



**VILLAGE OF SPRING LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
September 25, 2018 7:00 PM**

**Barber School Community Building
102 West Exchange Street
Spring Lake, MI 49456
49456**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman **Kauck** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Bohnhoff, Johnson, Kauck, Martinus, Nauta, Van Leeuwen-Vega, and Van Strate.

Absent: None

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, to approve the agenda as presented. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: July 24, 2018 regular meeting

Motion by **Van Strate**, second from **Nauta**, to approve the minutes from the July 24, 2018 regular meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

5. PUBLIC HEARING

A. 106, 108, and 110 West Savidge Street: The Planning Commission will consider a request for a Special Use Permit for residential dwellings above the first floor (Epicurean Village) located at 106, 108, and 110 West Savidge Street, Permanent Parcel Numbers 70-03-15-382-007, 70-03-15-382-026, 70-03-15-382-025, and 70-03-15-382-009. This request will also require a Site Plan Review for the proposed restaurant and other commercial uses.

Chairman **Kauckeck** introduced this item and asked **Howland** to give a brief overview, and then allow Ms. Van Kampen's representatives, from Progressive AE, to explain their project and request for a Special Use Permit before opening the Public Hearing.

Howland explained that this project had been in the newspapers quite a bit over the last several months and included the property immediately west of Village Hall, down to the pocket park. **Howland** said the applicant was looking to do a mixed-use development including a three-story building with retail and restaurant on the first floor, restaurant and residential space on the second floor and residential space on the third floor with different architecture in each section to make it look like multiple buildings had been constructed but it would actually be one big building with lots of architectural features. **Howland** said the applicants design professionals were here to represent Kim Van Kampen and they would go over some building renderings and explain the details of the project.

Ken Brandsen, Project Manager, and Lee VanderMullen, Civil Engineer, from Progressive AE explained that they had been working with Ms. Van Kampen for several months and that she had shared her vision with them for what she would like to see in the Village to make it a destination. Mr. Brandsen shared renderings of the three (3) parcels to be developed at this time. Mr. Brandsen also showed the Board a rendering of the vision Ms. Van Kampen had for future development. Mr. Brandsen pointed out different architectural details and went over the proposed floor plans for each section of the building.

Mr. VanderMullen went over a few issues, that **Howland** was working on with them, such as balconies and awnings that would hang over the MDOT right of way and a 3-foot gap between Village Hall and the building next to it. Mr. VanderMullen also explained the proposed parking needs, utilities, stormwater, possible upgrades for gas & electric, fire protection recommendations from the Fire Department and a request for an exception to the landscape ordinance. Mr. VanderMullen went through the renderings and explained what was proposed for each floor and section.

Motion by **Van Strate**, second from **Johnson**, the public hearing opened at 7:19 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7

No: 0

Joyce Aldridge, 750 Fall St., was concerned about enough parking.

Jerry Faubel, 14804 Farmwood Ct., was very concerned about parking and pedestrian safety.

Colleen Curran, 15721 Jennifer Ln, felt this new development would be wonderful for the Village.

Mark Powers, 312 Meridian, said he was encouraged by what he saw so far, and was looking forward to learning more about the development.

David Dye, 114 N Fruitport Rd., said she hoped that this new development would be a LEED certified development.

Motion by **Bohnhoff**, second from **Nauta**, the Public Hearing closed at 7:31 p.m. All in favor, motion carried

Yes: 7 No: 0

Van Strate said he liked the business plan with retail and residential, and the only concern he had was parking but thought it was a great project.

Nauta said he thought it was a great project and always thought Spring Lake could be a spectacular place and something like this project could do that, so they should not let this opportunity go by. **Nauta** said he thought they needed to be careful with parking and try a few things out before it was decided there needed to be a lot of paving.

Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if permission was needed to plant trees in the MDOT right of way. **Howland** said that anything that you see, all permanent structures, in the MDOT right of way would have had to have been approved by them. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** said, on a personal note, that she wanted to remind everyone that there were a lot of small business owners in the Village that have put their hearts and souls and a lot of money into their businesses, so she wanted to recognize them for their fantastic efforts. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** said this project would stand on the shoulders of those efforts and it was not a rebirth of Spring Lake, which was already doing well and in a lot of ways a more exciting place than ever and she hoped this was the next step in making it a more impressive destination.

Martinus said he appreciated all the positive comments and he saw this as a great first step in a positive direction and that he thought this was a wonderful project. **Martinus** also said he hoped that the developers were taking advantage of all the grant monies that were available and getting the support from the Village to get those monies.

Johnson said he also appreciated everyone coming to the meeting and that he, like Mr. Powers had mentioned, liked the initial design, he would like communication and collaboration open so that the community, Planning Commission and Village Council were all up to speed on the progress. **Johnson** also said that the parking was an issue and that he agreed with Mr. Faubel that pedestrian safety was very important and key in the Master Plan. **Johnson** said on the point of the landscaping, a lot of communities, including the Village, use pots to increase the vegetation and to avoid just brick and siding. **Johnson** said he really liked the walking mall idea even though it would cause more parking issues. **Johnson** said it looked good and was exciting.

Bohnhoff said that, as someone who lives downtown, this was amazing and he was excited to see this come even though parking would be a struggle. **Bohnhoff** said the whole mall concept was amazing and would encompass the whole customer safety on the back side and they should continue with their vision or goal. **Bohnhoff** asked if **Howland** thought MDOT would have issues with the balconies. **Howland** said she would not predict what MDOT would say about the balconies, but it was very common to have projecting signs, balconies, awnings and sometimes even partial building facades in a street right of way. **Howland** said that Grand Haven had a lot of them and were reviewed but the City Council on a regular basis. **Howland** said this was a different agency, but they work well with them and would help the applicant communicate their requests. **Bohnhoff** asked what the Village would do for the pocket park. **Howland** said the pocket park was a more straight forward process because it would be Village Council approving those kinds of encroachments.

Kauckeck said, first, he would like to commend Ms. Van Kampen for her investment into the Village of Spring Lake, and second, they were looking at a concept right now and did not have a final set of drawings for these buildings. **Kauckeck** said there were a lot of things to be worked out before this actually came to fruition, like exterior colors, materials, where brick had to be, per the ordinance, and parking was an issue with the proposed minimum of 10 sites. **Kauckeck** asked if general parking was used for these sites, what were they going to do if the next business that came to town also wanted general parking. **Kauckeck** said it was important to cut down on the footprints as new construction was built and shared that Copenhagen, by the year 2025, would be the first green country in Europe, having more bicycles and foot paths then they would have automobiles and that was the direction we were going. **Kauckeck** said, at this point in time, conceptually, does the Planning Commission want this to go forward to Council, recognizing the items that had been talked about to be looked at, and if so, there was a draft motion he would like the Commissioners to look over. **Kauckeck** asked if, the Planning Commission was in agreement with this proposed

motion, to read it out loud so that those in attendance could hear what was being sent to Council for consideration.

Howland said she wanted to clarify that the Planning Commission held the authority to approve the special use permit and site plan, and that the conditions that they were reading through were related to the parking agreement, because there was no private parking provided, encroachments in the right of way and the moving of the lot line to close up the three foot gap between the buildings. **Howland** said she wanted to paint a picture of what it might look like if Council approved moving the lot line because the building itself would change somewhat if the three-foot gap was filled in.

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Bohnhoff**, to approve the request for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review for a restaurant, retail, and ten (10) residential dwelling units above the first floor (Epicurean Village) located at 106, 108, and 110 West Savidge Street, Permanent Parcel Numbers 70-03-15-382-007, 70-03-15-382-026, 70-03-15-382-025, and 70-03-15-382-009, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Approval by the Village Council to enter into a joint parking plan with the applicant, which would include dedication of the nine (9) parking spaces immediately south of Village Hall.
- b. Approval by the Village Council (west property line) and MDOT (north property line) to allow encroachments into the right-of-way (balconies and awnings).
- c. The gap between the proposed building and Village Hall must be eliminated, likely via a lot line adjustment and expansion of the proposed Epicurean building three (3) additional feet to the east.
- d. An exception is hereby granted to the landscaping requirements of Section 16B.7 of the Zoning Ordinance concerning the side and rear property lines.
- e. The full storm water retention requirement is hereby waived.
- f. The building design must comply with the Design Standards of the CBD-1 District, including no vertical siding.
- g. The project shall be built in compliance with the submitted site plan and elevation drawings.
- h. The applicant will comply with any other local, state, and federal laws, including revisions required by the Fire Chief and Village Engineer.
- i. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.

VanLeeuwen-Vega asked if the Planning Commission could approve, as a special exception, the vertical siding. **Howland** said that the developers would have to choose materials that comply with the ordinance. **Kaucheck** asked who would handle approval of the windows on the first building that did not comply with the ordinance. **Howland** said that, in this case, since they were trying to preserve a portion of an older building, it was reasonable for the Planning Commission to approve that as part of the elevations that they would be approving but she did not know how they would treat the three-foot gap. **Kaucheck** was concerned that the Planning Commission would not see the final plans if they approved the plans now and asked if they could

request that they see the plans another time before they were finalized. **Howland** said that she would recommend then, that they give feedback now and not approve the plan and ask the developers to come back for approval. **Howland** said that if the plan was approved, any minor changes would be approved by the Zoning Administrator, but major changes would come back to the Planning Commission. **Howland** said that she wanted to make sure that the Planning Commission was 100% comfortable with the design that was going to be built and the developers were prepared to come back if the Planning Commission wanted them too. **Kauck** said he would really like them to come back to see the final design.

Van Strate said the plan was meeting all the ordinances and that he didn't think they needed to micromanage the project. **Johnson** said he wouldn't mind seeing the plan again, but he was good with approving it now. **Nauta** said he could go either way too but didn't have a problem with approving it now.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7 No: 0

6. DISCUSSION

A. Accessory Buildings on Waterfront Lots: The Planning Commission will begin a discussion about a potential text amendment concerning accessory buildings on waterfront lots

Howland explained that she had received a request from a person that lived on Spring Lake with a waterfront lot that would like to put a detached accessory building on the street side of their property, which was not permitted. **Howland** said that she had discussed this with the Zoning Administrator and they agreed that it made sense to take a look at amending this Ordinance.

The Planning Commission discussed this item and agreed an amendment to this Ordinance was worth researching.

7. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Parker Penny, 210 S. Cutler, and Robert Mersereau, 317 Lakeview, said as short-term rental hosts, they were looking forward to working with the Village on amending the ordinance and that they had a couple suggestions that they felt would improve the functionality of the Short-Term Rental Ordinance.

Darcy Dye, 114 N. Fruitport Rd, said that she had discovered that the Noxious Weed Ordinance had some factually incorrect information and wondered if it would be helpful to put together some materials that correct the information and to make some landscaping suggestions that would move in the direction of Michigan native wild flowers that could be used generally in public spaces. Dye asked what time frame

they were looking at for amendments. **Howland** said they would be working over the next year. Planning Commission appreciated Dye's offer and were very happy to have her gather the information to correct the information.

Elizabeth King, 17212 Benjamin St., said that when they went through their home buying process they had a lot of questions and they didn't know who to ask so she wondered if the Village worked with realtors to provide education for Village home buyers. **Howland** explained that she received calls from realtor's all the time asking questions regarding properties that were up for sale, so their realtor should be able to tell her what jurisdiction their home was in. **Howland** also gave Ms. King other resources for home buyer questions.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, motion by **Bohnhoff**, second from **Martinus**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 7

No: 0

Jennifer Howland, Village Planner

Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk