



**VILLAGE OF SPRING LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
February 26, 2019 7:00 PM**

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Kaucheck, Martinus, Nauta, Van Leeuwen-Vega, and VanStrate.

Absent: Bohnhoff and Johnson

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by **Van Strate**, second from **Martinus**, to approve the agenda as presented.
All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: January 22, 2019 regular meeting

Motion by **VanLeeuwen-Vega**, second from **Martinus**, to approve the minutes from the January 22, 2019 regular meeting with a typo correction of the word "what" to "want". All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Epicurean Village: The Planning Commission will consider a request for an amended Special Use Permit for residential dwellings above the first floor and rooftop dining (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.

Chairman **Kaucheck** introduced this item and asked **Howland** if she had anything to add.

Howland gave an overview of the amended Special Use Permit which included the following amendments for dwellings above the first floor and rooftop dining and amended site plan for the proposed restaurant and other commercial uses;

- The building will shift east to meet up with Village Hall
- 10 condos will now be 12 residential rental units
- Dining areas on the second floor will now be office space
- The rooftop terrace will be for restaurant patrons (rooftop dining) as well as for residents
- The parking analysis has been updated to reflect the increase in residential units and the addition of the office space. The current demand is 74 spaces; the proposed demand is 87 spaces. The approved plans called for a proposed demand for 98 spaces.
- The southern parking/loading/dumpster area has been modified. There is no request for dedication of public parking spaces for private use in this submittal.

Howland also noted that a few minor items were required to be changed on the proposed plans, including swapping out cement board siding for precast stone on the first floor, providing the minimum amount of public access to the building, and adding landscape planters along the south elevation.

Motion by **Martinus**, second by **Nauta**, to open the Public Hearing at 7:07 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

Ken Brandsen and Lee Vander Meulen, Project Managers with Progressive AE, explained the changes outlined and shared new drawings that showed the north, south, east and west elevation changes to the architecture from what was shared at the September 2018 meeting, such as rental apartments instead condo's and going from the look of 3 buildings to 2 buildings.

Kaucheck asked if the layout provided on paper was the same as the slides that were being shown. Mr. Brandsen said they were, but they were from 2 different systems. **Kaucheck** asked for clarification on what was shown on the second and third floors. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** said the windows were also different. Mr. Brandsen said the views were at slightly different angles. **Howland** pointed out to Mr. Brandsen the difference is the windows. Mr. Brandsen explained that the paper copies were the most current renderings and the windows were in the mansard roof and only decorative, not functional. **Kaucheck** asked why the mansard roof stopped where it did on the west elevation. Mr. Brandsen said that it stopped at the end of the brick where it transitioned to the dark masonry. **Van Strate** asked if the rooftop dining was covered or open. Mr. Brandsen said that it

will open dining. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked what the reduction in square footage was and why they took the building from the look of 3 facades down to 2. Mr. Brandsen said the square footage had not changed much and the change in the façade was an updated design choice. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if the change from 10 condos to 12 residential rental units was intended to go from resident owned to resident rented? Mr. Brandsen said that was correct. **Kauckeck** asked for clarification on the roof top area and what he was actually looking at. Mr. Brandsen explained that it was all open and the wall that he was seeing was the wall for the restrooms and stairway.

Howland went over the conditions from her staff report.

Nauta asked what was driving the switch from condos to rental apartments and if they would be short-term? Mr. Brandsen said that the goal, when looking at the pro forma and the return on investment, suggested that apartments would be a better option at this time and they would be year around. **Van Strate** asked for clarification on the reduction in parking spaces needed. **Howland** said that the parking demands were reduced based on their changes to the floor plan. **Nauta** asked if the winter parking had been resolved for residents. **Howland** said that it had not been worked out yet but would need to be resolved before they received any permits to construct. **Kauckeck** asked how the residents get out to their outdoor terrace on the 3rd floor. Mr. Brandsen said there would be doors to go to either rooftop terrace. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if the patrons of the restaurant's outdoor dining would be able to see the resident's side of the terrace. Mr. Brandsen said they were working on a barrier and considering a green wall. **Howland** confirmed that there would be some sort of access that would keep the restaurant patrons from going onto the residential side. Mr. Brandsen said there would be a separation. **Kauckeck** said that the height of the building appeared to be higher than was allowed. **Howland** said that when she measured the drawing, the mean height was 45 feet.

Darcey Dye, 114 N Fruitport Road, said that she was excited about this development and as the Adopt a Garden facilitator she wanted to say that standing water on Savidge Street this winter had been an issue that they do need to pay attention to rain water and overflow from parking and make sure that all of that need in the downtown area was taken care of and that landscaping was important to absorb extra rain and vehicular water so that negotiating away some of those landscape spaces because of parking issues may not be in the best interest long term for the downtown.

Lazaro Vega, 718 Fall, asked the Developers if they were considering LEED Certification. Mr. Brandsen said that, in their opinion, most of the building and energy codes have adopted those as standard, so in their industry, LEED was a benchmark and embedded into a lot of requirements, so they were seeing less and less of their clients choosing to go through that process. Mr. Brandsen said they

were cognizant of those standards, but this project was not anticipated to be a formal LEED project.

There was no other public comment.

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Van Strate**, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:05 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

Planning Commission was happy with the plans and felt this was a very good opportunity for the Village and looked forward to the project's completion.

Motion **Martinus**, second from **Nauta**, to approve the request for an amended Special Use Permit for residential dwellings above the first floor and rooftop dining and a site plan review for 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 to meet the parking requirements for the project.
- b. A lot line adjustment must be approved between the subject property and Village Hall to eliminate the gap between the buildings.
- c. An exception is hereby granted to the landscaping requirements of Section 390-163 of the Zoning Ordinance concerning the side and rear property lines.
- d. The full storm water retention requirement is hereby waived.
- e. The building design must comply with the Design Standards of the CBD-1 District, including no cement board siding on the first floor and public access at appropriate intervals.
- f. The project shall be built in compliance with the submitted site plan and elevation drawings, with the exception of items noted by the plan review dated February 14, 2019 and acknowledged by the applicant's response dated February 20, 2019.
- g. The applicant will comply with any other local, state, and federal laws, including revisions required by the Fire Chief and Village Engineer.
- h. The applicant will comply with all verbal representations.

All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

- B. Barrett Boat Works:** The Planning Commission will consider a request for an amended Special Use Permit and development in the Waterfront Overlay District for a new boat storage building and parking lot at Barrett Boat

Works, located at 813 and 901 West Savidge Street, Permanent Parcel Numbers 70-03-16-476-007 and 70-03-476-004.

Chairman **Kauckeck** asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing.

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Van Leeuwen-Vega**, the Public Hearing opened at 7:42 pm. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

Howland asked to give an overview as to why they did not have plans and explained that a Public Hearing had been noticed for this project and they wanted to collect comment from the public and that staff had been working with the applicant on revisions to the plans and had meetings and communications but were not able to get plans to the Commission in time. **Howland** said they wanted to honor the Public Hearing and give the applicant an opportunity to share their plans and bring the Commission up to date and share the primary concerns with the plan review.

Andrew Rossell, Civil Engineer for Milanowski and Englert, 403 Oak St, Spring Lake, MI, distributed the original and current preliminary site plan to the Planning Commission so they could compare the revisions. Mr. Rossell explained that Barrett's was looking to expand their operation with a boat storage facility on the former DeLass property, adjacent to the existing ships store, and add a parking lot between the transmission shop and the tattoo shop. Mr. Rossell explained that the proposed boat storage building was approximately 21,000 feet and the sole purpose was to help Barrett's clean up their site by providing winter boat storage and a catchall for equipment in the summer. Mr. Rossell explained that the proposed parking lot was needed for relief during heavy summer use times, but they were sensitive to the fact that they were crossing the bike path 2 times, so for the layout of the parking lot and pedestrian safety, they divided it into 2 one-way lanes and propose to reconstruct the bike path in that whole area and add signage. **Nauta** asked what happens to the storm water. Mr. Rossell said that right now the existing stormwater discharged into the lake, so they planned on installing a stormwater treatment device to treat the water before it was discharged into Barrett's existing stormwater system. Mr. Rossell shared the drawings of the storage building and said the average setback on the north elevation along the bike path was 10 feet and that they had originally proposed the overhead door access through the north, crossing the bike path at that point, but staff had recommended that they consider access on the west elevation instead. Mr. Rossell said having access on the west presented several problems for Barrett's, such as interrupting parking and traffic's ingress and egress and would still cross the bike path, so for these reasons, they did not feel a west entrance would be feasible, so as an alternative suggested that the best option for them, would be to have the access on the east wall at the north east corner. **Kauckeck** asked to have the height of the building explained. Mr. Rossell explained the roof line at

eave height would be 41 feet and the peak 42 feet 7 inches with a solar array on top that would take it to 44 feet, 9 inches, which was 3 inches less than the maximum height allowed in that district. Mr. Rossell said they had received suggestions for the façade and layout of the building from staff and were now looking for the Planning Commission's recommendations. **Kauck** said that, as they all recognize, was one of the main entrances into the Village, so a warehouse, looking like a warehouse, was not conducive to the entrance to the Village or anywhere along Savidge Street. Mr. Rossell shared the south elevation where they incorporated glass and varied materials to breakup the expansive warehouse look. **Kauck** said that he sees what they have done on the lower portion of the building, but the upper portion still looked like a warehouse to him. Mr. Rossell said that Barrett's was very willing to work with the Village to enhance this area and still make the building functional for them. **Nauta** asked if there was room for landscaping in the front. Mr. Rossell said it was a zero-lot line but shared the proposed landscaping plan for the east and north elevations from Landscaper, Mike Rose. **Kauck** asked if they were planning on rack storage and how many boats would be stored. Chuck Harloff, Barrett Boat Works, said that their plan was to store 140 boats on racks for winter storage with no in-and-out service from this building. Mr. Harloff explained that their exterior appearance was equally as important to them as it was to the Village and to have the building be functional as well as aesthetically pleasing so they were proposing glass panels in 3 different sections and possibly step them on the corners and then stack desirable boats from floor to ceiling on racks inside near the windows, that would be backlit to see them at night. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if their intent was to match the other building. Mr. Harloff said their intent was to have the new building complimentary to the other. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if they would be amenable to a different design that could incorporate some of the same materials in places so that it felt like a companion to the other building. Mr. Harloff said that they would, that it was very important to them that, as the face of their business and the face of the Village as you enter, to be attractive. **Nauta** asked what material were planned for the front. Mr. Harloff said the front was stone down low with panels of glass and the rest would be metal siding running vertically and horizontally which matched the theme of the ships store and sales offices. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if they had seen the drawings that had been suggested by staff as options. Mr. Harloff said they had taken a look at them and put their builder to task to come up with something that was attractive but fit the same theme as the building next door. **Kauck** asked what they would use the building for in the summer. Mr. Harloff said they would store mobile racks, 20 or 30 boats, that don't launch for one reason or another, and boat trailers, but the main use would be winter storage. **Kauck** commented that fork lifts would not be running back and forth then. Mr. Harloff said correct, they would not. **Martinus** asked if there wasn't a better use for prime real estate than winter boat storage. Mr. Harloff said that boating was very popular in this port, that there was a premium on being in this port because they provided a wonderful atmosphere, nice community to visit, great storage rates and skilled professionals to fix their boats, so it was more than storage. **Kauck** asked how many spaces were planned for the parking lot. Mr. Rossell said that after working

with staff, they came up with 41 spaces. **Van Leeuwern-Vega** asked if the circulation pattern was typical. Mr. Rossell said you could argue either way, but it was designed to get entering traffic in before the exiting traffic to create less of a conflict because 99% of the traffic came from the east. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** asked if they would take a look at that design to make sure it was the safest way for traffic. Mr. Rossell said that they would.

Angela Stanford-Butler, DDA Director for the Village of Spring Lake, 15386 Oak Point Dr., said she was very excited for their project and asked that, because boats were very expensive, the applicant look at their project like they were a high-end auto dealer or something to that effect, not just boat storage, so that when people came into our town, it would catch their attention because it would say that people with very valuable possessions put their trust in them and at the same time showing that our Village was a place where people that have the ability to buy these items and care about them and care about our community were there. Stanford-Butler asked that they keep in mind that the look should be as dramatic during the day as it was at night since most of the traffic was during the day.

Lazaro Vega, 718 Fall, asked Mr. Rossell to elaborate on how the second design interrupted the way they wanted to use the building. Mr. Rossell said that pontoon boats were flooding in, so they designed the building to stack pontoon boats 4 high on one of the sides of the building, but they might find they need them on two sides, so if the roof was rounded it would bring the side walls down to accommodate the height limits which would take away the upper tier and add another \$350,000 to the cost. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** said they were not locked into the rounded roof design, and there were other elements that could be integrated that would not add a much greater cost. **Kauckeck** suggested that a mansard roof and dormers could be added at the top, similar to what the Epicurean Village was doing. **Kauckeck** said they were not asking for the Taj Mahal, they were just asking that it not look like a storage facility. Mr. Rossell said they feel the same way and that he was up for the challenge to create something that was attractive and functional. **Martinius** said he liked the idea of Barrett's bringing multiple designs to the next meeting. **Kauckeck** discussed the pro's and cons of the location of the access door. **Howland** said that she understood that the door on the west would not work for Barrett's, but staff was worried about the building being so close to the path on the north, that when the door was opened for exiting and pulling out, they would not be able to see anyone on the path until they were onto it. **Howland** said they would have to figure out the safest way with mirrors and flashing lights. Mr. Rossell said that Lukas Hill had suggested, as an alternative, that they not cross the bike path at a perpendicular fashion, but instead, move the door to the east wall at the far north end so that any traffic that crosses the bike path will be brought parallel before it crossed perpendicular to the open area so when Barrett staff pull out they will have a full line of sight with people on the path.

Darcy Dye, 114 N Fruitport Rd., explained that the Village was in the process of replanting the landscape spaces with Michigan native plants because they were

ideally suited for this area and require much less water during the drought times of summer and are good plants for absorbing the lead, mercury and oil runoff from the vehicular traffic. Ms. Dye also explained that arborvitae was not a Michigan native and does not grow well in sandy soil or like being planted next to buildings where there was hot reflection. Ms. Dye encouraged the applicant to work with Village staff on getting plants that were suited for those landscaped areas and to do more landscaping in pocket areas. Mr. Rossell said they were open minded on the landscape and would have Mike Rose modify his plan to include Michigan native plants.

Howland suggested the applicant bring 2 architectural designs back to the Planning Commission's next meeting. Mr. Rossell said that the Planning Commission and staff had given them a lot of input, so they would go back to the drawing board to implement the suggestions, but they would also like a clear direction on the parking lot. **Kauck** said the parking lot was down to the landscaping. **Van Leeuwen-Vega** added that they take a look at the traffic flow too. Mr. Rossell said they also needed Planning Commission's position on the door location. **Howland** said the staff preferred the north east rather than the north.

Andrew Dull, DDA member, 114 W Savidge St., suggested that if the applicant come back with the mind set of benefiting the Village with their design, they would go a long way and also encouraged the applicant to revisit who they were as a brand and not to reflect on a 22-year-old building, but what was Barrett's brand for 2019.

Motion by **Nauta**, second from **Van Strate**, the Public Hearing was closed at 8:46 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

Ron **Bultje**, Village Attorney, explained to the Planning Commission that there were no specific architectural requirements in the Zoning Ordinance, but the Special Land Use Standards, Waterfront Overlay Standards and Site Plan Standards all talk significantly about the appearance, the compatibility and the purpose of the building, so the Planning Commission was operating from a position of strength and the applicant was to be congratulated on the atmosphere, attitude and flexibility shown tonight and they were on the right track.

Motion **Nauta**, second from **Martinus**, to table this discussion until the next Planning Commission meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5 No: 0

6. PRESENTATION: Workforce Housing (Ryan Kilpatrick, Housing Next)

Ryan Kilpatrick, Housing Next, explained that Housing Next was created to support, develop and implement a range of impact solutions that improve lives and create stronger communities. Mr. Kilpatrick went through his presentation and explained the opportunities Housing Next had to offer the Village.

7. STATEMENTS OF CITIZENS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no statements from citizens.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, motion by **Martinus**, second from **Nauta**, the meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 5

No: 0

Jennifer Howland, Village Planner

Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk