

CITY OF HOLLAND
SUMMARY OF DECISIONS OF PLANNING COMMISSION
April 9, 2019

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

Members Absent: None

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

4:00 p.m. Study Session

Study Session began at 4:00 p.m.

I. Holland Hospital Parking Lot Expansion, Rezoning, 25th St Vacate

Jenna Elswick shared the details of this proposed project: Holland Hospital plans to submit a site plan, rezoning request, and a street vacate request to Planning Commission for its May 14 meeting. They are proposing a new 89 space parking lot with a perimeter 4' to 6' high white vinyl fence and landscaping, new light fixtures to match the existing mounted on existing poles, a 5' wide concrete sidewalk and bollard lighting. Applicant is working with Brian White and Assessor's office to determine a vacate value.

Josh Bauman, Director of Facilities at Holland Hospital and Jason Vander Kodde, Project Engineer at FTC&H were present to speak about the proposed plan that they are hoping to apply and present at the May meeting.

Mayor De Boer asked if these additional parking spaces will be on the ground. Bauman noted they will be.

Bauman shared why they are looking to expand parking. Currently Holland Hospital has a 50/50 relationship with the Aquatic Center to utilize 100 parking spaces and a shared maintenance building. Last October it was decided the lease agreement would expire. The additional parking is slotted to be created by October 2020 and the building by October of this year.

There are three houses that would need to be demolished to create the new lot. 1 house = 30 spaces. The hospital owns these homes, the lease on 198 W 25th street ended in January. The other two tenants (194 and 210 W 25th St) will be served notices in the coming months.

Brooke Anderson asked how many homes the hospital owns. Bauman noted 18 around the campus.

Fred Van Antwerp asked if a formal parking study was conducted. Bauman noted there was. The blue lots on the map show those over threshold. Currently they have 590 spaces

for employees. Van Antwerp asked if the study was conducted for both visitor and employee lots. Bauman: yes.

Van Antwerp asked about parking on the street. Anderson followed, asking if they receive complaints regarding that. Bauman stated no, very rarely do they. They are proactive in making sure lot spaces are available; however, some do park along 25th Street.

Andy Kenyon asked if they have discussed building up on top of or in addition to the existing parking garage. Bauman noted they have. Two factors led them to decide to not go up: cost and aesthetic. The cost to build up is \$30,000 per space with a cost of \$5,000 per space to build flat. Lot C was designed, with a long-term plan to allow the ability to build up.

Marvin Martin asked about zoning – and any changes with the Unified Development Ordinance. Zoned to PUD, remaining single family lots rezoned to PUD if they agree to do so.

The hospital reached out to two homeowners regarding selling. They declined to sell but were appreciative.

Vander Kodde noted they will maintain the utilities underneath, storm water – will go above and beyond.

Bauman expressed that there will also be a walking path, stairway into the building, and a green space. Hoping to support walkers.

Intersection change to private road, a simple change. Anderson asked if same curve cut. Bauman noted it will be the same as 25th Street.

Fence for neighbor, 6' white vinyl.

Martin asked about the possession of hydrant line. Easement? Vander Kodde noted they would replace the line as part of the project. Possession will be dependent on what they decide with Brian White.

Scott Corbin still unsure why they aren't going up, if Lot C has that ability. Vander Kodde noted that with either going up, or flat, they lose three houses. Going up would actual make the lot farther from hospital and come at a higher cost. They would have to review the following to build up: economics, timing, location.

In 5-10 years we will further look at this option, Bauman replied. Right now, e are simply replacing existing with existing, they need capacity to move those 100 spaces to the hospital's lot from where they were using the Aquatic Center's parking lot. This isn't truly an expansion, or an expansion based on need for more room.

Anderson asked if Lot 3 could get a deck. Bauman noted it would need a new ramp, assessment, and require quite a bit of work. Lot C currently not the right shape for up.

Elswick noted they will be able to reassess this in later and when more parking is needed, have them start building up. Lot C is prepped for the long term.

De Boer expressed the benefit for the community that this project offers.

Anderson is concerned about more pavement space, wants to make sure the neighborhood is preserved.

Bauman noted Lot 3 is below grade, and that Lot 3 and C don't measure up to one another.

Elswick asked if any additional questions or comments. No further comments. The Public Workshop will be at the library on April 15 from 5:30-6:30pm.

II. Agenda Review

Elswick provided a quick review of tonight's agenda.

Boatwerks is requesting an addition, there will be wall lights and foot lights, and a new canopy with lighting underneath. Elswick received an email from a neighboring resident regarding their concern about additional lighting. Suggest the resident file a complaint, as it is the sign lighting that they complained about as a nuisance. Elswick doesn't see the additional lights from the addition being a point of concern.

Lyn Raymond inquired if they are planning to increase seating. Martin asked if the canopy is a structure or tent. Elswick noted it is a structure, and that they aren't expanding the number of seats. Anderson asked if the side bar will be enclosed. Elswick, yes, but it will have an overhead door to open-up.

254 River Ave, site plan with three waivers and three OPRs.

Martin brought to light the 60' entrances are for commercial buildings. Inquired about this. Elswick noted that this was the same standard for General Capital.

Ron Vander Veen, City Attorney noted that if no need for it, no need to do it again.

Adjusting it to 2 OPRs and 3 waivers.

Staff report, page 16 has been updated. Public easement maintained by private entity. The applicant has been working closely with staff and they have come a long way, meeting the four provisions, and the staff thanks them. Landscape, wastewater, and snowmelt is all good. Staff recommends OPRs are approved.

Elswick asked if there are any resolved questions from last week's meeting with Vander Veen. Any questions for Elswick, Vanderploeg, or VanderVeen right now relating to the site plan and procedure.

Martin inquired about the calculations on the OPRs, percentages seem misleading. 60% is truly 100%.

What is the intent of this OPR? Corbin and Marvin noted to bring these types of questions to the regular meeting.

Raymond inquired about the process for the regular meeting. Will the waivers be reviewed together? Separate?

Martin suggested they decide on each, with separate votes. First, approve the waivers and OPRs, and then the site plan. Asked if possible to approve the waivers and not the site plan per a previous comment VanderVeen made. VanderVeen noted it is possible, but looking at standards in the ordinance, if the information provided meets those standards, then required to approve. Chapter 39-130c, standards of approval shall. MCL 125.3504.

Vanderploeg noted, so if it passes those 4 tests, it is approved. Van Antwerp inquired, all four? Yes, all four.

Martin inquired if any questions. They are going to go through each waiver and OPR separately: staff, applicant, period of discussion between each vote, and then end with the site plan. If they approve two, but not all three what should they do? VanderVeen noted they could suggest a table and allow the applicant to come back with a revised plan and could add on a condition that they redo the Public Outreach event, if they think the need. This took place mid-November with 30 or so people attending.

Anderson has a hard stop at 6 p.m. Keeping the order of the agenda, 254 first, Boatwerks after.

III. 727 Waverly Ave

Last item for Study Session, 727 Waverly Ave, north of the fire station, it has long been vacant. Want to turn it into a kickboxing gym. I-2 doesn't allow said use. Either rezone to I-1 or text amendment for I-2. 1.6 acres. Vanderploeg noted less than 2 acres in size, could split parcel if larger section. I-2 required to have 2 acres. Anderson noted the educational / residential use of this space, a text change. Decided to bring this back to the May 14 meeting.

Study Session ended at 4:59 p.m.

5:00 p.m. Regular Meeting

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Martin called the regular meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion by De Block with support from Kenyon to approve the March 12, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.

Motion passes 9 – 0.

III. Communications from Audience – None

IV. Old Business

a. 254 S River Ave – 9 Unit Multifamily Residential

(tabled February 12, 2019 & March 12, 2019)

Martin outlined the process for this site plan, three waivers, and two OPRs. They are going to do each individually.

Elswick clarified that one of the three OPRS is not necessary as it is not a commercial building. This is the third OPR: entrance every 60ft. Used this in error, which became precedent. It is no longer needed and has been removed.

Elswick provided an overview of the project. The applicant is requesting site plan approval to construct a 11,834 sq. ft., 3-story multifamily building with 9 apartment units ranging in size from 950 sq. ft. to 3,800 sq. ft. The first floor is proposed to have four apartments with one to two bedrooms. Two multi-level apartments are proposed on the north side of the site with a one-bedroom apartment on the second level and living space and kitchen on the first level. Two two-bedroom apartment units are proposed for the second story and two units with two to three bedrooms are proposed for the third story. A partial basement is proposed for storage and mechanicals and maintenance space. It will be below most of the east portion of the building, but not below the garages or two-level apartment.

An approximately 15 ft pathway and park is proposed along the north property line with a combination of walking space, benches, and landscaping, which will be separated from a private courtyard by a 6-foot from grade pierced brick serpentine wall. The courtyard is proposed to be elevated above grade.

The southeast corner of the property is proposed to have 2" x 34 "corner sculpture/virtual monument" celebrating the 1850s formal plan of Holland's Central City with an 18" high seat wall.

The south property line has a proposed 27-foot front yard setback with a path crossing the River Ave/11th St corner, a concrete paver area with 4 public bike racks, landscaping, and a private terrace.

Snowmelt is proposed on S. River Ave, 11th St and into the parking lot and possibly through the pathway. Details on if this will be private snowmelt or connected to public snowmelt are being worked out with Brian White, Engineer.

Elswick noted that the applicant has been working closely with Staff, and their patience and investment in the City is appreciated. She also noted the updated staff report, on pages 16 and 17 with a condition of approval to obtain an easement from an adjacent property owner to the west prior to being issued a building permit. Two additional conditions of approval were added today by the City Attorney – 1. To provide the City a public easement for the north side linear park; 2. To provide the City an easement for public access and the widened sidewalk on 11th street. Both conditioned on if the waivers are approved. These items have been added to the conditions of approval.

Martin invited the applicant to present.

Har Ye Kan, consultant, thanked the Planning Commission for their patience.

Kan provided a brief recap of the project and project intent. They think this is the best design option possible. The location is at the edge of the C-3 zone district and at a transition point. It is different from the commercial condition, set among other mixed-use buildings in the block. She noted the high level of public activity in the area. The building is purely residential and because of that it needs special consideration. They took the following context considerations into thought: historic buildings, park, neighboring homes, as well as the housing needs of the City. Concept of the project: multi-family housing, moving beyond minimal code, enhancing pedestrian-oriented, public amenities, and complementing the character of Centennial Park. They believe this is the best design for the site taking everything into consideration.

She walked through the design beginning on the south lawn. The setback on the southside relates to two of the waivers, and are requesting for relief for natural light, greenspace, and the commemorative corner. The front elevation is a gracious and classical architecture, deferring to City Hall.

Nick Rolinski, consultant, spoke about the north elevation of the building. Second pedestrian-oriented amenity: there will be a pierced serpentine wall, planter strip with trees and light poles, and park. Goal is a public outdoor living room. Long term intent is a safe through block connector, but currently hinges on a few factors: securing a pedestrian easement with one or both neighboring properties. The project team took into consideration the Park Theatre wall and would like Planning Commission to reconsider if the space could function as an enclosed linear space. Rolinski explained a through block connector is the goal, but a linear park would be for the in the interim until a through block becomes an option. Believe the typology allows for this.

The Applicant is requesting two additional conditions to the conditions for approval provided by Staff. Rolinski read the following:

1. In the event that no pedestrian easements can be secured with either Geenen & Kolean and/or Hope Church prior to obtaining a building permit, the applicant will enclose the linear park for public safety. The landscaped, linear park will be maintained and made accessible as a public amenity in the interim until neighboring properties are agreeable to creating pedestrian easements. This will allow the linear park to be phased and converted to a through-block pedestrian connector when the appropriate pedestrian easements are secured.

2. Geenen & Kolean and/or Hope Church reserve the rights to decline the applicant's requested for an easement agreement. The applicant will understand and respect any objections to such an easement on the part of Geenen & Kolean and/or Hope Church.

They are considering the "what ifs". Kan noted the intent is the through block. Applicant is going to continue to pursue this. Kan asked the Commissioners to take these additional conditions into consideration. Kan noted gaining these easements may take more than 18 months before the site plan approval expires, but they want to build prior to this. Rolinski stated this still a public amenity, and stands ready to connect through when the time is right. Still landscaped and designed well.

Motion by De Block to take 254 S River off the table, supported by Anderson. All in favor.

Motion by De Block to open the public hearing, supported by Kenyon. All in favor.

Martin noted they will begin with the waivers. The process will be presentation of the waiver/OPR, applicant, public comment, and then close the hearing.

VanderVeen noted you don't need to open and close the public hearing with each. Can keep it open throughout.

Elswick outlined waiver #1: The southwest corner of the site at the S. River Ave and 11th St corner has a proposed front yard setback of ~70 feet for a corner "commemorative urban terrace." An 18" seat wall and a "sculpture/virtual monument" in addition to landscaping is proposed in this setback. Staff recommends approval.

Elswick outlined the criteria for approving a waiver:

1. Provides a special pedestrian-oriented feature
2. Does not create a significant interruption in the continuity of street level pedestrian movement and interest
3. Is compatible and integrated with adjoining properties and nearby public improvements
4. Is not for providing parking and/or drive through access

Martin clarified criteria one: "Provides a special pedestrian-oriented feature such as, but not limited to a public accessible plaza, or garden, or outside dining area, which adds an amenity to the pedestrian character of the street".

Martin asked if applicant would like to speak to waiver #1. They passed. Any public comments? None.

De Block noted it looks good on paper, but how does anyone keep track of it? Martin asked keep track of what? De Block noted a park like experience. How do they enforce this? Martin clarified talking about waiver #1. If approved they put in amenities like a bench, sidewalk, wall, monument, and landscaping.

Martin asked for more detail on the monument. Kan noted it will be a stone marker, physical plaque, potentially a QR code.

Martin inquired, why 70 feet?

Kan noted that space is for the commemorative corner and the public green zone. The 70ft is for items in waiver #1 and #2.

Elswick outlined waiver #2: 80 feet west from S. River Ave is an "A" street requiring a 6 ft maximum setback. An approximately 27-foot setback is proposed to accommodate an uncovered private terrace, a semi-circle concrete paver area with 4 bike racks and an 8-inch curb to the lawn, landscaping, and a corner desire path.

Anderson asked if they can have a say in design of the bike racks. Martin shared that it doesn't matter. Elswick clarified that there is a downtown standard.

Raymond stated that at the March study session, commissioners inquired about benches rather than bike racks and asked for clarity on how the green space is a public amenity.

Elswick noted that if the widened sidewalk, bike racks, and wall are public. Lawn area is not public correct? Elswick asked for clarification from applicant.

Rolinski clarified that is correct. It is a backdrop and site line that affects the pedestrian experience. Since it is residential use on the ground floor they intend to use the green space as a buffer.

Van Antwerp spoke to waiver #1 and #2. He is in favor of the regulations already in place in the zoning ordinance. The current requirements are beneficial: building entrances, street level building facades, glazing, parking – all enhance and support the pedestrian. Used example of other connected buildings in downtown – bring a positive experience. He would like to stick up for the regulations already in place and doesn't think the setbacks being requested meet the criteria. Inclined to not support these waivers.

Anderson thinks it is a beautiful feature. Resembles the parks by the police department. Provides a site line for vehicles on River and 11th Street corner. Curb cut at Centennial Park, encourages people to go to the park.

Raymond is still struggling with the separation of the two waivers. Doesn't think the proposed setback is compatible with adjoining properties, specifically Park Theatre. Sees how it reflects City Hall across 11th street the t setback is still substantially greater on this proposed building. The consultants haven't fully addressed the need for 70', and the additional 27'. Lozano also questioned why 70', as it seems these items can be achieved at a lesser setback. There is ambiguity with the semi-private space.

Martin shared he holds some of the same concerns; don't want to promote the crossing of River. Elswick inquired of Kenyon where the crossing for the Oz Project will be. Kenyon, 12th and River (pedestrian crossing will be going in). Martin has concerns with the 70', and item #1. Asked, when does a widened sidewalk become something? His other concern is beyond the crescent, the private space. He thinks the minimum setback would be to the public amenity, and maybe the front corner for the commemorative piece.

Discussion ensued about the corner of 11th St and River and other nearby corners, such as 10th St and River. Anderson noted the other corner (10th and River) has a traffic light, a very different intersection.

Martin noted that much of what is being requested for these setback waivers is to accommodate the residential use of the building. He noted that some setback is allowed, based on ordinance, north of 6th and east of Central, but that this was changed by an ordinance text amendment to allow greater setbacks in that area and the setbacks allowed are not as large the ones being proposed at 70, 27, and 39 feet. He noted that when they changed the ordinance, they specifically only changed that one area and not others, including this area around the Park.

Van Antwerp thinks the commemorative plaque could be anywhere along 11th street or in the park. He doesn't think this is the best location for it. Setbacks form a barrier and have been designed to do so.

Anderson stated she disagrees, that this is a place of transition, unlike even the corner of 10th St and River Ave.

De Boer agrees with Anderson. She thinks this is a place of transition, and that green space in the background is a public amenity. It provides breathing room, and a sense of place and space. Creative and educational to have the plaque in this location. Give more of a square thinking, a connector. She thinks it would be a nice addition.

Martin opened the floor for public comment.

Ed Hislop, 237 Van Raalte, shared that residents in the city struggle for green space, and thinks any green space is a good thing.

Vanderploeg, City Staff, elaborated on the staff recommendation. Recommending they do approve these waivers and OPRs. It is a transitional space, and there is an opportunity to allow a more gracious setback. On civic historic square, and though not a civic building, it is amongst those and many have a greater setback. Provides more breathing space. Staff is comfortable in recommending these and believes this is in line with what is happening in the neighborhood.

Martin closed the public hearing and asked commissioners for additional discussion.

De Boer noted that currently this is a parking lot, and that we are used to space here. It is going to look quite different with a big structure. The setbacks provide a buffer. She trusts staff's assessment on the specifics. The green space, the openness, it softens, is inviting, and provides a sense of place.

Kan stated they are meeting the zoning ordinance based on the requirements for health, safety, and welfare and the perspective from inside the building and the residents' needs (natural light, etc.).

Martin asked they concentrate on the four criteria for determining a waiver as that is what the Commissioners are judging this on.

Kan noted the four criteria don't speak to light, but the zoning ordinance does state that the intent and role of the Planning Commission is to ensure public health and safety considerations (light, air). If extended out, it increases the building depth to 67', the optimal depth for residential is 39'.

Martin asked if there are other design options. Kan stated they believe this is the best design. There will also be alternatives, but they think this is the best.

Rolinski shared they completed a massing study that took the building to the corner off 11th. When they viewed the massing from the park side, it was quite large next to City Hall. They think there is a limit to how wide the façade should be. Transitioning into residential fabric, and the building has been designed to create that transition.

Van Antwerp noted that the C-3 allows 18 different uses for this site, one of which is residential. First look at the regulations and fit the design to those. It is a C-3 environment.

Martin requested Elswick to continue with waiver #3. Elswick questioned if Martin wanted to hold the vote on Waivers #1 and #2 now. Martin stated to wait until later.

Elswick outlined waiver #3: A side setback of 39 feet is requested where the side setback requirement is 0 feet. An approximately 15' pathway and park is proposed along the north property line with a combination of walking space, benches, and landscaping, which will be separated from an ~20' private courtyard by a 6-foot from grade pierced brick serpentine wall. The courtyard is proposed to be elevated above grade. The pathway is proposed to provide connectivity from River Ave to one of the two properties to the west of this site. A tree removal agreement and easements will be required as conditions of approval.

No comments from the applicant, or the public.

Anderson asked why they need a waiver from the other two businesses. Martin clarified that they don't need a waiver from the businesses, they need an easement for the pass through to a private property. Marin asked if the property only abuts Geenen & Kolean, and not Hope Church. Elswick clarified that there is a chance, depending on the path line that it would cross to Hope Church's property.

Anderson asked if Park Theatre has any parking or ownership back there. Martin noted they own a bit, the electrical building, but walking east to west, you won't cross Park property.

De Block asked about the funny building section, higher than 26'. Elswick clarified that this has been fixed, and that it is allowed and not an issue because the building is now proposed at 29' in that area.

Raymond thinks the same way about waiver #3, as #1 and #2; that it is not compatible with the adjoining property. Thinks the pedestrian feature should feel welcoming, it doesn't feel like a public space. The benches at the back not visible making it less of a public feature. She noted past conversations about the church parking lot being semi-public, and though cut throughs are common in downtown, this one doesn't make sense from public to private or private to public.

Martin stated that the current site plan shows abutting the Geenen & Kolean property. This is what they are to go off of, not another design approach to Hope Church's parking lot.

Elswick clarified that staff put it as a condition of approval, the through path, and could still be approved to have that design element.

Elswick asked for clarification from the applicant. Planning Commission needs to know if they are looking at the through path as a viable option still, not preferred, but still viable, or if they are only requesting now that it be approved as an interim linear park.

Martin stated that Planning Commission has the ability to look at all the conditions of approval in front of them, and they get to make the decision. They understand what the

applicant is asking for, and what staff is recommending. They have the final say. Vander Veen affirmed this.

Van Antwerp is not inclined to support this waiver, opens a 39' gap and he has concerns about security.

Kenyon likes the linear park, if it connects. The connector piece is important, a dead end feels less appealing.

Anderson could see this as a gated space, a private space. Otherwise it turns into an alleyway. Agrees that safety would be an issue.

Martin requested Elswick continue with the OPRs. Elswick questioned if Martin wanted to hold the vote on the Waivers now. Martin stated to wait until after the OPRs.

Elswick shared OPR #1. The C-3 requirement is: elevations facing an "A" street require a minimum of 60% windows from 18" to 10' above sidewalk. The applicant is requesting relief from the requirement for 60% window area on the street facades measured from 18" to 10 ft above sidewalk where 45.3% is proposed along the 11th St "A" street façade and River Ave, which is an "A" street.

Martin asked if the applicant would like to speak. The applicant stated no.

Martin opened the public hearing.

Seeing no comments from public, he closed the public hearing.

Anderson stated she has to leave, she asked for clarification on voting. Martin noted they are voting on waivers and OPRs at the end.

Van Antwerp spoke to the purpose of the 60% glazing, it provides transparency between the sidewalk and the building. He thinks it is an important one to maintain in the C-3 district.

Raymond states the intent talks about modest flexibility. Buildings surrounding the park, there is a consistent variation for the context of the properties. Agrees with Van Antwerp there is a reason, but in this case the window reduction would be appropriate.

Martin finds this one difficult because glazing is for visibility and security. Nowhere in the ordinance does it state a change should be allowed due to the use of the building. C-3 district allows residential use, and he doesn't understand why they can't still meet the glazing requirement other than for the residential privacy, but the intent of the ordinance is for people to see in both directions. The OPR criteria for approval does not include one for maintaining residential privacy.

De Boer noted the OPR makes sense for the modesty factor in bedrooms and bathrooms. Used example of bathroom buildings downtown, the window percentage is different on those. It is very reasonable.

Martin understands but is unable to find that in the ordinance.

Van Antwerp thinks that residential use can be placed on this lot with a different design.

Elswick covered OPR #2: Relief is requested from the requirement for 40% window area on facades facing a secondary street measured from 18" to 10 ft above sidewalk where 18.6% is proposed along the 11th St "B" street façade. She noted the extent of the building on the "B" street is 108 square feet. Staff would recommend the minimal window percentage, as this is for the side garage.

Martin asked if the applicant would like to speak. No comments from applicant.

Martin opened the public hearing.

Vanderploeg brought up precedent. Planning Commission has had precedent with this OPR in the past. He noted specific projects: police building, court building, General Capital, and 5th Street Lofts. Two of which were residential properties, and they allowed that due to the residential use of those building.

Martin closed the public hearing.

No other comments or discussion.

VanderVeen noted they can motion on each waiver and OPR, and then allow public comment on the site plan before the final vote.

Elswick recapped waiver #1.

Motion by De Boer to approve waiver #1 with support from Corbin.

- Lozano – Nay
- Raymond – Nay
- De Block – Nay
- Kenyon – Yay
- Van Antwerp – Nay
- De Boer – Yay
- Corbin – Yay
- Martin – Nay

Motion fails 3 - 5.

Martin asked for clarification, since one member is absent, just the Commission present, correct? VanderVeen noted correct, it would take 5 votes to approve, so this was not approved.

Elswick recapped waiver #2.

Motion by Corbin to approve waiver #2 with support from De Boer.

- Kenyon – Yay
- De Block – Nay
- Van Antwerp – Nay
- De Boer – Yay
- Corbin – Yay
- Lozano – Yay
- Ryamond – Nay
- Martin – Nay

Motion fails 4 - 4.

Elswick recapped waiver #3.

Motion by Corbin to approve waiver #3 with support from De Boer.

Lozano – Nay
De Block – Nay
De Boer – Nay
Van Antwerp - Nay
Raymond – Nay
Kenyon – Nay
Corbin – Nay
Martin – Nay

Motion fails 0 - 8.

Elswick recapped OPR #1.

Motion by Corbin to approve OPR #1 with support from De Boer.

De Block – Yay
Kenyon - Yay
Raymond – Yay
De Boer – Yay
Lozano – Yay
Van Antwerp – Nay
Corbin – Yay
Martin – Nay

Motion passes 6 - 2.

Elswick recapped OPR #2.

Motion by De Block to approve OPR #2 with support from Lozano.

Raymond – Yay
De Block – Yay
De Boer – Yay
Kenyon – Yay
Van Antwerp – Nay
Lozano – Yay
Corbin – Yay
Martin – Nay

Motion passes 6 - 2.

Martin – on to the site plan. Any comment from the applicant on the site plan? None.

Martin opens the public hearing.

Seeing no comments, Chairperson Martin closed the public hearing.

Van Antwerp asked Staff, how does the vote on the waivers and OPR alter the site plan? Elswick directed the question to VanderVeen. The applicant can be given the choice to table to reconfigure the plan, since the waivers were not approved. Martin asked for a motion to table, or a vote.

Elswick asked the applicant's preference. Their preference is for a vote.

Van Antwerp asked for clarification on what they are voting on. Martin noted you are voting on the entire site plan now.

VanderVeen continued, what you are voting on is a site plan that doesn't meet the requirements, so it would not be approvable. However, the applicant asked for a vote, so you must vote.

De Block asked if no motion made, what happens? Martin, we will find out.

No motion made.

VanderVeen, if no motion made it dies due to a lack of motion.

V. New Business

a. 216 Van Raalte – Boatwerks Addition & PUD Amendment

Elswick summarized the project. The applicant is requesting a PUD Amendment. Demo current addition and add new addition with elevated patio seating area and enclose current outside bar. Lighting for the wall and stairs. Also requesting a canopy at existing entry from building to existing patio; tensile canopy with columns for shade, and the northwest corner of the patio to be lowered. Current seating remain as is, with canopy on top of it.

Martin opened the floor to the Applicant.

Mike Baker with Nederveld, Civil Engineer on behalf of the applicant. Baker shared that the goal of this project is to make enhancements to the restaurant. There will be the building addition, reconfigured bar area and demo of the current bar area, 224 square feet gained, and the reworking of the seating area and layout. Additional lower seating area. Plus, a canopy over the seating area.

Raymond asked if there will be new, additional seating down below?

Baker noted he isn't sure on the specifics of the total seating, but mostly reworking the current seating area.

Martin stated that with an increase of 224 square feet, not much more can be added. Raymond doesn't see any concerns with this, as it is a very minimal change.

Martin asked if the canopies are being added because of sun or seagulls. Baker noted to add more shade.

Chairperson Martin opened the public hearing.

Ed Hislop, 237 Van Raalte shared his concerns around the potential increased lighting. The current lighting, specifically the florescent front sign, which changes every 8-15 seconds is bright and intrusive all night long. He, and other neighbors are worried about more lights and not less.

Martin recommended the resident file a nuisance complaint, and that with the changes taking place on the water side, they can't speak to the sign, just the new lighting. Any concerns around lighting on the water side?

Hislop asked about those new lights being dimmed down after hours.

Elswick to connect with the resident after the meeting to speak further and provide additional assistance.

Chairperson Martin closed the public hearing.

Martin inquired if the Commissioners have any comments.

Kenyon shared he likes it.

De Block motioned to approve the PUD Amendment for 216 Van Raalte with support from DeBoer.

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 Kenyon the meeting was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

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