

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

Members Present: Marvin Martin, Fred Van Antwerp, Scott Corbin, Dave De Block, Mayor Nancy De Boer, Andy Kenyon, Luis Lozano, and Lyn Raymond.

Members Absent: Brooke Anderson

Staff Present: Jenna Elswick, Keith Chapman, Mark Vanderploeg, and Mallory Huizenga

4:00 p.m. Study Session

I. Agenda Review

Elswick addressed 121 E 8th Street. The elevation drawing submitted with the application shows the bathroom doors facing 8th Street. After presenting to the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) for their review, they are recommending, and City Staff is as well, that the doors move to the sides of the building. Still waiting on renderings from the applicant, but new elevation drawings with the changed floor plan will be submitted. With this change, there is still a visual site path from splashpad, and applicant is okay with the changes.

Kenyon noted the parks have been utilizing jug fillers with the drinking foundations. He will provide the recommendation to the applicant during the regular meeting.

II. 254 S River Ave Multifamily Residential Plan

Elswick began by stating that the applicant is back to share their design refinements, as well as receive feedback from the Planning Commission on the changes made.

Har Ye Khan, consultant, began by summarizing the intent of project. First, she noted the location is on the edge of the C-3 zone district, and because of its location and intersection, they have put careful thought into the zoning. The property is 0.6 acres and 26,004 square feet in size. Khan stated there is a lot of public activity at this location, and shared that they have taken into consideration the principles as well context of place, to ensure this transition from public to private and back is seamless. Khan shared they have also taken into consideration the historic buildings that surround the area, as well as attempted to build on the character of the park. She highlighted three points: 1) mixed income multi-housing 2) creating a publicly accessible park or through block connector 3) complementing the civic character of Centennial Park.

Nick Rolinski, consultant, presented the revised site plan. He began with the changes to the southside first. The setback from 11th Street is beyond ordinance, which is why they applied for the setback wavier. This corner spot will be a commemorative corner and will include a seat wall, (“urban” furniture) for public use. There will be a pedestrian passthrough behind the seat wall and concrete pavers with bike racks. These items provide a way for the public to interact with the space. Rolinski also noted this setback is to provide site lines to the civic

environment. Last, he noted, this setback provides a clearer view for traffic turning off 11th and onto River, which was a concern raised by residents living and interacting with 11th on a regular basis.

Next Rolinski explained the softening and calming measures made to the building. There are still architectural elements, but they pulled back on many of these in this revision. The changes include a more approachable masonry construction, domestic programming to civic architecture. Rolinski showed a comparison of the current site plan to the previous plan presented. The façade has also been simplified as to not overwhelm City Hall.

Rolinski moved to the revised northeast wing next, which is an area in which they are hoping to discuss more fully during the session today. This area has been designed as a linear park, that is a public space. The building on this side is pulled back slightly from the main building – serves as a wing, mirroring the other side.

De Block asked is the park space goes behind the building. Rolinski shared it is linear on the design plan, but it is adaptable.

Raymond asked about the wall height, 6 ft, correct? Applicants confirmed it is 6 ft, with the courtside height being 3-4 ft.

Van Antwerp asked about the amenities being provided in the space. Martin asked for questions to be held until the end and redirected the conversation, so that the applicants could continue their presentation.

Rolinski explained the cement block connectors of the wall; as a pierced design, in a serpentine shape.

Rolinski stated the courtyard has been designed to help manage the transition from public to semi-public, to semi-private, to private. Due to the neighboring properties and public activity in the area, the courtyard is also intended to be a noise buffer, as well as a transitional element. The egress provides a notion of safety.

Van Antwerp asked about the egress routes if boxed in (say a neighboring property built a wall). He also noted the difference between a linear park and a through park, with the through park having a way out on the other end. He then asked Mark his thoughts on the park space, specifically the public/private feel of it.

Vanderploeg shared that it reflects a “third space” in a way, a blend of private/public. He noted, if concerned about linear vs. through, could add the condition to include an egress, if looking for that.

De Boer noted that the applicant has done a nice job of listening to the feedback provided and reworking the original model. She feels it is a beautiful addition. The transition with the linear park offers a nice green space. She likes that the corner has been reworked for visibility for 11th Street, so that drivers and pedestrians and see around that corner well, as well as the addition of the bike racks and a seating area.

The applicants are looking for clarification on where the wing setback will be measured from on the building. Elswick noted that from either, column or building façade, it exceeds the 6 ft. Rolinski pointed out that, with residential, the hope is for as much space as possible. Elswick noted that typically setbacks are measured from the furthest point, which would be the façade in this situation.

Martin inquired what will be commemorated on the south corner? Rolinski noted it would be a historic marker, or something that fits with the other commemorative items throughout Holland.

Martin brought up special pedestrian-oriented feature, one of the criteria items used in evaluating a setback waiver. Are these features falling into that category? Van Antwerp mentioned it is difficult to be precise, it depends on the space and location being evaluated. There is no real technical definition for a special pedestrian-oriented feature. However, there was agreement from the Commissioners that this corner setback meets the criteria item of a special pedestrian-oriented feature.

Raymond shared that she likes the revised design of the corner better. Martin inquired on whether it warrants that type of setback. Raymond feels it does justify that setback.

The group moved onto to the second wavier, the 27 foot setback off 11th St where the terrace and oval concrete pavers are proposed. Martin asked what it would be like without the terrace. Nathan Funk, Project Manager, noted it would be the same setback. Khan shared the terrace is a type of buffer, and needed for greater privacy. Van Antwerp did mention looking into benches vs. bike racks for the area setback from 11th St in front of the terrace. Corbin shared he likes the idea of more seating vs. bike racks.

Elswick explained the north side setback waiver request, reviewing the staff report description. The linear park is proposed to contain a: 6' wide snow-melted sidewalk; 9' wide landscape and tree bed with lighting and benches; 6' high serpentine, pierced brick wall with 1' to 4' wide landscape at its base and a locked gate to access the private courtyard. The private courtyard is proposed to be raised to the level of the first floor; contain two private apartment doors into the courtyard; be accessible from a private stairway for the other main building residents; be separated from the linear park by the serpentine pierced brick wall.

The ordinance doesn't provide clarity on the percentage of the setback. The applicants asked Planning Commission if they would define the percentage that would be allowed. Martin stated that if they say 50% (as an example), does that apply everywhere else? Elswick clarified that it would not be a zoning amendment, but on a case-by-case basis.

Elswick noted an option of keeping the private space and not having a public space. Khan shared their reasoning to not pull to the property line, both for noise level and for breathing space for the Park Theater.

Martin inquired if the Planning Commission would be comfortable pausing the Study Session and resuming after the regular meeting.

All in agreement.

Study Session came to a pause at 4:55 p.m.

Study Session resumed after the regular meeting at 5:24 p.m.

The group picked back up on their review of the north setback request. Raymond asked about the intent of C-3, as she is unsure if this truly matches a C-3. This isn't a modest change; rather, a big change. De Block noted, it is still a C-3.

Martin observed, with other linear through parks in Holland, they are more often a public to public through way, not public to private to public and back. This linear park is different in that regard. Also, there is a two square block park across the street, what makes this park stand out? He asked if others have additional thoughts to share.

Van Antwerp feels the linear park is a benefit. It is a good cut through, if it goes through. He feels it would be used for the wrong reasons if it dead ends. Need to be mindful and careful.

Elswick stated there could be a condition of approval, that there is a pass through to the Geenen & Kolean parking lot. Vanderploeg stated it could happen by the time of the Certificate of Occupancy is issued. Martin stated they would prefer this is obtained prior to the building permit. Vanderploeg pointed out, worst case scenario, they rearrange the parking lot to ensure there is a pass through.

Several Commissioners stated it would need to be worked out by the time of a building permit issuance, not a Certificate of Occupancy because the building would already be built.

Martin noted, they are asking for a path to someone else's parking lot, which would require a discussion with those property owners. The applicant would need to talk with Geenen & Kolean and/or Hope Church. Rolinski noted there are many through spaces in Holland. Khan adding on that some of those are public to private to public passes. Martin reiterated it is on the property owners to be involved and their desire to participate in this, and that their permission is given prior to obtaining the building permit. Rolinski shared they would prefer CoO over building permit, if willing.

Khan inquired about timeline, if by building permit. Martin stated it would be dependent on when they apply for the building permit. Elswick stated they have 18 months until a site plan approval expires and can request an extension if needed.

Van Antwerp asked Vanderploeg his thoughts. Vanderploeg noted timing for both is reasonable, and both types of park are reasonable. Knowing before the building permit is issued would be helpful, but we don't know when they plan to pull the permit.

Martin shared that dead end parks aren't common. Rolinski stated that a cut through is desired by everyone. Khan followed in agreement, the intention is a cut through.

Van Antwerp sees it as a benefit, a plus to downtown. De Boer noted the breathable space it offers. Martin inquired if it meets Raymond's needs. Raymond noted not entirely, the private feel of the space doesn't fit in to what is happening around C-3, the building doesn't quite fit. Khan shared the open space allows for light, air, safety, and natural light in the winter months. Martin inquired if this is the only way to bring light in.

Rolinski shared the courtyard space responds to the neighboring Park Theater. It is a transition from residential to public to the theater. This design wasn't an accident, and allows the theater breathing space.

Rolinski noted the harmonious design with the area. Raymond pointed out the square massing, some same features, but overall still different. De Boer inquired whether Planning Commission can critique the design of the buildings. Vanderploeg clarified their role is more in the massing than in the architecture. Rolinski shared their goal isn't for this to be a showcase, but their goal is for it to be composed and fit in with the surrounding area. Raymond is appreciative of the calming affects that are in the new design.

Elswick inquired if there is any remaining feedback on the northside setback. The Commissioners are okay with it, but an arrangement needs to be made with surrounding property owners regarding the pass through prior to the building permit.

Last item to address during today's study session, the OPRs. Corbin asked to walk through through the criteria items for each.

Elswick read through OPR #1 regarding window coverage on "A" streets and each criteria item (a-j), no questions from the Commissioners. Martin asked the applicant to speak to item j. Rolinski responded that due to the residential programming and need for privacy they have requested this OPR. Martin noted the first floor in C-3 buildings is generally not a residential space. Rolinski noted that 11th Street is the border of C-3, right on the fringe, in the grey area; they are responding to this transition line, and the zoning that is across the street.

Elswick read through OPR #2 regarding window coverage on "B" streets. No questions from Commissioners.

Elswick read through OPR #3 regarding building entrances. C-3 is commercial, hence the doorway requirement. Van Antwerp stated, since this is residential, the exception makes

sense and he doesn't feel it is a pressing matter. Lozano inquired, does the building make sense for the zone it is in? Martin mentioned UDO, form-based code that is in the works. Van Antwerp noted holding this standard of doorways with retails, but since residential a lesser need to do so. Martin inquired if this is the only design opportunity. Rolinski pointed out this is in keeping with apartment typology – and a center entrance is more welcoming.

Van Antwerp inquired if staff was planning to go through the site plan considerations. Elswick noted this was a study session for the waivers and OPRs, but commissioners can certainly ask additional site plan questions.

Van Antwerp asked about mitigating traffic noise and dust. Funk shared the analysis they received from HUD; they are 10% exceeding. Traffic count was at 20,000 cars. Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) calculations were 28.54%. HUD percentage is 25.9%. Elswick recommended they include those report findings in their application.

Van Antwerp asked about amenities in the linear park. Khan noted benches. Van Antwerp asked them to consider ways to use that space more.

Raymond asked if 70 ft is necessary for from River Ave. Rolinski shared that site line kicks in at 20 ft, and that is intended to mirror the site elevation of City Hall. Khan noted the optimal depth for residential is 39 ft.

Martin inquired, did the applicant receive what they needed during today's session? They stated their case, which was important for the Commissioners to hear. Khan thanked the Commissioners for their patience and is greatly appreciative of their time.

Any final comments? De Boer thanked the applicants for their investment in the community. Corbin thanked fellow Commissioners for their time.

Study Session ended at 6:25 p.m.

5:00 p.m. Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Martin called the regular meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Corbin with support from Raymond to approve the February 12, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.

Motion passes 8 – 0.

III. Communications from Audience – None

IV. Old Business

a. 254 S River Ave – 9 Unit Multifamily Residential (tabled February 12, 2019)

Raymond motioned to remove the agenda item of 254 S River Ave from the table with support from Kenyon.

All in favor.

Motion passes 8-0.

Applicant has requested to move review to the next meeting.

Raymond motioned to table 254 S River to the next regular Planning Commission meeting with support from Kenyon.

All the favor.

Motion passes 8-0.

V. New Business

a. 121 E 8th Street – Splashpad Restroom

Elswick explained the applicant is requesting to build a two-stall, unisex restroom by the splashpad. The original elevations that were received are being redone following the Downtown Development Authority's (DDA) recommendation to move the doors from the front of the building (facing 8th Street) to the sides of the building, with the drinking foundation on the west side wall. Recommending a condition of approval to obtain these elevations to make sure everything is aligned.

Tom Welding, applicant, with Suburban Inns shared they made a run at this while under construction, but due to neighbor concerns, it was tabled. Now, everyone is back in. As shared earlier in the meeting, the DDA made their recommendation and the architect is working on redrawing and the floor plan will be revised as recommended by the DDA.

Van Antwerp asked about the design and capacity. It is a welcomed feature, but small compared to other public restrooms, which are a three-stall. Concerns with queuing during busy months. Any reasoning why limited?

Welding shared this was designed with the city – already footing and foundation in the ground, currently covered up, but still there. Welding was deeply involved in the design, so unsure about how capacity was determined. Splashpad is small, a compromise between the size and providing the space for restrooms.

Van Antwerp asked if he feels changing the doorways will affect the queuing?

Welding thinks not really.

Van Antwerp asked is this is response to providing relief from hotel bathroom usage.

Welding shared the public does use both the restaurant table space and the hotel at times. Not a lot of traffic, but some wet bathing suits from time to time. There may be some queuing, but feels it is a win-win for the public and hotel.

Lozano asked if changing area in the stall? For entire family?

Welding noted floor plan – changing table in each stall.

Elswick clarified, asking about adult or bigger kid changing space. Any benches?

Welding, not at this time. Tricky with ADA requirements, would need to fold up or down.

Kenyon shared maybe a fold up on north end.

Raymond asked about the west side door to the hotel. Will the building interfere?

Welding shared that from that door, approx. 4ft sidewalk, landscape, and then at least 6-7ft from the splashpad.

Kenyon mentioned utilizing jug filled with the drinking foundation.

Welding okay with that – hasn't been picked out yet and will reach out for recommendations.

De Boer thanked the applicant for their partnership and helping that side of downtown. Grateful for the installation.

Martin asked Elswick to address OPRs.

Elswick clarified there are 3 setback waivers and 2 OPRs requested, and explained each:

- The first setback is: Front Yard 8th St – proposing 103' setback instead of required 6' maximum setback
- The second setback is: Side Yard West – proposing 43' setback instead of required 0' setback
- The third setback is: Side Yard East– proposing 15.3' setback instead of required 0' setback
- OPR #1: Relief is requested from the requirement for 60% window area on the street facades measured from 18" to 10 ft above sidewalk where 5% is proposed facing the 8th St "A" street.
- OPR #2: Relief is requested from the requirement for 25% window area measured from 18" to 10 ft above sidewalk when facing an open space or parking where 5% is proposed facing the splash pad.

Martin feels these are rational requests. Asked if any comments. Asked Kenyon if splashpad water is recycled and refreshed.

Kenyon noted yes, it is recycled.

Martin noted, good to have the bathroom then.

De Boer noted, health, safety, and welfare.

Martin asked for clarification on motion: site plan with waiver and OPRs separate?

Elswick confirmed, motion for site plan with waivers and added conditions of approval, and then each OPR will need to be separate.

De Boer motioned to approve the site plan, with waivers from 121 E 8th Street with support from De Block.

Martin clarified they are amending to add on conditions to add benches and jug filler, with those two items needing staff approval. And add on the condition of receiving the new elevations.

De Boer motioned the approval of the site plan, with waivers, to include the following conditions, with staff approval: to add the fold-up benches to each stall, the use of jug filler water fountain, and the receipt of the new elevations with the doorway reorientation as recommended by the DDA with support from De Block.

Motion passes 8-0.

Van Antwerp motioned to approve OPR #1 for 121 E 8th Street with support from Raymond.

Motion passes 8-0.

Van Antwerp motioned to approve OPR #2 for 121 E 8th Street with support from Raymond.

Motion passes 8-0.

VI. Communications and Petitions

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings – None
- b. Communications from Commission members – None
- c. Communications from Staff – None

VII. Adjournment

Upon a motion by De Block with support from De Boer the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m. to return to Study Session.

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