

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF GRAND RAPIDS
Minutes of the February 28, 2006 Meeting**

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of Grand Rapids Charter Township was held at the Township Hall on Tuesday, February 28, 2006, at 7:00 p.m.

Present were Chair Susan Molhoek, Vice-chair Stephen C. Fry, Secretary Wayne A. Harrall, Commissioners David A. VanDyke, Michael J. Fuller, James Saalfeld, and Edward J. Robinette. Also present was Township Planning and Zoning Administrator Richard Sprague, Jr.

1. Approve Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 24, 2006.

Motion by Edward Robinette, second by Wayne Harrall, to approve the January 24, 2006 regular meeting minutes with the following amendments: on page 1, item 1, remove the word “minutes” following “regular meeting”; on page 7 under subheading (n)(1), fill in the blank with “PUD5”; on page 7 under subheading (n)(3), in the second line, remove the word “the”; on page 8 under subheading (4), the word “payment” is changed to “pavement”, on page 8, subheading (5) shall now read “Density of the project shall be reviewed and approved by the Site Plan Committee”; and at the bottom of page 10, add “by vote of 4 to 3” following “Motion passed”. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Hearing: DAR Development Request for Rezoning from Single Family Residential (R-1) to Neighborhood Commercial Planned Unit Development (NC-PUD), for Property Located at 2333 East Beltline Avenue.

Stephen Fry stepped down from his seat on the Commission due to a conflict of interest.

Bill Granzoe of Concept Design Group presented the request noting the following:

- the applicant has met all requirements for site plan approval;
- the sidewalk was been moved further back from the street;
- berms have been added between the sidewalk and the parking area
- elevations were presented;
- the front of the building will be mostly glass with character accents;
- a traffic study will be done if MDOT requires;
- regarding the cross-easement access, the intention is to record easement instruments prior to this being brought before the Board;
- parking requirements have been met.

Rick Sprague presented his comments summarizing his staff report. He noted that the

Township Engineer has concerns regarding stormwater discharge, the height of the retaining wall needs to be engineered, and following discussions with MDOT, he believes a traffic study will be required. Sprague also stated the parking does exceed the requirements. The issue of signage was brought up noting that Township Attorney Jim Brown submitted correspondence regarding this. He said the parties need to come to some sort of an agreement as to signs. The applicant stated he would look into what can be agreed upon as to signage.

There was discussion regarding the exact amount of acreage involved. Sprague confirmed 8.45 acres is what is in the legal description.

James Saalfeld asked what the intended use for the development is. Granzoe noted that the retail space will be for smaller/local neighborhood type retail, and the out-lots will be restaurants with a bank on the most northern site.

Motion by Edward Robinette, second by David VanDyke, to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments:

1. Lynn Redgrave, 1071 Cherrywood Lane – would like berm and vegetation to block view of parking area.
2. Nancy Sauke, 309 Wyncrest – asked if all retail space has been rented out. She believes this development will create more traffic and the Township does not need another restaurant – things are developing faster in this area than need be.
3. David Dye, 2480 Crescent NE – noted concerns regarding access and also the current appearance of the site.
4. Mike Pupilinski, 2456 Greenings – concerned about tree removal. He noted the Herkner property promised to put up buffer trees to provide a shield for the residents.
5. Dean Hill, 2436 McIntosh – concerned about traffic being diverted through the Celebration property and through the development. Also set forth concerns about landscaping and lighting.
6. Gary Kuyper, 2436 Greenings – agreed with comments of D. Hill regarding concerns over landscaping and lighting. He noted there will be traffic issues and parking issues if the sites are joined.
7. Darci Dye, 2408 Russett NE – asked how many more shops are needed in this area – she is looking for “quality” shops.
8. Sue Howe, 2500 E. Beltline – would like to see earth berm and would not like the connection.
9. Gene Hathaway, 11642 Crystal Ridge – set forth his concerns about traffic and the process being abused without regarding for the East Beltline Overlay District.

Motion by James Saalfeld, second by David VanDyke, to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unanimously.

Susan Molhoek spoke regarding submission of an extensive landscape plan and lighting plan to the Commission. She said the request for the connection is for safety reasons.

Wayne Harrall stated that this plan needs MDOT approval. He would like to see more berming shown on the plan. Need to plan for the future and provide for future cross access to the north. Harrall recommends using leaching basins for drainage retention.

The applicant noted they would be open to the connection and they will be doing a full stormwater study. They are very open to using products and innovations that are available.

James Saalfeld stated he agrees that berming is important along the Beltline. He has some concern about the small scale store concept. He believes a traffic study should be done at this point -- at the preliminary plan approval stage.

Randy Dykstra of Herkner Jewelers spoke about sign location noting that Herkner prefers separate signs, supplementing with directional signs.

David VanDyke noted that the berm height should be specified.

It was moved by David VanDyke, and seconded by Edward Robinette, to approve DAR Development's request for rezoning from Single Family Residential (R-1) to Neighborhood Commercial Planned Unit Development (NC-PUD), for property located at 2333 East Beltline Avenue, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions set out in Township Attorney James R. Brown's February 6, 2006 letter and compliance with the Ordinance.
2. Satisfaction of Moore & Bruggink's correspondence dated January 17, 2006 and February 23, 2006.
3. Satisfaction for landscape requirement of 3-4 foot ungulating berm and landscaping to obscure automobiles.
4. Satisfaction of MDOT's approval for entrance and de-acceleration lanes and any requirements they would have for traffic studies, etc.
5. Proposed Parcel D is to come back before the Planning Commission (Phase 3) with the understanding that either more frontage can be obtained from the state or the whole thing would have to be pushed back to comply.
6. Future access to the north to be provided and graded in such a manner that the connection can be completed.

7. All catch basins are to be leaching-type catch basins with filtration.
8. There shall be 3 additional landscape islands put in to break up the middle areas of the parking lot, in front of proposed Building A.
9. The traffic study shall be subject to review and approval by the Township Engineer and if there is a change to the driveway location, it is to come back before the Planning Commission.

Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Fry rejoined the Commission at this point.

3. Public Hearing: Proposed Amendment to the PUD-5 (Community Service PUD) Ordinance.

Rick Sprague first went over the changes to the Amendment. These changes were made after conferring with Township Counsel. The proposed Amendment has been broken down into a PUD-5A option and a PUD-5B option.

Motion by Wayne Harrall, and second by Edward Robinette, to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously.

Public comments were made as follows:

1. Joe Zagrivino – spoke about the LC-PUD 5A and 5B. He said the Commission needs to look to the residents to determine what they want the Township to evolve into.
2. Ed Bolmont – commented on the process. He said he is unclear as to what the changes are and therefore would have liked the proposed language ahead of time to look it over. He does not want to see more commercial development.
3. Martin Andre – urged the Commission to adopt the amendment.
4. Lynn Redgrave, 1071 Cherrywood Lane - noted she is the president of the Northeast Citizens Action Association. She said the PUD5-A does not require any open space, while the PUD5-B does. She believes the open space definition language is appropriate. She spoke about acreage allotments and percentage of retail, etc. She asked the Commission not to pass ordinances based on specific plans.
5. Mr. Franklin, 3446 Devin NE – stated there is no need to amend the PUD5 ordinance because it was just re-written. He said it feels like this is being amended to use for one specific site. Need to preserve Grand Rapids Township as a good place to live.
6. Howard Congers, 2626 Dunnigan – noted he agrees with the previous comments. He also asked if there will still be a referendum vote in August. He feels amending the ordinance is a scheme.

7. Judith Larson, 2861 Lynns – stated she believes this is not thought out to meet the desires of the residents and not in keeping with the Master Plan. The Planning Commission is mandated to consider the Master Plan when making decisions. She read the “goals” of the Township in this regard.
8. Chuck Dykstra, 3368 Three Mile – spoke regarding how townships change and grow and how developers have no consideration for residents.
9. Sue Howe, 2500 E. Beltline NE – believes the township has gotten smaller and smaller and has become more closed.
10. Theresa, 3100 Cooksema Dr. NE – questioned how the 50/50 is calculated. She noted she agrees with comments previously made and she does not support the increase.
11. Mort Hoffman, 4200 Robinhood Dr., SE – believes the Commission should table this and get more information to the citizens on the details of this.
12. Bob Baird, 3642 Lenwood Lane – stated that it seems this amendment is premature. He would like this tabled and to wait for the upcoming referendum vote.
13. Deb Claypool, 3385 Three Mile Rd., NE – she noted she feels the residents are not informed and have not been notified other than in the *Grand Rapids Press*.
14. Sheryl Kropewnicki, 3544 Three Mile Rd., NE – read correspondence she had submitted to the Commission. She noted that a study on water tables should also be done.

Motion by Michael Fuller, second by Edward Robinette, to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unanimously.

Susan Molhoek stated correspondence was received on this agenda item from the following:

1. Rex and Judith Larson, 2861 Winesap NE.
2. Sheryl Lynn Kropewnicki, 3544 Three Mile Rd. NE.

E-mails received from:

1. Joe Zuiderveen
2. John VerPlank
3. James Keller, 2810 E. Beltline Lane, NE.
4. Rod Horlings, 2885 Coppergrove Ct., NE.
5. Francesca Amari, 2929 Bird, NE.
6. Paul Zimmerman, 3018 Woodsboro Dr., NE.
7. Beth and Michael, 2581 Lenwood Lane, NE.

Commission discussion commenced. They spent time discussing specific language of the proposed ordinance amendment. Rick Sprague went over the process for this ordinance amendment. He said at the last meeting there were gray areas and thus the Township

Attorney came up with this proposed amendment language. There are no noticing requirements for amendments to the zoning ordinance. This is still subject to Township Board reading, hearing and approval.

Susan Molhoek commented that she has concerns regarding taking action on this until the Commission has a re-write of the Master Plan closer in hand.

Wayne Harrall asked about the reduction in acreage of 70 to 40 and how many parcels in the Township this would allow. Rick Sprague said he would have to check into it, but most parcels are adjacent to the Beltline.

James Saalfeld asked for revision in the language regarding “unimproved open space”, wherein he suggests it read: “unimproved or improved open space which improves its natural state”.

It was moved by David VanDyke, and seconded by Edward Robinette, to recommend to the Township Board, approval of the proposed amendment to the PUD-5 (Community Service PUD) Ordinance, as written and submitted by Township Attorney James R. Brown (dated February 9, 2006), with modifications as follows: (1) page 1, paragraph 2, change “70 acres” to “40 acres”; (2) page 2, second full paragraph, put in 5% in the blank line; (3) page 2, the first paragraph under PUD-5B Option, change “at least 70 acres” to “greater than 40 acres”; and (4) in the third paragraph under the PUD-5B Option, change “unimproved open space” to read “unimproved or improved open space which improves its natural state”. Motion passed 5 to 1. (Stephen Fry abstained from voting).

4. Update from Township Planning and Zoning Administrator.

Rick Sprague passed out information from Tim Johnson regarding the Master Plan review. There is a meeting scheduled on this for March 2, 2006 at 4:15 p.m., wherein the goal is to look for input and set procedure for updating the Master Plan.

Rick Sprague also stated there have been no new submittals for the March agenda, so there may be time to work on the Master Plan at that meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Wayne A. Harrall