperson Martin closed the public hearing.

Van Antwerp stated that he is still concerned about the residential effect. Not in support of the waiver to lessen the effect on the residential area.

Martin asked for clarification on dumpster placement if waiver denied. Elswick stated this is not contingent on the waiver.

Martin stated that then, if the waiver were denied it would remove three less parking spaces, correct? Elswick stated this is correct, 3-4 parking spaces.

Anderson shared concerns with the fencing.

Martin asked for clarification on the waiver.

Elswick stated the waiver is for a 3 foot setback from parking lot to property line vs. the required 10 foot setback. Staff recommended a condition for property owner to erect a fence if the residential fence comes down, however, Planning Commission may require a fence be erected now by applicant if desires.

Motion by Anderson to approve the waiver, with the condition change that along with the construction of the building a fence would also be built by the applicant, and approval of the site plan with Support from Van Antwerp.

Motion passes 8 – 0.

B. 254 S River Ave – 9 Unit Multifamily Residential

Martin requested if applicant would like to still table site plan review as requested or to have Planning Commissioners vote to provide direction to applicant going forward.

Rolinski stated we would like to stick with the tabling.

Martin: is the Planning Commission in agreement to table this? In agreement.

Elswick outlined the details of the site plan approval request: 9-unit apartment, 3 story building on the corner of River and 11th. Requesting 5 several waivers and 4 optional plan reviews.

Rolinski explained we would like to address one of the questions in the Study Session regarding the waivers, and the rationale behind those. Residential use in this context. Waivers look for pedestrian oriented amenities. Shared that the setback on the southside is a benefit to the residents, site line, and even pedestrians. Setback on the northside is for light to the court and units facing north. Both setbacks offer a buffer space between private and public space.

Khan stated section 39-128(f) speaks to a zone that is north of 6th street and east of Central that is similarly located on the edge of downtown like 254 S River. Allowance of 12-foot set back from the street. Providing gardens and public

amenities that would creative privacy buffer for street level residents. Looking and seeking the Planning Commissions judgment and flexibility in considering these conditions.

Elswick asked they want to walk away this evening knowing if the Planning Commission will approve the waivers and OPRs or not, as proposed, you may choose to have them vote, which would help you to amend and resubmit.

Martin stated another option is to not table and the applicant withdraws the application and schedules time for a Study Session for feedback. Then could make changes and file new application.

Elswick stated could do March 12 Study Session.

Rolinski explained they are unable to make a call on withdraw without speaking with property owners.

Elswick stated they could table to the April meeting.

Kenyon stated he would value more time. Van Antwerp in agreement. Martin discussed tabling to April meeting.

Rolinski asked to table to March meeting.

Anderson stated could table to March meeting and re-table to April meeting if needed.

Rolinski explained they would like to table to March meeting, and will possibly withdraw application tomorrow.

Martin directed that they come back for March 12 Study Session. Table review to March 12 meeting with public hearing open until that time.

Chairperson Martin opened the public hearing.

Bob Schulze 49 E. 8th Street, on the Board at the Park Theatre. Has been in conversation with the developer. Just put in a fire suppression system. Their next focus is on the south and west wall. Would like to be engaged in the conversation.

Martin stated they will have the opportunity to do so and Schulze should stay in touch with City Staff on the third floor and the developers as he will not receive another notice of the application.

Seeing no other comments, Martin asked for a motion to table with the public hearing open until the March 12 meeting.

Anderson motioned to table the application to the March 12 meeting with the public hearing left open with support from Raymond.

Motion passes 8-0.

VI. Communications and Petitions

A. Scheduling of Public Hearings

None

B. Communications from Commission members

Martin thanked the Planning Commission for reelecting him as Chair.

C. Communications from Staff

Elswick welcomed Lozano and Anderson to the Planning Commission.

VII. Adjournment

Upon a motion by De Block with support from Anderson the meeting was adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Recorded by: Jenna Elswick, Senior Planner, Keith Chapman, Planner, and Mallory Huizenga Department Assistant