

PROPOSED MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE KENTWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 13, 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, Dan Holtrop, Sandra Jones, Ed Kape, Mike Pemberton, Monica Sparks

Members Absent: Frank Vander Hoff, and Johngerlyn Young (with notification)

Others Present: Community Development Director Terry Schweitzer, Economic Development Planner Lisa Golder, Senior Planner Joe Pung, Planning Assistant Monique Collier and the applicants.

Motion by Fox, supported by Pemberton, to excuse VanderHoff and Young from the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- VanderHoff and Young absent -

- D. Approval of the Minutes and Findings of Fact

Motion by Commissioner Holtrop, supported by Commissioner Benoit, to approve the Minutes of February 27, 2018 and the Findings of Fact for: Case#6-18 – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments – Commercial and Industrial Façade Requirements, Form Based Code Modifications and Zoning Board of Appeals Non-Use Review Standards

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- VanderHoff and Young absent -

- E. Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Holtrop, supported by Commissioner Fox, to approve the agenda for the March 13, 2018 meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- VanderHoff and Young 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#7-18 - 5400 & 5432 Division Avenue Rezoning – Conditional Rezoning of approximately 1.2 acres of land (5400 S. Division) and 56,500 square feet of land (5432 S. Division) from Corridor General to Corridor Edge – Located at 5400 & 5432 South Division Ave SE

Schweitzer stated the request is to rezone the properties from the Form Based Code Corridor General Context Zone to the Form Based Code Corridor Edge Context Zone.

Schweitzer stated there was a work session and there was a lot of the discussion regarding the private easement. He stated if the private property owners enforced upon the easement no buildings could be placed within that area which is contrary to the zoning on the property, whether it is the current Corridor General Context Zone. The proposed Corridor Edge Context Zoning would allow an option to have the building 50 feet back. He stated even at 50 feet back it will still fall within the cross access easement. The conditional rezoning involves the 2 properties 5400 & 5432 South Division Ave SE, they are pledging they will modify the easement if they can get the rezoning.

Schweitzer stated there are also several other properties that have a vested interest in the cross access easement. Schweitzer stated he's had discussion with the City Attorney and he indicated that these two property owners 5400 & 5432 South Division Ave SE on their own cannot just wave or modify the easement across the frontage. It is in the interest of other property owners to act upon it as well. Schweitzer stated when staff shared this information with the applicant he requested to table the request until April 10 to allow him time to reach out to the other property owners. Schweitzer stated this will affect the properties to the south too, that is the reason for the delay in action.

Jones opened the public hearing.

There was no public comment

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Kape, to table the public hearing to the April 10, 2018 meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- VanderHoff and Young absent -

I. Work Session

Case #8-18 – Super Green Market – Major Change to a PUD Plan Located at 3321 East Paris Ave SE;

Golder introduced the request. She stated the applicant is proposing a 3,280 square foot addition to the existing 11,480 square foot grocery store. She stated back in 2010 it was

zoned C4 and since grocery stores are not allowed in the office zoning the City granted the request to rezone the property to CPUD. Along with that came a list of commitments that they made.

The proposed addition would be used primarily for non-public grocery storage and a small expansion of the bakery activities. The applicant has submitted an update to the PUD Statement, dated February 19, 2018. The applicant states that the addition will be the same height as the existing building and roof top mechanical equipment will be screened from adjacent properties.

The existing storm water detention pond will be re-shaped and re-sized to accommodate the addition. The addition will not impact the 100 year floodplain or the existing vegetation.

The applicant is requesting the relocation of the existing dumpster. The dumpster was originally located on the east side of the building in the plan approved in 2010. Since then the applicant has placed three dumpsters on the west side of the property, adjacent to the residential condominiums to the north. These dumpsters are unscreened. The proposed location of the new dumpster and enclosure is 55 feet from the closest condominium unit.

In the original approval, the applicant has stated that all loading would take place on the south and east side of the site. Now loading is being proposed at the new addition, closest to the residential development, inconsistent with the original approval.

The conditions of the 2010 approval required the applicant to place ten 6' pine trees on the north side of the site. It is unclear whether all these trees were planted. There are two dead pine trees along the northern driveway.

The applicant is requesting a deviation from the façade requirements of Section 12.05 7 of the zoning ordinance. In the February 19, 2018 updated PUD Statement indicates an amount of each building elevation includes metal siding. The applicant should calculate the percent of siding based on the overall percentage of materials of all sides of the building. It is possible that a waiver is not required.

The 2018 PUD statement amends the 2010 PUD statement in the following ways:

- References to the "Furniture Showroom" is removed
- 2010 statement indicated that the refrigeration and mechanical units will be screened. The 2018 version indicates that the refrigeration and mechanical units will be screened on the new addition. This should be clarified.
- Deliveries would now be permitted on the northwest corner of the site.
- There is no longer a reference to fitting the windows on the north side of the building with dark materials to eliminate light on the neighboring properties.
- No reference to wall mounted lighting being directed downward.

- Slightly different list of permitted and prohibited uses (although this might be an error)
- No reference to trees along north property line or additional landscaping proposed along East Paris.
- Deviation being requested in 2018 from building material requirements.

One of the conditions of approval of the PUD was for the applicant to provide a copy of the cross access easement and parking agreement between the mosque and the grocery store for the approval of staff and the City Attorney.

In 2010, the applicants specifically limited potential future uses to the following:

- Personal service establishments (no drive through or warehousing)
- Non-automotive repair and service establishments
- Fitness facilities
- Commercial schools
- Private clubs (no alcohol)
- Recreational facilities (indoor)
- Delicatessens

The applicant had further excluded the following uses within the CPUD:

- Building supply and equipment
- Commercial enterprises producing on premises
- Drive through establishments
- Open Air businesses
- Pawnshops
- Sit down restaurants
- Retail with on-site warehousing
- Vehicle rental establishments
- Animal hospitals and kennels
- Freestanding financial institutions
- Funeral homes and crematoria
- Hotels and motels
- Radio and TV stations
- Vehicle fuel stations
- Vehicle repair
- Colleges and universities
- Elementary and secondary schools
- Emergency medical centers
- Hospitals
- Recreational facilities, outdoor
- Recycling station
- Theatres

- Utility sub stations, etc.

Now, in 2018, the applicant has removed “Private Clubs” from the list of excluded uses. This should be clarified.

The site includes the sale of propane gas by the dumpster in the front yard and a donation box near East Paris Avenue, The donation box should be removed; the gas tanks should be relocated.

Issues:

- Dumpster relocated next to residential uses
- Deliveries adjacent to residential uses
- Tree required for original approval were either removed or died
- Requesting waiver from building materials if required
- Reconcile original approval with current request—what has been completed, commitments to other items in original PUD statement
- Clarify prohibited uses
- Status of easement with mosque and parking agreement

Paul Henderson with Rossien and Associates, Civil Engineer for the applicant was present. He stated the site work is minimal other than the access to the rear overhead door and also a pedestrian door. He stated they are reconfiguring the storm water detention basin that has been reviewed by the City Engineer staff and will be subject to further review. He stated they are doing very minor site improvements. Henderson stated they are providing storm water detention for all the hard surface on the site.

Henderson stated there are only a couple of pines tress and they are both dead. He stated the entire area in the back is a fairly heavily brushed area and wooded with quite a bit of brush and over story trees. He stated his client will be happy to provide whatever screening is necessary. Henderson stated he doubts whether pine tree planting in that area will be a success with the amount of over story trees but this is something they can work out with staff and maybe the condominium association. Henderson stated part of the requirement in the last PUD approval was that the applicant coordinate with the condominium association and get their approval for the screening. That had been done and at that time they were satisfied with that but since then the two trees have died. He stated he doesn't see the benefit with the two evergreen trees in that particular area this time. He stated there is some landscaping that was originally proposed and the next submittal they will include all of the original required landscaping out in the front yard.

Project Architect Ken Dixon stated the owner would like to expand the back side of his building for additional storage and expansion of his bakery activities. He stated it will be 3,282 square feet with an access door on the north side. He stated regarding the facade materials, he calculated the entire building and they do exceed the metal siding component where about 30% of the building is metal and the remaining is 25% brick, 25% EIFS, and 25% glass. They comply with all the other materials. Discussion ensued.

He stated if the masonry is required they will provide that, Because it is on the back side of the building he would prefer the metal, its a little more durable and the insulation component is also in a better location. Dixon stated regarding deliveries they actually use a fork lift. They have the truck park on the front side of the building and bring the forklift out to transport materials to/from the overhead door. It is not meant for trucks to load/unload at the new overhead door. He will continue with the forklift which is electric powered with virtually no sound.

Sparks questioned the dumpster location. Dixon stated they have an existing enclosure out in front that would be removed. They would create a new dumpster pad in the back it will be fully screened, it will be expanded, they do need more than one dumpster. Dixon stated the enclosure will be larger on the next submittal.

Dixon noted the staff commenting on window tinting. He stated they are blacked out now, they will maintain that and there are no windows actually on the addition. He stated any wall mount lighting that is required for safety around the building will be directed down and will not glare to the adjoining properties. He acknowledged the reference to the PUD they left out private clubs as the list of activities that would not happen. They will continue to agree that there will be no private clubs at this location.

Fox encouraged the applicant to read over the Fire Departments comments. Henderson stated the Engineer department did comment and it appears they consulted with the Fire Department. They increased the width of the access driveway to get the turning radius. Fox questioned if they have had conversation with the condominium association to see what they would desire for screening to allow for deliveries. Dixon stated they have not reached out to the neighborhood association. Fox questioned the 8 trees that were not planted he only sees 2. Henderson stated he met with the condominium association when Super Green originally moved in and the condo association was satisfied with the 2 trees plus the existing vegetation. Fox suggested the applicants speak to the condominium association regarding the deliveries to the back and the dumpsters.

Pemberton stated the deliveries are not an issue for him. Pemberton stated it does seem very tight to maneuver a garbage truck. Holtrop questioned the dumpsters and stated that is not his favorable spot. Ayesh showed a demonstration of his loading and unloading. Golder suggested in the PUD statement be clarified, no delivery or trucks or loading activities will occur on the north or west sides of the building nearest the adjacent residential dwellings.

Benoit echoed the concerns by the other commissioners. Kape questioned the time the dumpsters get emptied. Ayesh stated 12 noon every day. Jones questioned if the propane tanks will be moved. Dixon stated yes.

Case#9-18 – 5955 Wing Avenue Rezone - Rezoning 22 Acres of land from R1-B Single Family Residential to R1-C Single Family Residential Located at 5955 Wing Ave SE;

Pung introduced the request. He stated the Request to rezone 21.65 acres from R1-B Single Family Residential to R1-C Single Family Residential. Pung stated the main difference between the two are the minimum size of the lots

Pung stated the property contains a single family home with a single drive onto Wing Avenue. He stated any future development on this property will not be accessed off of Wing Avenue. The access will come off of the future Breton Ave extended. Pung stated in the spring they will be starting the reconstruction of Wing Avenue which would include utilities. Part of this site will be served with utilities coming from the west and a portion of it would also be served coming from the east due to the grades of the property.

Pung stated the Master Plan recommendation is for conservation oriented development with an emphasis on residential development. He stated there isn't a specific definition of conservation oriented development, the idea is to preserve significant natural features. He stated the way the Master Plan calls for the development to occur is either through a Form Based Code or a Planned Unit Development. Pung stated the schematic plan that is included in the Master Plan for this area was shown as medium density residential.

Pung stated what they are proposing is not a form based code or a planned unit development. They are looking at rezoning to a straight R1-C which would equate to low density residential generally less than 4 units per acre. He stated it is less than the Master Plans recommendation for density but it is not a planned unit development. He stated as the applicant comes in for a standard plat, we can put on conditions as part of the site plan regarding sidewalks and requiring the street trees etc., but would fall short if you wanted to dictate building size or facades. Pung stated that would be the only issue that they are not coming in as a PUD which was one of the recommendations of the Master Plan.

Chris VanderHoff with Bosco construction was present. He stated they would like to purchase approximately 15 acres of the parcel. He stated they are not sure where the boundaries will be at this point. He stated the plan is to split off about 4 or 5 acres with the home that exist on the property. And then the 15 plus or minus acres Bosco Construction will develop and build homes on them. He stated they feel it is a good fit with the Bretonfield development to the west that currently has 50 foot lots, but they did not want to go that small. They wanted to have a nicer, larger lot and also nicer homes.

Sparks questioned the price range of the homes. VanderHoff stated it will be dictated by the market and if they build the homes they would be in the \$250,000 range 4 bedrooms, 2 bath homes, 2 stall garages. VanderHoff stated that is what they would build if they were to build, but it is a long way to go before they get to that point.

VanderHoff stated the next phase of the Bretonfield development will provide street access onto Breton Avenue. The Breton Avenue Street access will include utilities from the west and they envision a sub division street design involving two cul-de-sacs. He

stated they would try to preserve the existing landscape and would only take out what they needed.

Benoit stated his concern is the Master Plan recommendation for a PUD to be able control more. He stated we will lose that option if we go to a straight rezoning to R1-C. VanderHoff stated the developers have to get a certain amount of lots out of it to make it feasible. VanderHoff stated if he shrank all the lots he could build a PUD less roadway and put in some common elements. Financially he could do better on the developing as a PUD. However he stated at Bosco they would like to see bigger lots. He thinks people like their yards and privacy and don't want to be stacked on top of each other.

Holtrop questioned the potential access to the Allen Edwin cul-de-sac to the north.. Pung stated when Allen Edwin first came in for their original concept plans, there were no plans how this will develop so they were open to have a stub and designed to provide access. VanderHoff did not anticipate an interconnection to the north. Holtrop stated officially they have the stub from the west. Holtrop questioned about how many homes. VanderHoff stated he hasn't read the ordinance on lot sizes yet but he would think 30-37 lots.

Pemberton stated he has the same thoughts as Benoit with the PUD versus the straight rezoning. He stated it will give them more flexibility to get creative and create more open spaces and still cluster and get the number to make it make sense. Fox stated he appreciates the wider lot lines.

Case#10-18 – DIS Transportation – Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for a Major Vehicle Repair Establishment Located at 3636 East Paris Avenue SE;

Pung introduced the request. He stated the request is a Special land use and site plan review for a major vehicle repair operation in the industrial district. Pung stated the applicant wishes to construct a four thousand (4,000) square foot addition onto the south side of the existing six thousand (6,000) square foot building currently used for a motor freight terminal operation. The proposed addition would be for truck diagnostic and repair work which is classified as major vehicle repair and is a special land use in the I1 Light Industrial district. This would include 3 service bays. Two bays for service of the vehicles and the other for engine diagnostics and a vehicle wash.

Pung stated the approved site plan for the motor freight terminal had the front yard along the 36th Street frontage; this would put the rear yard setback for the proposed addition at approximately twenty-six (26) feet, which is less than the forty (40) feet required under the Zoning Ordinance. After working with staff, that applicant is proposing to reorient the site so that the front yard will be along East Paris Avenue making the south side of the lot a side yard requiring only a minimum twenty (20) foot building setback. As part of the reorientation, existing paving along the East Paris Avenue frontage will be removed in order to meet the requirement for a minimum twenty-five (25) foot front yard

landscaped setback (as a corner lot street side yard it had only needed a ten (10) foot wide landscaped parking setback).

Issues

- Provide a more detailed Project Description. Pung stated we need more detail including hours of operation, type of services they expect to provide.
- Signage issues need to be addressed. Pung stated the have 3 wall signs zoning ordinance only permits two one per street frontage. They would also need to obtain a sign permit
- Clarify issue of outdoor storage associated with the vehicle repair operation. Pung stated there is no screening and outdoor storage on the site plan we need that clarified in their operations statement that there will not be any outdoor storage of materials and inoperable vehicles and if that is the case there is no need for the screening.
- Address issue of on-site circulation. Pung stated there are issues as far as accessing for the fire truck. They have indicated that they will be removing some of the parking spaces

Jeff Brinks, with Venture Engineering was present. He stated this is a building addition to facilitate repair. He stated they met with staff and they have no issues or concerns with any of the comments that were received. They can address the fire departments concerns regarding circulation with no problem. Front yard and landscaping issues are not an issue.

Fox questioned whether they would be retaining the greenspace planned along the 36th Street frontage. Brinks stated yes. Fox questioned vehicle storage. He stated right now they have trailers outside will they have an issue putting up screening. Pung stated they are still going to retain their motor freight terminal the screening will be for vehicles that are stored there for the vehicle repair operation. If they aren't park of the vehicle repair operation they wouldn't need the screening because that would have to be in the rear yard. Pung stated there will still be two uses but the ordinance doesn't require screening for the motor freight terminal portion. Fox questioned if they will store vehicles on site that need to be repaired. Brinks stated no.

Pemberton stated he doesn't have any problems with the use. He stated he thinks once the facility is up and running traffic circulation may be an issue. Pemberton thinks he needs to have the 36th Street driveway and onsite circulation resolved before a final is approved. Holtrop questioned the flow on the site and parking it looks awful tight. Benoit, Kape and Sparks were ok with the request.

Jones stated she had questions concerns regarding compliance and she would like for them to be respectful of the ordinances that the City has outlined. Brinks stated the condition of the 36th Street driveway was more of a construction issue. The contractor misaligned the sidewalk so that caused a change in the slope of the driveway and water drainage.

Case#11-18 – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments –Definition of Mechanical Work; Commercial Enterprises Producing Merchandise on the Premises Parking, Special Land Use Requirements and Establishing the Commercial Enterprises Producing Merchandise on the Premises Special Land Use Requirement in the Form Based Code Corridor General and Corridor Edge Context Zones

Schweitzer stated the text amendments he is handling are more refining the ordinance and assisting in the enforcement of some of the codes

Definition of Mechanical Work

To improve the clarity and enforceability of the Zoning Ordinance we propose the following definition of mechanical work:

MECHANICAL WORK: This term shall be synonymous with the terms vehicle repair major and minor, including, but limited to, the replenishment of fluids to maintain the operation of a motor vehicle.

Commercial Enterprises Producing Merchandise on the Premises

To improve the clarity of these ordinance provisions, we propose the following respective changes (highlighted in red) to the workforce limitation for commercial enterprises producing merchandise on the premises found in Section 15.04.FF.1 of the Zoning Ordinance and on site product sales requirement found in Section 15.04.FF.3 : 1. No more than fifteen (15) persons **in merchandise production** are employed on the premises. 3. ~~Entire~~ **The finished product is sold at retail on the premises.**

When the Form Based Code Use provisions were devised it is city staff's recollection that there was a desire to make Special Land Use allowance for microbreweries. The current use provisions do not include this use allowance in Form Based Code. If microbreweries are a desired special land use in the form based code corridor general and corridor edge context zones, Table 4.01 of Section 23.04.09 and Table 4.03 of Section 23.04.10 could be amended to include microbreweries.

Animal Keeping and Gardening in Kentwood

Pung stated in recent years there has been a growing interest in accommodating various local food systems in urban and suburban settings, from small garden plots to raising chickens. In order to respond to this desire we reviewed our existing ordinances, researched other communities, and reviewed state statutes in order to understand and develop ordinance language that would allow homeowners the opportunity to garden as well as keep domestic animals to satisfy their desire for homegrown food sources but not serve as the homeowners primary or secondary income. The ordinance concepts and draft language would tend to formalize the requirements and review process.

Pung described specific regulations in the keeping of animals as far as chickens, smaller rabbits, goats honey bees that have to be met. Right now they submit a written request stating how many chickens they want to keep and we look on it as a case by case basis. The Mayor wanted something more set in stone.

Pung stated we are also looking to add a definition for a Greenhouse. He stated right now we treat it as an accessory use and that counts against the amount you are allowed. Currently the ordinance allows your garage and one detached accessory building this would allow a greenhouse to be an accessory building but not count against the two that you are otherwise allowed.

Accessory Structures and Greenhouses

Under Section 3.15 of the Zoning Ordinance all properties are generally permitted two accessory buildings. Generally, in a residential district, one is allowed a garage of up to 768 square feet and a second detached accessory building of 120 square feet or 250 square feet depending on whether the garage is a detached or attached. There are exceptions for larger accessory buildings for residential unplatted lots of one acre or more (permitted a detached accessory building of up to 960 square feet in area) and homes with a minimum of 3,000 square feet of living area (permitted an attached garage of up to 1,200 square feet in area).

The following accessory structures are permitted but are not subject to a number limitation:

- 1) A child's playhouse or treehouse (not to exceed 100 square feet),
- 2) Doghouses, pens and other similar structures for the housing of household pets, but not including kennels as defined by in Chapter 2 of the Zoning Ordinance,
- 3) Fallout shelters,
- 4) Private swimming pool and/or private bathhouse,
- 5) Decks, porches, gazebos and similar structures, and
- 6) Recreation, storage and service structures in a manufactured home park.

As part of the animal keeping review process, staff has treated the structures for the housing of the animals as similar to structures for housing household pets and not subject to a number limitation.

A non-commercial greenhouse would be permitted as an accessory structure in a residential district but would count as one of the two accessory structures permitted on the property and would have to comply with the size restrictions of the Zoning Ordinance. Greenhouse structures have been permitted in the C2 Community Commercial zoning districts to house retail display of plant materials.

Pung stated we are also reintroducing some definitions we had before regarding agriculture and farming

Agriculture

Agricultural operations, including general farming, truck farming, fruit orchards, nursery, greenhouses, and usual farm buildings, are specifically identified as not being permitted in R-1 residential districts (Zoning Ordinance Section 5.02: Table of Uses) nor in the F-1 Flood Plain district (Zoning Ordinance Section 4.04: Table of Uses).

In 2001 the City rezoned all A-1 Agriculture properties to either R1-A Estate Residential, R1-B Single Family Residential, OS Open Space or I-1 Light Industrial. Prior to 2002 customary agricultural operations were allowed in the R1-A and R1-B districts as special approval uses; customary agricultural operations were removed as an allowable use in the R1-A and R1-B districts in the 2002 update of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Zoning Ordinance currently does not define *agriculture* or *farm*; prior to 2002 the Zoning Ordinance had the following definitions for *agriculture* and *farm*:

Agriculture: The use of land for tilling of the soil, raising of tree or field crops, or animal husbandry. The words agriculture and farming shall be considered synonymous.

Farm: All of the contiguous neighboring or associated land operated as a single unit on which bona fide farming is carried on directly by the owner-operator, manager or tenant-farmer by his own labor or with the assistance of members of his household or hired employees; provided, however, that land to be considered a farm hereunder shall include a contiguous parcel of not less than ten (10) acres in area. Farms may be considered as including establishments operated as bona fide greenhouses, nurseries, orchards, livestock and poultry farms, and apiaries; but establishments for the purpose of keeping furbearing animals or game, or operating fish hatcheries, piggeries, stock yards, stone quarries, or gravel, dirt or sand pits shall not be considered farms.

Section 17.08.A of the Zoning Ordinance permits an owner, tenant or lessee of a farm to openly store the machinery and equipment used on his farm; the Zoning Ordinance otherwise prohibits the open storage or parking, either day or night, of heavy equipment, semi-tractors and/or trailers or other commercial vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of more than 10,000 pounds in a residential district or area.

Staff is aware of one (1) active farming operation in the City:

- Heyboer Farm on the south side of 52nd Street where up to 120 acres of land is leased for the growing of crops.

Pung stated another amendment staff is looking at is accessory buildings on larger lots to allow for larger accessory buildings maybe even get a 3rd accessory building. Mayor wanted to see more flexibility.

Allowable Size and Number of Accessory Buildings

Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow up to one (1) detached accessory building of up to 1300 square feet in gross floor area (up from the current limit of 960 square feet) on residential unplatted lots of one acre or more. Over the past 13 years the Zoning Board of Appeals has approved 5 detached accessory buildings averaging 1300 square feet in area on residential unplatted lots of one acre or more. This increase in the allowable size of the detached accessory building on larger unplatted residential lots should provide these homeowners greater flexibility to shelter gardening equipment or bee hives in the off season.

On lots of five (5) acres or more permit a third accessory building of up to 500 square feet in area.

Fox questioned if there was a domestic animal list such as tigers, foxes etc. Golder stated there is a list on the State's website of exotic animals.

Holtrop questioned the mechanical work definition and whether this is for anybody doing mechanical work in their front yard even on you own vehicle inside. Schweitzer stated there is no allowance for outdoor vehicle repair but if you are doing it inside it would only be on your own vehicle.

J. New Business

Motion by Holtrop, supported by Benoit, to set a public hearing date of April 10, 2018, for: Case#12-18 – Lowes – Change to the Special Land Use Open Air Business and Site Plan Located at 3330 28th Street; Case#13-18 - Breton Avenue Precise Plat Amendment within Section 34; Case#14-18 – CIP Capital Improvements; Case# 15-18 – 36th Street Rezoning – Rezoning from R1-A Estate Residential to I1Light Industrial Located at 3596 36th Street

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Young and VanderHoff absent -

K. Other Business

1. Golder stated she met with Bethany Christian Services and they are looking at a parcel of land east of 52nd and Eastern. They are looking at establishing office use along the current office area. They have also looked at purchasing another parcel on 52nd Street that is zoned commercial and they are looking to make that into a child caring institution, a residential use of about 18 boys that would be part of their Bethany system that would eventually reunite with family. This is consistent with the Master Plan because it recommends mixed used. Golder stated the applicant wanted

the commissioners comments about the use. It will be a special land use and they are looking at a rezoning to R2.

Dan Brody was present. He stated they are looking to move a group home from Gaines Township. He stated Bethany is looking for a group home site. The kids are between 14-17 years old they are generally in the program about 8-12 weeks. He stated they really don't go to school they go through educational assessments to find out where they are in their age bracket. They hope to use the existing Bethany building on the parcel which is what Bethany uses for conferences on the south side of Grand Rapids and also some classroom space. They are hoping to build a residential unit to house the boys. They want to know what the commissioners thoughts are on rezoning.

Benoit stated it sounds fine, but he can't guarantee anything until he sees staffs report. He stated if they are talking about a straight rezoning it doesn't matter what it is being used for it is irrelevant. However, if he is talking about a conditional rezoning it is different. Sparks questioned how many children he plans to house. Brody stated 18 boys and 4-5 staff that is currently what they have now.

Pemberton suggested a conditional rezoning and the commissions agreed

2. Commissioners' Comments

Fox asked about the Arts Commission. Schweitzer stated the group from the mural wasn't able to attend the first meeting of the Arts Commission. The mural will be reviewed at a meeting which will allow time to have the appointment of the fifth commission member.

Fox stated the Taste of Kentwood is on March 15.

Kape suggested the other commissioners check out the newly renovated Parks and Recreation Facility at 355 48th Street

3. Staff's Comments

Staff offered no additional comment

L. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Benoit, supported by Commissioner Holtrop, to adjourn the meeting.

- Motion Carried (7-0) –
- Young and VanderHoff absent -

Proposed Minutes
Planning Commission
March 13, 2018
Page 15

Meeting adjourned at 8:55pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Kape, Secretary