

APPROVED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 27, 2018, 7:30 P.M.
COMMISSION CHAMBERS

- A. Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
- B. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Pemberton.
- C. Roll Call:
Members Present: Bill Benoit, Garrett Fox, Sandra Jones, Ed Kape, Timothy Little, Mike Pemberton, Monica Sparks
Members Absent: Dan Holtrop (with notification)
Others Present: Mayor Stephen Kepley, Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier, Planning Intern James Kilborn, the applicants and about 10 residents.

Motion by Kape, supported by Sparks, to excuse Holtrop from the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Holtrop absent -

- D. Approval of the Minutes and Findings of Fact

Motion by Commissioner Benoit, supported by Commissioner Fox, to approve the Minutes of November 13, 2018

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Holtrop absent -

- E. Approval of the Agenda

Jones stated we will make one adjustment to the agenda reverse Case #31-18 and Case #32-18 and allow Case#32-18 first under public hearings.

Motion by Commissioner Pemberton, supported by Commissioner Sparks, to approve the agenda for the November 27, 2018 meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Holtrop absent -

- F. Acknowledge visitors wishing to speak to non-agenda items.

There was no public comment.

- G. Old Business

There was no Old Business

H. Public Hearing

Case#32-18 - Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Relating to the prohibition on marijuana establishments and facilities

Schweitzer stated the request involves proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance text that relate to the zoning provisions for marijuana establishments and facilities.

Schweitzer stated On November 6, 2018 the voters in the State of Michigan approved the adoption of IL 1 of 2018, the Michigan Regulation and Taxation of Marihuana Act (MRTMA). In essence, the MRTMA legalizes at the state level (not federal) the recreational use and possession of marihuana. In addition, the MRTMA sets out a regulatory process to permit and license certain types of “marihuana establishments” (i.e., growers, safety compliance facilities, processors, microbusinesses, retailers and secure transporters). The MRTMA does not replace those laws and regulations already in place in Michigan involving the medical use of marihuana (including the establishment of marihuana facilities under the Medical Marihuana Facilities Licensing Act, Act 281 of 2016 “MMFLA”).

Under the MMFLA, in order to allow medical marihuana facilities to be established within a community, the community needs to affirmatively adopt an ordinance to this effect (i.e., it must “opt in”; recently, the City of Grand Rapids did precisely this). The MRTMA, however, is fundamentally different and requires that if a community wishes to prohibit the establishment and operation of (recreational) marihuana establishments within the community, the community must adopt an ordinance to this effect (i.e., it must “opt out”). In other words, if a community does not opt out then (recreational) marihuana establishments can be located and licensed by the state within that community.

Consistent with how the City has treated medical marihuana facilities, and at the direction of the Mayor’s office, two proposed ordinance amendments have been prepared that would prohibit marihuana establishments in the City. The first is a regulatory ordinance adopted by the Kentwood City Commission on November 12, 2018 that amended Chapter 26 of the City Code (Business Regulations). Specifically, it added a new article 9 to define marihuana establishments and facilities as referred to above and prohibited the establishment of either within the City. It also preserve the rights of patients and caregivers under the Medical Marihuana Act from 2008. The second ordinance is a companion amendment to the Zoning Ordinance which would replace the current prohibition on medical marihuana dispensaries with a general prohibition on marihuana establishments and medical marihuana facilities.

Mayor Kepley was present. He gave an overview of why the City is prohibiting marijuana establishments in the City of Kentwood. He stated otherwise if someone applies to have a marijuana establishment in Kentwood they would be able to as long as they meet the requirements from the State. He stated Kentwood had to opt out because if we didn’t, then anything could have happened. He stated there are a lot of questions yet to be answered. He stated we need to take our time and understand what are the rules that will be enforced and by

whom. He stated there have been issues in Colorado and California. Mayor stated one of the issues is environmental impact of growing cannabis in a State. He stated another concern is, if there are some interior growers, what chemicals are they going to use which could now go into the waste water treatment facility. He stated he has had conversations with Grand Rapids and Wyoming regarding what they have done to study the byproducts of the marijuana industry relative to waste water treatment and they haven't studied it yet. Mayor stated we want to be cautious and we want to find out what are the rules and who is going to enforce it before we open the door. He stated we want to make sure we are not making decisions that we are going to be paying for in the future, there are so many unknowns.

Jones opened the public hearing.

There was no public comment.

Motion by Pemberton, supported by Sparks, to close the public hearing.

- Motion Carried (6-0) –
- Holtrop absent –

Fox questioned if this is set up in such a way that Kentwood could restrict growth to indoor facilities. Mayor stated we can do whatever we would like to do to open the door. Mayor stated it is concern with interior growers of what is actually being used that will be actually flushed into the sewer systems. Fox suggested Kentwood could ban certain chemicals. Mayor stated now we are getting into what are the rules and who is going to enforce them. Mayor stated any City that opts in probably won't see any State funding that would be paid for this industry. He questioned who is going to regulate what is being flushed down the drains. Fox stated he thinks if Kentwood has concerns about certain chemicals we should be able to say you can't use these chemicals. Mayor questioned who would enforce it. Fox stated if you are found to be using these chemicals then you lose your State license.

Fox questioned if there is a timeline in place to get the questions answered. Mayor said we have no idea yet. Fox stated without a timeline he doesn't see us as being proactive enough. Mayor stated he is concerned and doesn't think we are losing out on anything. Fox stated he feels that a lot of the concerns can be addressed through regulation. Fox stated Kentwood has the ability to do that. Fox stated Kentwood could also set the zoning district that we would like to have these marijuana businesses in. Fox stated a lot of the concerns are just on regulation, there is still a process of getting approved by the State, Inspections etc. and then it takes months to fix up a building to start growing. Fox stated he feels there is plenty of time for the City to do what we need to do. Fox stated he wants to make sure that Kentwood is not putting ourselves in a position to not continue to have the conversation. Fox stated he would rather be in the position where we are forced to have the conversation so we can say this is what we want and this is what we don't want and then leave it alone.

Benoit stated he likes the idea we opt out because of the unknowns. He stated we can always opt in later when we have a better understanding of the specific issues.

Little stated he has seen many times State government has rushed into innovative procedures and processes and after a few years finds out that it wasn't the solution. Therefore he expressed support looking at this a little longer and studying the implications.

Pemberton stated the voters spoke and were in favor of this but he thinks it is a wise move at this point to opt out and let things settle.

Kape stated he agrees with letting the dust settle and seeing where everything lands.

Sparks stated she understands the economic impact it can make on our City. She stated we don't know all the ramifications and thinks this is a good idea for now to opt out and wait and see what happens. However, she also stressed the need to keep the conversation open.

Jones stated she is also in favor of taking a pause. She stated it will be 18-24 months before they have rules. She stated it will take a long time before we know what the State regulations are going to be and it is wise for the City to hit the pause button.

Motion by Benoit, supported by Pemberton, to recommend to the City Commission amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to - Relating to the Prohibition on Marihuana Establishments and Facilities per Schweitzer's memo dated 11-16-18.

- Motion Carried (6-1)
- Fox opposed -

Case#31-18 – Aloft Hotel by Marriott – Special Land Use and Site Plan review for a Hotel
Located at 4316 Sparks Drive

Golder stated the site is 2.25 acres, is zoned commercial and was once part of a former outdoor waterpark called Splash (later AJ's) Water Park. The Park was redeveloped into CarMax and Residence Inn. The site has access off Sparks Drive, which was not constructed until the development of the Residential Planned Unit Development that includes Clark Retirement Community, Forest Meadows Condominiums, and Christ Community Church.

Golder stated they are proposing a 105 room 4 story hotel. She stated the elevation to the site rises to the east. The applicant has indicated that the ground floor of the proposed hotel is at 782 feet. She stated the hotel is 52 feet in height. She stated the proposed hotel part of their branding is a decorative roof structure that increases the height of the building to approximately 59 feet. Section 8.03 B of the zoning ordinance limits building height in the C-2 zone to 3 stories or 45 feet, whichever is lower. She stated if the commercial property abuts any residential district, building height would be limited to two stories or 30 feet. A variance is required to exceed these height requirements.

Golder stated the variances they are going to need are:

*They are proposing parking in the 35 foot front yard setback they will be going to the Zoning Board of Appeals

* the height of the building to approximately 59 feet

* there is a 25 foot greenbelt that is required along the front. She stated they have proposed a 16 foot driveway along the front and fire needs access along all the sides, they will want the drive to be 20 feet. They will also need a variance on the 20 foot setback required when you have a hotel adjacent to a residential property.

*A 10 foot separation from the parking lot to the property line that would require a variance. She stated the applicant has indicated they are negotiating with Carmax to get the 10 feet so they wouldn't need the variance.

Golder stated special land use is permitted if you meet all the requirements of the zoning ordinance. She stated most of the special land use standards are fine.

A. Be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance, with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that a use will not change the essential character of the area in which it is proposed.

The 2012 Master Plan recommended Mixed Use Residential and Commercial for this site and the overall site that now includes CarMax and the Residence Inn. The proposed use is generally considered a commercial use. Golder stated she thinks this is appropriate for the area in terms of the use.

D. Not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, electrical or electromagnetic interference or odors.

Golder stated the concern is the lighting. She stated the façades that she has seen show a banded lighting along the sides of the hotel, on the top decorative roof and under the canopy. She stated not all lighting is bad, there will be other lighting on this site, there will be parking lot lighting, signage lighting and the windows will be lit.

Golder stated images of the Aloft hotel brand suggest that colorful lighting is used on the building signage and entry canopy of the hotel. She stated this lighting may be disruptive to the residential uses to the north and east. The applicant must limit this type of lighting altogether. She stated the entry canopy lights must be reviewed to ensure that they are not disruptive to the residential uses within Clark Retirement Homes north of Sparks Drive.

Golder stated another issue is music. Aloft has live music but she doesn't know if that is the case here. We would want to make sure that the music is indoors contained and there is no amplified music.

Golder stated the applicant has met with the neighbors and staff and we have discussed various solutions to the issues some of which are offsite. These are offsite things that we can't require them to do. However, the applicant has offered and if these are things that are being offered we would want, then they should be incorporated into the statement of operations. One being the retaining wall and that there will be landscaping placed there if he doesn't get the 10 feet. She stated another thing the detention pond for the Forest Meadows condominiums. They discussed doing some additional landscaping on their site and maintaining it. We would also like to make this part of the statement of operations.

Golder reviewed the staff recommendation for conditional approval of the Aloft Special Land Use Hotel and conditional approval of the site plan dated November 20, 2018.

Bill Mast, 1946 Turner Grand Rapids MI 49504, was present representing the request. He stated they own the Residence Inn just east of the proposed site. Mast distributed a handout displaying the overall area and configuration of their site. He stated the relative height of the hotel to the condo from their main floor and their main deck would be 30 feet higher and 475 feet away. He displayed photos of what the condos would see from their view. Mast displayed renderings. He stated they are proposing to exceed the exterior surface 50% requirement and go to 65% with brick and then use pre finished panels for the other 35% of the structures exterior. He stated he is going to try to stay away from using EFIS.

Mast stated a lot of the drawings and renderings of Aloft Hotels have a sign above the roofline. He stated he had the architect get the sign below the roofline so that it is less high and less imposing. He stated the sign can't cover up a room window, so they have processed placing it on the stairwell wall. He stated the sign will face 28th Street and will not be visible from either the Clark Condominiums or the Forest Meadows Condominiums because it will face 28th Street and a little bit just southwest. Mast displayed the front elevation of the hotel. He stated the canopy is painted metal. He displayed the north elevation which will be seen if you came down from the north and the east elevation will face over the top of CarMax.

Mast stated with their discussion with Carmax he got the preliminary approval they need for the retaining wall on their side to get the parking lot up to height and to accomplish the 10 feet of landscaping. He was initially asking them for an easement but they would rather purchase that 10 foot strip from them and the wall would be built on that. He stated they would landscape the east side of the retaining wall. He stated there is a concrete curb to keep cars from driving over and a guardrail to keep people from falling over.

Mast displayed drawings of the modified site plans. He stated initially there were two drives proposed they have reduced that to one. He stated the driveway around the north side was proposed to be 16 feet to stay out of the sideyard 20 foot zone. But, when they met with fire their requirements for hose length and access necessitated a 20 foot driveway. He stated they have done that and are now in compliance. He stated all the storm water none goes west across Sparks north east into the condo detention pond it all stays on the original property.

Mast displayed the landscape plan. He stated they are happy to do any amount of landscaping with permission from the condo association if they want them to do that and maintain it. He stated they will also meet the landscape buffer on the south side as well.

Jones opened the public hearing.

Mark Danneman, 2557 Forest Bluff, member of the Forest Meadows Condominium association was present. He stated their concerns are the building lighting and height, hotel use and too many variances. He stated a smaller project would be better for that site. He stated they need to look at this project and see what kind of impact it may have. He stated they don't want to see any parties outside.

Lois Devries, 2504 Forest Bluff was present. She stated the hotel will be right next door and Clark Home is building a multi-story unit. She stated the only way for the hotel to exit is on the two lane road. She stated around 5pm the traffic comes from Burton and sometimes they can't get out of their street because the traffic is backed up. She stated there will be a need for another traffic light and for the street to be widened. She stated this is an urban hotel and this should be located downtown.

Golder stated Sparks and Forest Hills are two lane with a center turn lane and the City in the spring is going to add right turn lanes at Forest Hill/Burton intersection to help with the stacking at Burton Street.

Kurt Freund, 2550 Forest Hill was present. His concern was if the DNR has been brought into discussion to address of protection for the designated wetland area. He was concerned about the chemical runoff that was going to come from the hotel into the wetlands. He thinks it could be disastrous to any wild life that is in there. Golder stated that the area he describes as wetlands is the detention pond put in so Forest Meadows Condominium could be developed.

Motion by Benoit, supported by Pemberton to close the public hearing.

- Motion Carried (7-1) –
- Holtrop absent –

Sparks questioned if there will be events held at this hotel, food or drinks. Mast stated it is not designed as a convention center. Each brand has its own standard. He stated they serve breakfast for their patrons but it is not restaurant and convention center space. They may have a meeting room on the main floor.

Pemberton stated lighting has been a concern and questioned if Aloft will be ok with the proposed lighting. He also questioned if the canopy could be lit on 3 sides and not the back side or not lit on the east side so that it would light up enough to be noticeable, but would not be noticeable by the residents behind it. Mast stated he doesn't know what he will be able to do with the lights, there are things that are Marriott Aloft non-negotiable. Discussion ensued. Mast stated they can try to get some form of approval or discussion and satisfaction of all items, but for the

lighting maybe table and come back and address lighting with more specifics. Pemberton stated the hotel will be a relatively quiet type of development. It has quite a bit of distance between the hotel and condo and quite a bit of barrier. Pemberton stated he doesn't see this as a huge detriment to the neighborhood. He stated if we can take care of the lighting then we will be ok.

Benoit stated the number of hotels going up doesn't matter. It is generated by business. They won't dump millions of dollars in if there is no need for it.

Little stated his biggest concern was storm water but Kentwood has a good reputation of managing it.

Mast stated it is an urban design hotel. The actual target market is urban and the millennials. It is more of an age group than a geographical location.

Fox questioned what they are doing for screening for Clark. Mast stated he drove the site and it is further away, they have maple trees and it is two rows deep. He stated they would be happy to do something on their property. Fox suggested evergreen trees to have more year round coverage and anything they can do to add more coverage on the residential side would be great. Fox questioned if there will be a bar. Mast stated there will be a bar in the hotel. Fox questioned will there be an entertainment space. Mast stated he will find out. Golder stated that aspect is covered in the recommendation for amplifications, all that would have to be inside. Fox questioned if there will there be any outdoor seating. Mast stated the pool is inside it may be some chairs in the courtyard area.

Jones stated as far as the lighting she thinks we are covered with the conditions. She stated she thinks this is a good use for the property. It is zoned C2.

Fox questioned if it would be his desire to go back to Marriott and to table. Fox stated he should go back to Marriott and let them know what we are suggesting for lighting.

Golder stated if the commissioners approve as written no lighting on 3 sides and Mast goes to Marriott and they say we will accept two sides then rather than waiting a year he can come back with that amendment and it would have to be re-noticed. Discussion ensued regarding lighting and discussing tabling to give the applicant a chance to go back to Marriott.

Jones re-opened the public hearing

Motion by Pemberton, supported by Kape, to table Case#31-18 Aloft Hotel by Marriott to January 8, 2018.

- Motion Carried (6-0) –
- Benoit and Holtrop absent -

Work Session

I. New Business

There was no New Business

J. Other Business

1. Allen Edwin Home Elevation Review

Schweitzer stated back in 2007 the Bretonfield PUD was approved including building elevations. He stated recently Allen Edwin approached the City with a new design involving of a garage as much as 22 feet forward from the main mass of the house. He stated it was turned down by staff, the applicant is appealing. At the last meeting there was discussion about the appeal and what its impact may be aesthetically and also discussion about reducing the cost of housing came into play. At the last meeting the commissioner's adjourned action to allow for staff to get together with the developer and discuss their concerns. He stated they have submitted an amendment in terms of the frequency that they would like to use this new design and measures that they have come up with to be responsive to the aesthetic concerns that were discussed at the last meeting. Schweitzer stated he has a recommendation and staff has detailed what the conditions would be. He stated the other condition would be to look at the cost of the house and looking specifically at amending the provisions of the PUD dealing with the minimum finished living area.

Dan Larabel with Allen Edwin Homes 795 Clyde Ct. Byron Center MI, was present. He stated they are proposing a 1,560 foot 3 bedroom home 2 story. He stated they think this will compliment the community and provide a variety of home plans to the community and also some architectural upgrades. He stated the benefit of the plan will increase separation distances between the homes. He stated the plan has a garage forward layout that results in a 9 foot variance from the homes that are in the community. He displayed photos of 5 different home sites.

Larabel stated there is currently up to 8 feet of separation from the front of the garage to the main mass. They are proposing an increase in 9 feet measuring to the front of the porch. He stated along with the discussion last week they wanted to do some upgrades. The full front porch will be about a 3 ½- 4 foot deep porch about 10 foot wide. He stated they have proposed garage enhancements. He stated they are proposing required windows along the front included in the garage door, carriage brackets and carriage handles.

Larabel stated Schweitzer has some staff recommendations. He stated one of the conditions no 1560home to be located within 2 lots (adjacent to each other and across the street) that is feasible, they can implement that. He stated the second item is a 25% restriction on the number of times the can build this plan. it is also feasible. He stated they can implement that by making it a homeowner installed requirement. He stated they will be installing sod in all of these sites. Another suggestion was moving a window to the front of the house, but unfortunately based on some of the architectural dimensions they don't see that as feasible. He pointed out that they are adding windows to the garage on the front elevation.

With regard to a PUD amendment reducing the minimum square footage. They don't see much benefit to lowering it to 1,400 square foot. He stated they see a much bigger value for the community and the market in what they have proposed.

Fox stated the discussion about windows was not about relocation it was about quantity. He stated he can appreciate adding windows to the garage but that doesn't do much for the number of windows on the house itself. Fox questioned if reducing the square footage to 1,400square feet makes the house affordable. Larabel stated they currently have two floor plans they can construct; one is a ranch and the other is a raised ranch. Larabel stated people in poverty may not be able to afford the home because it is brand new and homes cost a lot to build. Fox stated then he doesn't see why we need to change and allow him to do a smaller home if we are not helping the people who need it.

Little stated at the last meeting he was not in favor of the design but when he drove through Windy Ridge development development he was impressed. Then he drove to Wildflower he stated these homes are a definition of cookie cutter because he has seen the houses from 52nd and they are ugly. However, he stated when he drove through and saw the front he was impressed. Little stated Larabel addressed what he thought would work and that was changing the garage and adding windows. He stated he isn't opposed to it.

Pemberton stated he likes the variety. He questioned if 1,400 square feet would make a difference to him. Larabel stated it would be a benefit but not a substantial benefit. Pemberton stated making it 1,400 square feet might open the door for people who can afford the home now. Schweitzer stated 1,040 square feet is the otherwise minimum in the standard residential in this case. Originally the developer offered, and the City accepted, setting a 1,500 square foot finished living area. Pemberton stated he likes the idea of the variety.

Sparks stated her issue with going down to 1,400 square feet means there is more profit for the builders. Sparks stated there is a need for affordable housing. Discussion ensued.

Jones stated she likes the recommendation from staff including shrubbery. Jones stated looking at the schematic where he said the window wouldn't fit , she questioned why they could not make it the same size as the window over the entryway. Larabel stated they would still have to put the egress window on the side of the house and they would be adding a window to the front of the house in a master bedroom. He stated it would be an odd window with no function other than to hang a curtain or a blind. Larabel stated they do not see the value in it. Jones stated she doesn't like the lack of windows. She stated she doesn't like the little narrow strip of the house that you will see in comparison to the expansive garage.

Motion by Sparks, supported by Kape, to Approve the proposed Bretonfield Preserve integrity 1560 Plan (il 560) Request conditioned upon the following: garage

doors as depicted in the 11/20/18 plan proposal; no il560 home to be located within 2 lots of (adjacent to or across the street from) another il560 home; no more than 25% of the homes within the first two phases of Bretonfield Preserve shall be of the il560 home design; install low profile shrubbery along both sides of the garage; add another window on the front elevation of the home to yield comparably sized windows on either side of the garage peak; and install at least one more window of at least 6 square feet in area on each side elevation of the house.

2)Begin conversation with the developer to consider a PUD amendment to reduce the minimum finished floor area to allow for a reduction in the cost of the new homes while being mindful of the appearance of the homes and the overall neighborhood

Pung requested clarification on what size additional window do they want on the front elevation. Fox stated to offer a friendly amendment he would say increase the number of windows on the front and sides and point 2 based on this conversation he doesn't think we need point 2.

Jones stated we will go with point 1 only and amend the language to indicate additional windows not necessarily comparable in size.

Motion by Sparks, supported by Kape, to Approve the proposed Bretonfield Preserve integrity 1560 Plan (il 560) Request conditioned upon the following: garage doors as depicted in the 11/20/18 plan proposal; no il560 home to be located within 2 lots of (adjacent to or across the street from) another il560 home; no more than 25% of the homes within the first two phases of Bretonfield Preserve shall be of the il560 home design; install low profile shrubbery along both sides of the garage; add another window on the front elevation of the home to and install at least one more window of at least 6 square feet in area on each side elevation of the house.

- **Motion Carried (6-0) –
Benoit and Holtrop absent -**

2. Master Plan Discussion

Kilborn discussed 2 sites 44th and Breton and 3800 52nd Street
44th and Breton Avenue SE

Site Description

Location: The site is located on the southeast corner of 44th Street and Breton Avenue, encompassing 5 lots

Topography: The site features varied elevation, as the highest elevation lies in the southeast corner at 792 feet above sea level while the lowest elevation of 768 feet above sea level lies near the pond on the site's western portion.

Wetlands: The site has three areas with wetland characteristics: one in the southwest corner, one in the central portion of the site, and one in the northeast corner. Future site development will take these locations into account, as they may influence the form of development

Transportation: The site has adequate transportation access, with freeway US-131 4 miles to the west. Public transportation access is acceptable as well, with stops for both the Rapid route 2 and route 44 less than .1 miles away. Walkability within the area is adequate, with sidewalk located along 44th Street and Breton Avenue. However, more pedestrian routes within the site would be feasible and desirable.

Adjacent Parcels: The easternmost lot within the site is located south of a Walgreen's which is zoned for community commercial (C2). East is Crestwood Middle School, which is zoned for public uses (OS). To the west is the Bretwood Center shopping center, which is zoned for community commercial (C-PUD).

Dimensions: The overall site has an area of 1,105,879 square feet, or roughly 25 acres. The vacant lot is approximately 10 acres in area.

School District: The site is located within Kentwood Public School District

Park Accessibility: The closest park to the site is Old Farm Park, which is 2,000 feet to the south. Access to the park is acceptable, with sidewalk and a bike lane on both sides of Breton Avenue.

Zoning/Master Plan: The site is zoned for commercial planned-unit development (C-PUD). The site is currently occupied by the Bretwood Center shopping center facing Breton Avenue, two office buildings containing a dentist office and ministry services, and a former bank building on the western portion of the site. The master plan and future land use map designates the site as mixed-use residential/commercial.

Potential Development

Current Zoning Provisions: The site meets the minimum size requirements for mixed use planned-unit development (MPUD). Green space could be retained around the existing pond as well as in the wetlands on the eastern portion of the site. Designating the site as MPUD would allow for additional uses that are perhaps under-represented within the area.

Potential Plan Illustration: Due to existing vacancies within Bretwood Center, better access to the shopping center should be included within the plan. The current private street that connects 44th Street and North Breton Court would be utilized in future plans, granting further access to the site. Consideration for existing wetland characteristics should be included as well, as future plans should account for green space for wetland mitigation.

Kape questioned if the vacant farm was deemed undevelopable because of wetlands. Kilborn stated there appears to be wetlands or potential for wetlands in that strip. He stated in the center

of the site and the northeast corner. Schweitzer stated they had a group out of New York that came up with a plan a few years ago that showed a commercial retail building on the frontage of 44th Street and multi unit residential on the back portion working around the wetland more in the middle of the site. He stated Kilborn's plan was a representative of this prior concept.

Kilborn questioned if the commissioners thought a CPUD is appropriate for this site or other uses.

Jones stated she likes the idea of high density residential or duplexes. Fox stated this may be where we do affordable housing.

3800 52nd Street (Bailey's Grove PUD)

Site Description

Location: The site is located southwest of 52nd Street and East Paris Avenue. A retirement home is located to the east and the Bailey's Grove condominiums are south of the site. A health care clinic lies to the west of the site. A multi-tenant retail development is north along the 52nd Street frontage

Topography: The site features little topographical changes, with the western portion of the site sitting at 758 feet above sea level, then gently sloping towards the east.

Wetlands: There appear to be no wetlands nor potential wetland restoration areas on the site.

Transportation: Transportation access is limited, with expressway M-6 almost 2 miles to the south. Public transportation is lacking as well, with the closest bus stop over 1.7 miles away. Walking facilities are adequate, with both sides of 52nd Street featuring sidewalk

Adjacent Parcels: The site is located south of a commercial strip center abutting 52nd Street. East of the site is a two-story 43-unit retirement community, and south of the site lies an attached ranch-style condominium development containing approximately 134 units. West of the site is a medical facility.

Dimensions: The site has an area of 204,659 square feet, or roughly 4.7 acres

Park Accessibility: The closest park to the site is Bailey's Grove Park, which is 2,200 feet to the southeast. The park can be accessed by sidewalk, providing an alternative to driving. There is a small pocket park on the northeast portion of the site.

Zoning/Master Plan: The site is currently zoned CPUD (Commercial planned-unit development), although the city has been approached about the prospect to have the zoning changed to RPUD-1 (High-density residential planned-unit development) in order to construct 40 townhouse condominiums. The site was previously designated RPUD-1 in the past, and was

rezoned to its current CPUD designation in 2006. The future land use designation is Office and Park/Open Space.

Potential Development

Current Zoning Provisions: The site's size is less than the minimum size required for both CPUD and RPUD-1. If the site is zoned RPUD-1, it would allow the developer to construct 40 townhouse-style condominiums as long as additional requirements are met.

Potential Plan Illustration: The applicant plans on constructing 40 townhouse-style condominiums on the site. The condominiums would be located on three north-south facing courts, would be accessed from Bailey's Center Drive to the east of the site as well as a private drive interconnection to the south. The attached images illustrating the desired form of development highlight an emphasis on high architectural design and extensive landscaping, features that should translate well with the surrounding community.

Schweitzer stated residential seems to be a good option to look at more than the CPUD. Pemberton stated or an infill type project that could too be affordable. Fox stated to the south all the homes are owned so he can foresee people saying they don't want rentals.

3. Commissioners' Comments

Kape wished Jones a Happy early Birthday

Kape stated Kentwood's Holiday Parade will be December 7, 2018.

4. Staff's Comments

Schweitzer stated if we have a meeting in December we will discuss Master Plan.

K. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Pemberton supported by Commissioner Kape, to adjourn the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Holtrop absent -

Meeting adjourned at 10:50p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary