

ALLENDALE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 20, 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 June 17, 2009 minutes.  
Approve the July 1, 2009 minutes.

Motion made to approve both sets of minutes made by TerHorst. Support by Smit.  
Motion carried 7-0.

3. Public Hearings: (None)

4. Site Plan review:

- A. Review the Final PUD Development Plan of the University Park which is scheduled for public hearing on August 5, 2009.

Mr. Brummel states that the applicant has requested to go into Public Hearing for the Board, so that the public can make any comments about the Final PUD. It is a typical workshop day, but it will be changed to a Public Hearing.

Steve Witte from Nederveld states that since they were here last, they have been in front of the Board, and hopefully the full approval will come next week Monday. They have been waiting for the approval of 12.04, they have submitted the Final PUD to the Township. The plans for the Final PUD will hopefully be sent in the next week. A few plan changes are as follows:

>Text amendment states that there should be 30% green space, and not over 40% building. Campus Crest meets both with 24.2 for building coverage, and 37.1% for green space.

>The clubhouse square footage has changed slightly.

>The temporary leasing trailer will be at the site from the beginning of the construction, until the clubhouse is completed- it will then move to the clubhouse and stay there for the future. There will 1 year maximum for the trailer to be on the premises. It will then be moved from the premises as will the temporary landscaping. There will be a sales banner on the south face of the model.

>The biggest change is that now there is no entry feature, MDOT will not allow it on their property. It may be moved to Stu Becker's property. We would rather not have it there; it would be as close to the M-45 and 48<sup>th</sup> Ave intersection, but not visible from all directions. There are concerns with how it would be maintained- the township mows it now. It is not a make or break deal, but we would like to just not have the sign at all, since there are two other updated signs.

Brummel wonders how the Commission will be looking at the community building- if it's a commercial property or residential. We also have to look at the carports- they need to have a good appearance and be more durable. The sign at 48<sup>th</sup> Ave will work there, the elevations and spaces are clear and it will help the feel of a neighborhood mixed-use development and helps with recognition of the area for potential residents. There will be a crosswalk at University Parkway and Becker Drive- it should be more detailed in all the plans, and stay cohesive. There may be a surety bond for the temporary trailer, to make sure that after the 1 year, it will be removed. We also would like more details on the pocket park.

Mr. Witte states that the concrete will not be stamped in the pocket park, and he can get a blow-up of the landscaping in the park for the Commission.

Knoper states that the community building is considered a commercial building, so he would like to see real brick all the way up to the roof-line. That way it is more durable than siding.

Underhill states that he would prefer it to match the rest of the buildings, and bring in the commercial aspects as well.

The commissioners agree that the carports should be up to the standard of the applicants before them, but no less. It would be nice to have split-faced walls 2ft- half way up to make sure it will hold up for the long term.

Underhill states that the signage may look worse if it in the wrong spot than and should possibly just not have it all.

Brummel states that we don't know what MDOT will do with that lot; it may become a bus pick-up site to help with cost. MDOT did say that if the Township were willing to do that, they may be willing to give the property for that. The identification for the overall area for the PUD will be there in the signage.

Guzicki states that it may not look off, but it will be a-symmetrical, it is not required, and if the money is going to be spent, put it somewhere else in the property. It's not a make or break deal for me.

Mr. Witte states that they could keep the surety bond separate from the water and sewer bond, since there may be different timelines for each.

Guzicki states that she recommends that Mr. Witte look at the sign ordinance, there are no banners allowed in the township.

Knoper states that the compact enclosure shows no landscaping. The Township Board will most likely not have the Preliminary PUD passed, for the August 5 Public Hearing. We don't want you to waste your money on a Public Hearing, if the Board hasn't even passed the PUD.

Mr. Witte states that he will add in the landscaping for the Final PUD. Also, they have already put the money and time into setting up the Public Hearing, so they would prefer to still make Aug. 5 a Public Hearing.

5. New Business:
6. Old Business:
7. Township Board Report. (Ken)

Knoper states that the Board has passed the text amendment, and they are currently looking at the preliminary PUD.

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

Kelly Tabre is a resident of the Allendale Meadows would like Campus Crest to put up stakes to mark off where the fence would go. That way the residents can know exactly how close it will be to their property.

Duane Thomas lives in Winding Creek Circle and has talked to the public about this plan. The message isn't getting through about the development going in, the Commission is only getting one side of the story. When IPA came in, they made sure that the neighbors were well aware of everything that was going on. It doesn't seem that Campus Crest has been that kind to the community of Allendale Meadows.

Obetts states that there were separate mailings to the separate people being affected and if we don't get the response, there's nothing else we can do after that.

Brummel states that if a person opposes a development, it doesn't mean that it doesn't fit the future land use plan and Master Plan. Not many people would rather have a development behind them than an open field.

9. Motion to adjourn made by Smit. Support by Underhill. Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:27PM.

The next meeting is on Wednesday, July 29, 2009 at 7:30 PM.