

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GRAND RAPIDS  
Minutes of the June 22, 2010 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of Grand Rapids Charter Township was held at the Township Hall on Tuesday, June 22, 2010 at 7:00 pm.

Present were Chair Susan Molhoek, Vice Chair Stephen Fry, Secretary Wayne Harrall, Commissioners; Edward J. Robinette, Mark Prein and David VanDyke. Also present were Township Planning Director Richard Sprague Jr. and Treasurer Clerical Assistant Kara Ronda. Commissioner Beverly Wall was not present.

**1. Approve minutes of May 25, 2010 meeting.**

**Stephen Fry**, seconded by **Ed Robinette**, moved to approve the minutes with the following changes;

- p. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under Rick Sprague, remove the colon between the words recommends and requiring

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**2. Public Hearing – Celadon PUD Amendment.**

Brad Rottschafer, Mosaic Properties, representing Celadon New Town, has requested an amendment to the Celadon New Town PUD. The request involves changes to the building, building layouts and the mix of residential and commercial.

- Building D will be reduced from 10,000 square ft of medical use to 7,800 square ft of professional office or 5,200 square ft of medical office
- A large portion of the parking area adjacent to Building D will now be replaced with residential condos; Buildings F(a), F(b) and F(c)
- Building E and F were larger buildings with large commercial/work spaces on the main level and live spaces above, which are now being proposed to be replaced with smaller scaled buildings; Buildings E(b), E(c) and E(d)
- Building I was Live/Work units and now are proposed as residential units
- In the area of single-family homes, proposing to have the potential for 4 Manor Homes which are 2-unit condos that look like large homes, located on lot 3 and/or any of the lots from 13 thru 18 and they will only be built if client requests them
- Reducing the intensity of the community by offering more residential and less commercial
- As proposed, subtracting at least 4,200 square ft of commercial/work space and adding 6 to 10 residential units as compared to the last approved plan

Sue Molhoek noted there was no indication of size or stories for F(a) and F(b). The applicant, Brad Rottschafer, explained they are 3 stories.

Brad Rottschafer also noted building E(a) will be a Work/Work unit while E(b), E(c) and E(d) will be Live/Work units.

Sue Molhoek clarified building I is now a residential building with 10 units. Brad verified that is correct, it is now all residential, no longer Live/Work.

Steve Fry asked if they are seeking approval for the Manor Home type on any lot. Brad said yes, explained they are asking for only 4 Manor Home types to be built on any lot 13 thru 18.

Steve Fry asked about the total reduction in parking. Brad replied the parking originally was 380 and the new number is 370. Brad also explained reducing the parking area will provide more green space.

Brad Rottschafer explained they are looking to have either 6 or 4 residential units in that building. If there are 6 residential units, it will reduce the commercial property by 600 square ft and by replacing the commercial property the parking requirement reduces.

Wayne Harrall referenced the second sentence of the letter provided by Brad Rottschafer regarding “changes will result in more green space” and noted the proposed landscape buffer between buildings F and building D does not appear to be significantly different. Brad stated it is based on what they suspect. Brad also referenced the buffer between building E and buildings F, which will be landscaped. Wayne asked if the courtyards behind building F(b) will infringe on the wetland. Brad stated a buffer will be there.

Mark Prein asked if building F(b) had a flat or peaked roof. Brad Rottschafer stated a flat roof.

Rick Sprague gave the staff report:

- exhibit A shows the building as T(a) when it is F(a) on the site plan
- exhibit A indicates a 24 ft side yard setback while the site plan indicates a 25 ft side yard setback and the “general notes” section of the site plan indicates a 30 ft setback to the properties along Leffingwell - this needs clarification
- exhibit E is a spreadsheet which indicates the total net change is 6 residential units and a decrease of 4200 sq ft of commercial space, the narrative indicates the units may increase between 6-10 if the 4 “Manor Homes” are constructed but the exhibit seems to include those 4 and it shows a total of 6 - this should be clarified
- a revised landscape plan should be provided that further explains the “Landscape Buffer” on the south side of buildings F(a) and F(b) and the tree’s abutting the Leffingwell homes that have been added to the plan, the type of plantings and sizes should be included

- the height and square footage of buildings should be shown on the plan for buildings F(a), F(b) and I
- Engineer Bob Bruggink indicates concern with encroachment into the wetlands, setting a schedule with final paving, erosion fabric covering an outlet and finishing sidewalk approaches at Celadon Dr and Leffingwell Ave
- the most significant change is the addition of buildings F(a) and F(b), putting a three story building in that location will have an impact on the residents at 2020 Leffingwell

Sue Molhoek asked Rick Sprague if he received a new landscaping plan. Rick stated he did not.

**Wayne Harrall**, seconded by **Ed Robinette**, moved to open the Public Hearing at 7:26 pm.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

No public comments were given.

**Wayne Harrall**, seconded by **Ed Robinette**, moved to close the Public Hearing at 7:26 pm.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

Steve Fry stated building F(a) shows a courtyard, questioned if there would be decks or patios as well. Brad Rottschafer replied there will be and it is shown as being fenced in on the site plan. Steve touched base on the issue the Engineer brought up about the wetlands. Brad explained there will be a deck over the wetlands or DEQ permit.

Steve Fry noticed in exhibit D the distance from the sidewalk to building C appears smaller. Brad replied the building size has not changed. Steve clarified he was not asking if the size changed, but if the location of the building has. Brad stated it was not an intentional change.

Wayne Harrall asked Rick Sprague if the neighbor at 2020 Leffingwell was aware of the on goings. Rick stated a notice had been sent out but did not receive a response.

Wayne Harrall asked the applicant about a landscape buffer behind building F(a). Brad Rottschafer replied there are mature trees and grass there now, but willing to put evergreens in as well if the Planning Commission so wished. Brad also explained the fence behind building F(a) would make it more of a courtyard, like a no disturb zone.

Sue Molhoek asked the applicant to define the no disturb zone. Brad explained it is not just a fence, but more like a courtyard with a 12-13 ft fenced area.

Dave VanDyke asked Rick Sprague if the house on 2020 Leffingwell had a deck. Rick replied it does have an open deck on the back of the house.

Steve Fry expressed his concern about the 25 ft buffer and the fact that half of the buffer is being consumed by patios. Feels that there was more flow in the original plan and bothered by the lack of connectivity and how tight the proposed plan feels.

Dave VanDyke noted there are some things he likes with the progression, as well as things he does not, but he is concerned with the impact building F(a) will have on 2020 Leffingwell.

Steve Fry believes there is only room for one building, not two, and believes 10 units is too much for F(a) and F(b) combined.

Wayne Harrall stated he would like to stick to the original 30 ft setback. Steve Fry noted the 25 ft setback would be fine if there was no patio. Mark Prein asked if it is 25 ft from the back of the building or the fence. Rick Sprague stated the setback applies just to the building itself, not the patio. Mark Prein asked if any of the commissioners had a problem with building F(c). The commissioners stated there was no problem, it is a small building.

Wayne Harrall asked the applicant what his plan is regarding paving. Brad Rottschafer explained the pavement is holding very well and they would like one more year of construction before paving. Wayne asked if they had received any complaints from the residents. Brad replied they have not.

Wayne Harrall stated he is leaning towards tabling the request, he is not comfortable with building F(a). He explained he would also like more information on green space and would like to see some more of the development paved.

Mark Prein agreed with Wayne and stated he is also concerned with building C. Mark noted a conflict with the possibility that the main drive entrance moved or that the parking shifted.

Steve Fry explained the commissions concerns to the applicant and what needs to be addressed:

- maintain original setbacks
- too full in the middle with buildings F(a) and F(b)
- connectivity
- need schedule of paving plans
- Township Planner and Engineers concerns
- building C moved back and drives realigned
- revised landscape plan
- label appropriate setbacks

Wayne Harrall asked the applicant about the DEQ permit regarding the wetlands. Brad Rottschafer explained he believes it is still open because the project is not complete.

**Wayne Harrall**, seconded by **Ed Robinette**, moved to table the request to amend the Celadon PUD.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**3. Public Hearing – Meijer Gardens Special Land Use.**

David Hooker, president of Frederik Meijer Gardens, is requesting a Special Land Use to build a “hoop house” (a.k.a. green house) on property they own adjacent to their maintenance building.

- need more space to grow plants and grow plants when weather is bad
- proposing a 30x96 hoop house
- it will be a temporary structure
- will not be adding additional exterior lighting
- inside will only be lit for access, no “grow lights”
- structure will be adjacent to maintenance barn

Sue Molhoek asked if the maintenance barn drive connected to the main drive. David Hooker replied yes it does.

Steve Fry asked if the drives connect internally. David Hooker responded one road from the hoop house connects internally to the Gardens.

Dave VanDyke asked about the area located directly behind the proposed hoop house. Rick Sprague noted it is a gravel area where a storage unit is located. David Hooker added the hoop house will be built on a gravel pad.

Dave VanDyke asked if there was anything that was going to screen the hoop house from Leonard or if anything was proposed. David Hooker stated there is an existing row of vegetation on the North side of the proposed hoop house and there is no additional screening or changes proposed.

Sue Molhoek asked the applicant if they had considered the use of the existing drive. David Hooker explained access to the hoop house will be thru the existing drive by the maintenance barn.

Steve Fry stated there is nothing there to prevent anyone from using the other drive. David Hooker replied that statement is correct.

Wayne Harrall asked if the applicant had an objection to removing a portion of that drive way. David Hooker stated they do not want to forgo the easement access and it would be more of a cost at this time.

Steve Fry expressed the idea to restrict drive access from commercial vehicles. Steve believes it is awful close to a house to use as a commercial drive.

Dave VanDyke expressed he is not thrilled to see a “hoop” house and that is not very aesthetically pleasing.

Wayne Harrall asked the applicant the reason for a temporary structure. David Hooker replied the provider of the hoop house classifies it this way. David also stated they intend to see it there for awhile.

Rick Sprague gave the staff report:

- explained the hoop house/green house property is not currently part of the Gardens
- this property should be added to the larger parcel
- no additional landscaping proposed
- additional landscaping may be required to properly screen the building from the neighbors and Leonard Street
- plans do not indicate an additional need for lighting

**Steve Fry**, seconded by **Wayne Harrall**, moved to open the Public Hearing at 8:11 pm. **Motion approved unanimously.**

Dorothy Heney, 1298 Suncrest Dr, concerned about a possible drainage problem or possible wet land issue. Ms. Heney also inquired where to get more information.

Susan Molhoek asked if the neighbors had been notified. Rick Sprague confirmed the neighbors had been sent a notice.

Rick Sprague noted he was not aware of any drain issues.

**Steve Fry**, seconded by **Wayne Harrall**, moved to close the Public Hearing at 8:16 pm. **Motion approved unanimously.**

Rick Sprague also noted a letter was submitted by Janet Haynes, a resident at 3334 Falconcrest, in favor of the hoop house.

**Steve Fry**, seconded by **Wayne Harrall**, moved to approve the Special Land Use using attorney James Brown’s Resolution with the following conditions;

- the parcel must be combined with larger parcel
- existing drive (east of maintenance building driveway) restricted to non-commercial use
- require landscape buffer defined as:
  - 8-12 ft evergreen trees for at least 50% of frontage property
  - Township Planning Director to review and approve
- Gardens shall maintain this structure in a good state of repair
- primary access shall not be from the 15 ft easement leading directly to Leonard Street
- external lighting must be cut off style that meets Township requirements

- internal illumination shall be for general illumination and not to enhance plant growth

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**4. Public Comment.**

No Township residents were present for Public Comment.

**5. Update from the Township Planning Director.**

Planning Director Rick Sprague stated there will be a meeting held in July regarding numerous items.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.

---

Wayne A. Harrall – Secretary