

ALLENDALE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
December 21, 2009

Members Present: Guzicki, TerHorst, Knoper, Smit, Rozema, Obetts, Underhill

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Brummel

1. Meeting called to order at 7:30PM.
2. Approve the November 16, 2009 minutes.

Motion made to approve minutes made by Smit. Support by Guzicki.
Motion carried 7-0.

3. Public Hearings: (None)
4. Site Plan review:

A. Jemco Logics

Joe made changes to the plan, the northern property on the east side, butts up to residential, and it needs 30ft of frontage, and now it won't work. The requirement is 10 spaces; there was no way to get a 30ft parking setback on the north and the east, nothing worked when we sketched it out. This plan is the new plan, but there is no curbing in the plan, it would be straight 6in curb or sidewalk turn-down. Because we're coming back with something very different than what was talked about before, I thought Mr. Brummel would be able to figure out the rest of the details later. There is an accessory building that would be brick and siding, with asphalt shingled roof- at this point there are no plans drawn up for the building. There is no sign shown, and if the owner wanted it at a later date, he would come back to have it approved. The lighting will be down-lights attached to the building. The sidewalk would go around the handicapped parking. The requirement is for 15ft greenbelt for the residential, and no parking lot within the first 30ft. There is some asphalt in the northern part, but it is access to the dumpster, not parking lot. There will be 75ft between the building and the residential- we can do all the asphalt within 45ft, but it may look like we are going over the 30ft setback on the residential, with the asphalt for the garbage enclosure. With almost every other plan drawn up, the only way for the trash truck to get out of the property, is to back out onto the street. This plan is the one that allows the truck to turn around on the property.

Brummel states that Eric Apol is asking for front yard parking, with 24.07.c.1.A in mind. The entire plan is based on that approach. All items on the Staff Report ;up to M, 1-6 have been covered in submittal, except for the irrigation- which will be talked about later. Item S deals with a free-standing sign- he doesn't have to have a free-standing sign out front. C-6 will have to be amended for compliance with front-yard parking. I believe that the spruce trees comply with the ordinance.

When you consider the entire square foot of the building to be office, it would require 10 spaces- in fact it would be required to have less than 10 spaces if there was residential counted also. There is no requirement to have 1 parking space per employee- that would be for banks and that sort of thing.

Underhill doesn't believe that this office use is one of the uses that the front-yard parking ordinance was written for, and this is an exception to the ordinance.

Guzicki states that she wants the playing field to be level, and we have been very strict with the ordinances with new construction, and we are letting pre-existing properties get away with not upholding the ordinances, since it isn't convenient.

Brummel states that no matter where we move the parking, there will be issues with the trash trucks. By allowing front parking on this site, you are in a sense saying that there is a variance being given to make the scenario work better. The structure is non-conforming when it comes to certain areas of the ordinance. The building height most likely doesn't comply with the ordinance, and the landscaping plan needs to be changed- so there will need to be more requirements for those items.

Knoper states that we re-zoned the property to become an office building, but we never guaranteed that this property would work under the ordinances for office spaces.

The Commission discusses the pros and cons of allowing front-yard parking:

Reasons this use of the building (office building) best functions with front-yard parking

- ~Re-use of an existing structure
- ~Applicant has displayed that there are no other options-
- ~Significant trees to south and east would stay
- ~Back yard for existing rental properties- for kids play area
- ~Best design for public safety vehicles
- ~Not on them-45 corridor

Reasons this use of the building does not best function with front-yard parking

- ~Not critical for health and well-being of public
- ~Self-created hardship
- ~Doesn't meet height or landscaping
- ~Not consistent with prior Planning Commission applicants- i.e.: Mr. Burger

Motion made by Underhill to approve front yard parking with the conditions: this is an existing facility that the applicant is trying to update, the planner has exhausted all other options, this is the most workable-user friendly lay out, it is not on M-45 corridor, an existing use across the street also has front yard parking, for the public safety access, it functions and works better, and in 24.07.c.1.A there are exceptions to the front parking rule. Support by Knoper. Motion carried 4-3.

Items to be ironed-out from Staff Report:

~The new construction should be current with the existing ordinances, and existing structure (out-building and dumpster enclosure).

~The lighting should be more detailed

~Deal with dimension and landscape plans

~Can we meet the 30ft setback for the residential?

Joe states that he can meet the 30ft setback with 10 parking spaces and no asphalt.

B. University Park Final PUD Development.

Steve Witte from Nederveld states that the Preliminary PUD is in front of the Board, and there will be a Public Hearing at the end of this month. We are trying to keep things moving by submitting the Final PUD. The plan has improvements that we would like to be tied in with the 14 acres when sold and developed.

Improvements:

Add sidewalks, add cross-walks, add more trees, signage up to a maximum of 200 square feet in both locations.

Brummel wonders if the term village gets put back in because of the Public Hearing- it is hard to act on it now since the Board has not acted on the wordage yet.

Knoper states that he feels that the Board will go along with what the Planning Commission has sent along. But after the Public Hearing, they may change their minds. Should we be asking for these things to be done when any part of this lot is developed? That would help set a standard, for any future developments, with the exception of Alaskan Pipeline.

Brummel states that if the wording is changed, it would apply to any amount of property that is sold- part or whole. We can amend the section to say that the improvements would be done to the south, when any piece of land to the south of Becker Dr. is developed. When any of the North or West side of Becker Dr. property is developed, the improvements would be done on the North side.

The sign size will be approved tonight- and the size and materials should possibly be submitted with Site-Plan review and the Planning Commission would have a say in what it looks like.

Motion made to approve by Guzicki- if the Board approves the Univeristy Park Final PUD sheet P1a dated 12-14-09 as crafted. With two conditions:
1) Signage identified in notes- any changes would be part of a Site Plan Review
2) Improvements in University Park (lights, trees, sidewalks) have two exceptions: Any improvements to south of Becker Dr. done with development of property to south of Becker Dr.
Any Improvements to north or west of Becker Dr. changed with development of property to north or west of Becker Dr.
If the ordinance in front of the Board is changed to include word "village," then come back in front of the Commission.
Support Smit. Motion carried 7-0.

5. New Business:

A. Master Plan review discussion.

There was a folder handed out to the Commissioners to be taken to each meeting. There will be discussion at the next meeting.

There will be an invitation sent out to the schools for students to come and hear what is happening with our community- it gives us an idea of what the younger generation is looking for in our community.

6. Old Business:

A. Ordinance housekeeping proposals discussed at earlier meetings need the go ahead to schedule public hearings.

There is a go ahead from all Commission members for Brummel to schedule public hearings.

7. Township Board Report. (Ken)

8. Public concerns and comments concerning items not on the agenda.

9. Meeting adjourned at 9:21PM.

The next meeting is on January 18, 2010 at 7:30 PM.